May 28, 2025

				Page 1
1		Hearing of	the New York City	
2		Charter Re	vision Commission	
3				
4				
5		Moderated 1	by Richard Buery	
6		Wednesda	y, May 28, 2025	
7		5	:37 p.m.	
8				
9				
10	Queens E	Borough Hall, H	elen Marshall Cultu	ral Center
11		120-55 Q	ueens Boulevard	
12		Jamai	ca, NY 11415	
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21	Reported b		Biu	
22	JOB NO:	7359714		
23				
24				
25				

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES
2	List of Attendees:
3	Christine Quinton, American Sign Language Interpreter
4	Madeline Labadie, Chief of Staff, New York City
5	Charter Revision Committee
6	Edward Kiernan, Member, New York City Charter Revision
7	Commission
8	Anthony Richardson, Member, New York City Charter
9	Revision Commission
10	Grace Bonilla, Member, New York City Charter Revision
11	Commission
12	Richard Buery, Chair, New York City Charter Revision
13	Commission
14	Carl Weisbrod, Member, New York City Charter Revision
15	Commission
16	Anita Laremont, Member, New York City Charter Revision
17	Commission
18	Shams DaBaron, Member, New York City Charter Revision
19	Commission
20	Kathy Wylde, Member, New York City Charter Revision
21	Commission (by videoconference)
22	Sharon Greenberger, Vice Chair, New York City Charter
23	Revision Commission (by videoconference)
24	Leila Bozorg, Secretary, New York City Charter
25	Revision Commission (by videoconference)

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	List of Attendees:
3	Dr. Lisette Nieves, Member, New York City Charter
4	Revision Commission (by videoconference)
5	Julie Samuels, Member, New York City Charter Revision
6	Commission (by videoconference)
7	Diane Savino, Member, New York City Charter Revision
8	Commission (by videoconference)
9	Valerie White, Member New York City Charter Revision
10	Commission
11	Frank Morano (by videoconference)
12	Raquel Centeno (by videoconference)
13	John Kaehny (by videoconference)
14	Paul Johnson (by videoconference)
15	Cassandra Stuart
16	Kim Svoboda
17	Richard Fox
18	Bella Wang
19	Michelle Jackson
20	Candace Prince-Modeste
21	Janet Wootten
22	Elyse Mendel
23	Caroline DiNola
24	Cariage Paul
25	Richard Mitagliaro

	Page 4
1	APPEARANCES
2	List of Attendees:
3	Kimberly Cruz
4	Shane Moynihan
5	Levi Anthony [ph]
6	Dareth Ogle [ph]
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
2 0	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
2 3	

PROCEEDINGS

MS. LAREMONT: Okay. We're going to start. Good evening and welcome to this public meeting of the charter review commission. My name is Anita Laremont and I'm honored to serve on this commission. Our commission's mission is to look at ways to make city government more transparent and responsive with a particular focus on the city's housing crisis. It is this commission's responsibility to review the entire charter and suggest changes to the voter's consideration.

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 committed to hearing from a broad spectrum of New Yorkers and to pursuing the best ideas that we can find. This hearing is just one of many public hearings across every borough to hear ideas from experts, community leaders, elected officials, and indeed any member of the public who wishes to testify.

Importantly, this is an independent commission. In making our recommendations to the city's voters, we are bound only by our judgment and our values. We will pursue ideas regardless of who

proposed them and regardless of who supports them.

Joining me in this commission are 12 other

commissioners.

There's the chair, Richard Buery, vice chair, Sharon Greenberger, secretary, Leila Bozorg, Grace Bonilla, Shams DaBaron, Dr. Lisette Nieves, Anthony Richardson, Julie Samuels, Diane Savino, Carl Weisbrod, Valerie White, and Kathryn Wylde. Although, as I said, we will be considering the entire charter, the commission is looking in particular at our charter's approach to housing and planning.

From my perspective, there really is no more important challenge for this body to take up.

Our city is in the midst of a profound affordable housing crisis. For millions of low income New Yorkers, housing costs are the central struggle of their lives. For millions more, especially low income New Yorkers, our housing crisis severely limits where New Yorkers can live, what schools they can attend, how they get to work, and whether their families can even stay together.

Our commission is also taking a close look at the problem of chronically low voter turnout in city elections. Although our city does have a vibrant civic life, we suffer from consistently low

turnout in local elections. We are also particularly interested in how to ensure that nonprofit partners who provide really vital services for New Yorkers are paid on time for their work.

The commission staff recently released a lengthy preliminary report summarizing what our commission has heard at public hearings thus far and identifying areas to explore going forward. That report is available at nyc.gov/charter. As the report reflects, your thoughtful testimony has driven and will continue to drive this process as it unfolds. Testimony on any topic is welcome at today's hearing.

So let me just say a few words about how the hearing will -- will unfold. We will generally hear from those who have attended this meeting in person before turning to virtual testimony. However, we have a few invited panelists who are joining us from around the country and we will hear from them during the first part of our hearing today. Members of the public are asked to testify for no more than three minutes.

We will call for testimony from three people at a time followed by any questions from the commission. I'll ask commissioners to hold their questions until the entire panel has finished. If you

wish to testify virtually, there's an form online.

You can find it on the meeting page for this hearing.

Go to nyc.gov/charter, click on the meetings tab, and select the Queens hearing. We will also drop a link to the form in the chat.

We will do our level best to hear from everyone who wishes to speak today. This meeting is scheduled to run until 8 p.m. In the event that we don't hear from you this evening, there are many more opportunities to submit testimony. This is but one of many public hearings that have been announced. You can visit nyc.gov/charter to find information about all of our public hearings.

You can also submit written testimony to the commission by emailing chartertestimony@citycharter.nyc.gov. And if you cannot attend a hearing, each of the commission's hearings will be public livestreamed and recorded for archival purposes. With that, let's get into our testimony. Our first testifier will be councilmember Frank Morano who is on Zoom.

MR. MORANO: Thank you very much. I appreciate and thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today, chairperson, members of the commission, and fellow New Yorkers. As you mentioned,

my name is Frank Morano and I'm -- I'm new to the city council, but not new to the charter revision commission process, especially not some of the electoral reform issues that you have focused on in the preliminary report.

I've testified before this commission twice already in favor of nonpartisan elections with ranked choice voting just as I've done before, every single charter revision commission that has existed in New York City since 2002. This is an issue I care deeply about because it's about making our city's democracy actually work for the people that live here.

On April 29th of this year, I was elected to the New York City Council in a nonpartisan special election using ranked choice voting. No party labels, no backroom deals, just a group of candidates competing on ideas, character, and a record of public service. The result: an election that was clean, fair, efficient, and, imagine this, actually representative of the voters, not the parties.

And that's exactly how all of our municipal elections should be conducted. New York City is long overdue for a full embrace of nonpartisan elections with ranked choice voting. Not just for special elections or temporary pilot programs, but

across the board. This sy	stem is already working for
us. It has for 30 years.	We shouldn't stop halfway.
We should finish the job.	Let me be absolutely clear

Nonpartisan elections with ranked choice voting, the very method by which I was elected, are not radical. They're the gold standard for local democracy. And I'm not alone in thinking that. In fact, nearly every major city in the U.S. that uses ranked choice voting uses it in nonpartisan elections: San Francisco, Minneapolis, Oakland, Salt Lake City, the list goes on. And let's zoom out a bit more.

Nearly every city in America with more -- with more than a million residents, Chicago, LA, Houston, Dallas, San Diego, uses nonpartisan elections. The only exception, that I could find anyway, Philadelphia. And, honestly, if you looked at how that's going, not very well. Nonpartisan elections are the norm, not the exception. They allow voters to focus on the person, not the party.

They empower independence. They reduce toxic partisanship and restore the focus of local government to what it should be: competence, leadership, and public trust. And yet in your preliminary report, you floated, I think, a dangerously confused alternative, so-called open

primaries, as a counter proposal to true nonpartisan ranch choice elections. Let me channel George Carlin here. Words matter.

An open primary has a clear, wellestablished definition. Political parties still
nominate their own candidates. But any voter can
choose which party's primary to vote in. That's how
it works in states like Texas, Georgia, and Alabama.
And you know what those states tend to have in common?
Some of the least represented, most gerrymandered and
ideologically extreme governments in the country.

So when I see this commission use the term open primary to describe California's top two jungle primary. It's not just wrong. It's Orwellian. What you're describing is not an open primary. It's a nonpartisan primary with a top two runoff. Those are not the same thing. Not even close. And California's top two system, it's been a disaster in at least four documented cases.

Vote splitting led to deep blue districts ending up with two Republicans on the final ballot or, vice versa, completely disenfranchising the majority of voters. Why would we want to do that here? It also shuts out minor parties and Independent voices. Why should a libertarian, Green, or

conservative	e have	to	out-	-poll	two	Demo	ocrats	or	two
Republicans	just	to i	make	the :	Noven	nber	ballot	:?	

It's not democracy. That's electoral Darwinism. Let's talk about cost and clarity. Ranked choice voting lets us settle elections, primaries in general in one round, one. No runoffs, no second bites at the apple, no months-long campaign extensions or extra extensions, just one, clean decisive vote. That's the government. And contrary to what doomsayers claim, voters can handle it. In fact, they already do.

Cities like San Francisco, Oakland, and Minneapolis, they've been using ranked choice voting for years in non-partisan local elections. The sky hasn't fallen. In fact, voter participation has improved and elections are more competitive and more civil. But above all, I beg you, be precise with the language of democracy. Stop calling a horse or cow just because they both eat grass. Using open primary to mean top two is a bait and switch and voters deserve better.

So here's my bottom line. Put real nonpartisan ranked choice elections, the same like I just had in April, on the ballot this November. Make one set of elections for New York City. Not one set

Page 13 1 for specials and one set for generals. Don't water it Don't confuse voters. Don't let them need a 2 3 decoder to figure out what system we're voting with today. Don't distort what works. 4 5 Let's give New Yorkers a system where 6 every vote counts, where no party has a monopoly, and 7 where candidates rise on merit, not machinery. If we can trust New Yorkers to rank their choices for mayor in a special election, we can trust them to do it in 10 every other election too. Let's be honest, if New 11 Yorkers can navigate alternate side parking and the subway schedule, they can definitely handle ranked 12 13 choice voting. Thank you. I apologize for going a 14 little bit over my time. 15 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. 16 MR. MORANO: Thank you. 17 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for your 18 testimony, councilmember. 19 Next up is Raquel Centeno. 20 MR. CENTENO: Oh, hi, commission 21 I'm really excited to talk with you today. members. 22 My name is Raquel Centeno. I'm a post-doctoral 23 scholar at the Caltech Center for Science, Society,

and Policy. And I'm here to talk to you today about

some research I've done with your colleagues on the

24

demobilizing effect of primary electoral institutions on particularly Asian American and Latino voters.

So we use survey data that includes validated voter data to evaluate across different states the impact that closed versus open versus top two primary elections have on participation in general elections. And what we ultimately find is that closed partisan primaries are associated with lower levels of turnout in the general election for all groups of voters -- all groups of -- racial groups of Independent voters.

But we argue that closed primaries actually have a larger impact on Asian American and Latino voters because we know from a lot of existing political science research that Asian American and Latino voters tend to identify as Independents or non-party preference voters at higher rates than White and Black voters.

And what that means is that in a city like New York City where you have many immigrant communities, you have large numbers of especially young people from these populations that, essentially in a closed primary system, you are kind of probably mechanically reducing participation, of course, at the closed primary level. But that -- that also can spill

over into the general election, which could mean that part of why you might see lower participation of especially these groups in a large general election is because people don't have this habit of turning out to vote in the primaries.

So what we find and suggest in the paper is that a move from any kind of closed primary to something like an open primary, a top two or top four kind of primary, can result in positive gains of turnout for Independent voters from these different groups. And that there could be additional benefits, particularly for these groups of voters as, like, Asian Americans and Latino voters that tend to identify as Independents.

They may vote with a particular party, but they are not necessarily registered with that party and because of that are not engaged in elections in the same way. Of course, you know, I want to note that this doesn't necessarily mean that this is a panacea for reducing any kinds of, you know, disparities and turnout gaps or anything like that.

But that, you know, moving away from closed primaries can be one way to improve participation of a lot of these groups that historically have been under-engaged or disengaged in

Page	16

these kinds of elections in the first place. I'm trying to keep to time. So that is kind of my initial sort of summary of the research that we've been doing and why we think that closed primaries are related with lower levels of turnout for these groups of voters and why you as a commission might want to consider moving away from those primaries.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. I neglected to ask earlier if there were any questions. Okay.

Thank you so much, Ms. Centeno.

The next testimony is from John Kaehny.

Please apologize if I mispronounce your name.

MR. KAEHNY: It's John Kaehny. Thank you. And thanks for the opportunity to comment today remotely. Appreciate that and compliments to the commission and your staff on your preliminary report. You know, my job is to read through stuff like this and yours is particularly good, so kudos to that. My organization, Reinvent Albany, advocates for more transparent and accountable New York government.

We have a staff of policy experts who have drafted and passed dozens of city and state bills and we're frequently called upon by journalists and elected officials to help them decipher complicated

public policy issues. So that preliminary staff report is excellent and it emphasizes longstanding concerns about New York City's poor voter turnout, which the preceding two commenters did a great job discussing.

The preliminary report identifies two basic interventions. One is even year elections, which are a very good idea and supported by enormous evidence, and some kind of open primaries. The commission report also notes that about a million New York City voters are unaffiliated and therefore can't vote in party primaries. So research by political scientists suggests that the two biggest factors that drive local election turnout is, one, whether the election's in an even year, which really matters because of federal elections, and, two, how competitive a race is.

Now, New York City rarely has a competitive Democratic primary and general election for citywide offices and typically has low turnout for one or both. So today, Reinvent Albany's here to urge you to place two charter changes on the -- that had to do with elections on the ballot. First, even year elections. Great idea. Don't need to get into the details. Many have spoken to this. Second, we ask

you to consider a vote once process, which FairVote calls single round RCV.

And that consists of a single election using ranked choice voting and no primaries. Those would be a big change. But as the councilmember noted, this is what dozens of cities and local governments across the United States are already doing and have been doing. And ranked choice voting has really changed everything. The possibility is that New York has to do things that are more rational and logical. And the overwhelming logic of ranked choice voting is to hold one election and eliminate primaries.

Turning eligible voters -- voters out once is pretty easy to do and far easier than turning them out twice. RCV elections guarantee a high level of competitiveness without splitting the vote. So that competitiveness is an attractive thing. Now San Francisco, which we heard mention, uses general election RCV process with no primary, a vote once system. And they had a voter turnout of 79 percent in their 2024 mayoral election. New York City's last mayoral election had 23 percent turnout. Seventy-nine percent versus 23 percent.

Now there's a lot of confounding

factors that we could look at, but that shows you the magnitude of the difference between those different systems. Another plus to what we call vote once is that it could dilute the ability of a single issue independent expenditure. And those you can't constrain. They're constitutionally protected by the Supreme Court now.

To sway an election -- sway an election in a general election with only two candidates, you could easily have an IE come in and drop ten, twenty million dollars to wreck a candidate on a single issue. And it's much harder to do that when you have a larger field in a ranked choice vote with large number of candidates. So, for instance, San Francisco limits their field to ten. Now vote once does not have to be nonpartisan. Candidates could list their political parties to help voters, you know, with more information about who they're voting for.

These people do care about that, but it doesn't have to. And of course it would save a bundle to not have to have two elections. It would save 30 to 40 million dollars to only have one. And some of that saving could be put towards encouraging people to vote in other forms. Now, can -- can New York City do this through charter change? Probably not.

But the charter has -- the city's been doing things via charter change with the hope of getting the state to pass state laws and enable them with some success. And we think it's totally possible. Now, if that's too scary to have the -- the single vote RCB, vote once, we -- we think you should look at semi-open primaries where anyone can vote in a primary their choosing. Those are used in Massachusetts and were recently approved in Washington, D.C.

Again, we think vote once makes a hell of a lot more sense and has all the upside. But if it's too politically bold, then semi-open primaries would give those one million unaffiliated voters a voice which matters. Lastly, unrelated to this, we strongly support making Mayor's Office of Contract Services a full mayoral agency with robust powers.

As your excellent report identifies,

New York City procurement process is seriously screwed

up. Something that we look at carefully and we'd like

to see a strong MOCS with robust authority to

standardize procurement and get other agencies to get

their act together. So thanks again and happy to

answer any questions.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for your

testimony. Are there any questions? Car	1?
---	----

MR. WEISBROD: Yes. Thank you very much for your testimony. You suggested that we support even year elections. As you know, we don't have the power in New York City to unilaterally establish even year elections. We need state -- a state constitutional amendment. What is the advantage of making that charter change now without knowing in advance what the state legislature and the potential state constitutional amendment will do or what conditions such an amendment might place on what New York City could do?

MR. KAEHNY: It sends a strong signal politically to Albany that New York City voters support even year elections. And that will help get the charter change through the legislature, and then when the charter is before voters statewide, build momentum for it to pass. So as a political precondition, it's very important. You're right. Legally, it -- it's not, but politically it is. And it also keeps Albany from doing the old, you know, you guys got to go first thing. So we think it's very important for New York City to put into a charter.

MR. WIESBROD: Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Okay. Thank you so much.

Novt	TATO	harro	Daul	Johnson.
Next	we	nave	Paul	Johnson

MR. JOHNSON: Well, first, I'd like to thank the committee and the state -- or the city of New York for taking a look at what I think is a very important issue. I was the mayor of the City of Phoenix. I am here to advocate for an open nonpartisan primary. Ranked choice voting or top two to me are -- are less important than opening the primary itself. I've run in both types of elections. I've run both in an open primary as well as in a closed primary.

And I'll just give you a little bit of experience so that you can think about this. When you run in an open primary, basically as a candidate I ran who was a democratic mayor and a democratic council person. But when you go run, you get a voting list of every Republican, every Democrat, and every Independent. You knock on their doors. You meet them. You hear people with differing points of view.

When I became mayor, it was obvious to me that there was a connection between business and the ability to produce commerce and social programs.

That connection made sense. But when you run on a partisan primary, whether it's a Republican primary or a Democratic primary, what happens is, when you go get

a voting list, you don't go get a list of every voter.

You get a list only of those people who are in your
party.

And worse yet, you get a list of those people who turn out in a low turnout primary election. The result of that is that you end up with a much more skewed point of view. And it's problematic. It's problematic for a city to be able to operate because both of those things are important. What the two parties want you to believe is that either you have to be pro-business or you have to be pro-labor.

You have to be pro-business or proeducation. You're pro-God or you're pro-human rights.
The thing that I've seen in running in a non-partisan
primary is how can you be pro-business without being
pro-education? How can you be pro-labor without being
pro-business? And I don't buy into it for a second
that God isn't pro-human rights. These things can be
connected.

What you do is you give a much greater latitude to your elected officials to talk about issues as they're important and to find common ground between people which help make our governments more popular. Again, I'd like to thank the committee for looking at this. Certainly, I think a lot of other

	Page 24
1	cities and states follow New York, so I hope that
2	you're successful in this measure.
3	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for
4	sharing your experience.
5	Any questions for Mayor Johnson? No.
6	Thank you so much for your time.
7	Really appreciate it.
8	Okay. We're going to move to in-person
9	testimonials and maybe I'll call up two people at a
10	time if that's okay. First, Cassandra Stuart and Kim
11	Svoboda. And just so you're ready, after Cassandra
12	and Kim will be Richard Fox and Bella Wang. All
13	right. Cassandra and Kim. Thank you so much.
14	MS. STUART: Good evening, members of
15	the Charter Revision Commission. My name is Cassandra
16	Stuart and I'm a lead budget and policy analyst at the
17	New York City Independent Budget Office or IBO. IBO
18	is a non-partisan independent government agency
19	mandated by the New York City Charter. IBO's mission
20	is to enhance public understanding of New York City's
21	budget, public policy, and economy through independent
22	analysis.
23	Our vision is to empower New Yorkers to
24	engage with their government and shape the future for
25	their families and their communities. Armed with

budget and policy information that's accessible, transparent, and timely. This evening I'd like to take the opportunity to present findings from an IBO report published in August 2024 on the topic of moving local elections from odd to even number years.

While IBO itself does not take a position on this proposal, this is an example of the kind of work that IBO does on behalf of stakeholders and members of the public. IBO conducted this analysis at the request of Citizens Union. IBO evaluated what the fiscal impact would be on New York City's budget if all local odd year elections were shifted to even number years alongside state and federal elections.

For this analysis, IBO included the cost associated with primary and general elections, but omitted special elections as the timing and frequency of these are variable. There would be fiscal year savings of approximately \$42 million every other year if the city held even year, on-cycle local elections. IBO's analysis assumed that the cost to run elections in even years would not significantly change as the infrastructure for conducted elections would already be in place and paid for in these years.

IBO noted that there may be additional

incidental costs such as increased printing or other promotional materials, that there may also be costs related to operational challenges in handling larger volumes such as ranked choice voting analysis. IBO calculated the five-year average of election-related costs in fiscal years 2014, '16, '18, '20, and '22. Though these are even numbered fiscal years, they each contain the cost for the November general election of the prior odd numbered calendar year.

For example, 2022 includes cost for the November 2021 general election. It should be noted that a given even numbered fiscal year also contains the cost of primary elections in even numbered calendar years. Total election related costs for the past five odd year elections range from 50 million in 2016 up to 63 million in 2022. The five-year average of election costs for these years is \$42 million.

Even if IBO excludes 2016, for which there was only one primary election compared with two in most other years, the average of the other four years is 40 million. To put these costs into context, the Board of Elections has spent over \$200 million per year in recent years, inclusive of standard operating costs and the costs of election. Standard operating costs account for the bulk of BOE's expenditures and

include but aren't limited to personal costs and other than personal costs.

In terms of costs for elections, the cost of poll workers consistently comprises the largest share of election costs, while items such as full site furniture rentals and election staff transportation cost relatively less. Finally, IBO acknowledges that the timing of the local election is prescribed by the state constitution and a change at the state level would be necessary to facilitate the shift to on-cycle elections. Thank you for the opportunity to testify and I'm happy to answer any questions.

MS. SVOBODA: I'm not an expert. I'm an artist. I'm a homemaker in the city of New York City. I'm a political Independent and have been my entire voting life. I like to think of myself as a good citizen. I carry my food scraps out to the compost bin. I pick up after my dog. I pick up after other people's dogs if necessary. And I do volunteer work. I recently retired from a not-for-profit organization that works with inner-city youth.

I believe in civic responsibility. So not being able to vote in a primary election because I'm an Independent feels like I'm being stopped from

participating in my civic or the last 38 years
since I moved to New York, I've been shut out of
voting in primary elections. I'm not a newcomer to
supporting open primaries. I've worked on the issue
in the past. I have petitioned and I've campaigned.

Today, I feel it's urgent. Now more and more eligible voters are not registering with a party. And I believe every citizen has the right and should be able to vote in every election. And I urge the commission to act now and put open primaries in front of voters. Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Are there any questions for Ms. Stuart or Ms. Svoboda?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you both for your testimony. Ms. Stuart, you were citing that the Board of Elections spends around 200 million a year and that the savings from shifting to even year would be around 42 million. Is there any evidence or anything in your report that suggests that the switch would also -- there would be other savings?

And as it relates to, you know, what the Board of Elections among -- I know you -- I know you said personnel a lot. But the idea of moving into even, does it -- are there exponential that you're not -- I don't know if your report speaks to that or

Page 29 1 not. MS. STUART: Our report strictly looked 2 at the costs to conduct elections. It didn't account 3 4 for costs related to, say, running the borough-based 5 There are offices in each borough. So there offices. 6 might be, but our analysis did not account for that. 7 MR. BUERY: Thank you. And, Ms. 8 Stuart, I assume that there's no difference financially in aligning with gubernatorial and 10 presidential elections. Is there any difference 11 you're aware of? MS. STUART: 12 No. 13 MR. BUERY: Any further questions? Thank you both so much for your testimony. 14 15 MS. STUART: Thank you. 16 MR. BUERY: Next I invite Richard Fox 17 and Bella Wang. Just that they're aware, the next 18 folks will be Michelle Jackson and Candace Prince-19 Modeste. 20 MS. WANG: Thank you. My name's Bella 21 I'm with the League of Women Voters of the City 22 of New York. I just want you to say that I appreciate 23 the opportunity from all the commissioners here today 24 to submit testimony on your preliminary report, which 25 I found very interesting. So as a multi-issue, non-

partisan political organization of over a century,
League of Women Voters of New York City encourages and
informs active citizen participation in government and
works to increase understanding of major policy issues
and influences public policy through advocacy and
education.

I've been volunteering here for almost decade at this point, which is very -- so we read your preliminary report with interest. We submitted written testimony in the last round around ranked choice voting and around even year elections. Given the focus in the preliminary report on even year elections, I just wanted to dig into a few things that I think people have testified pretty thoroughly around most of the usual advantages.

But we wanted to highlight a few things around accessibility and access for people in the city. So people even this evening have already talked about the turnout problem in New York City, the effects on local election -- or on our local elections from moving from odd to even years as well as the cost savings. But a few things we would like to highlight.

First of all, we believe that it would generally promote a more inclusive and representative electorate benefiting communities of color, young

voters, as well as there's actually some evidence from the research that it might give more voice to renters as well as homeowners, which is definitely a balance of voice and representation that's very active in the city, because we're obviously very diverse as well.

Secondly, from an accessibility standpoint, moving the election timing would ensure compliance with HAVA, the Help America Vote Act, which is a federal law on ballot access. It guarantees certain ballot access protections to voters in federal elections, which then extends to any concurrent elections that are happening at state and local level. That means that these protections are not guaranteed in non-federal elections.

years would put under the HAVA umbrella, which I think as we've seen with political developments lately, it's very important to protect things with existing federal laws whenever we can. Also, I think a thing that we are interested in is ensuring that voter education is covered. Voters experience election fatigue with constant elections and we do think it's important when voters are really tapped in during even years to take advantage of that time to educate on local as well as federal and state level issues.

Lastly, I want to note a little bit around the how to actually get this as a ballot question. Again, from an accessibility standpoint, we realize, as people have mentioned, that the necessity of lining up the local and state elections makes this a little bit tricky.

We are really dedicated to voter education and making sure that should this ballot item be up, that we're in support and really clear to our communities around -- essentially this is a part of the necessary but not complete part of the puzzle and really urge the commission when you're thinking about how to phrase it, to make sure you phrase it in with very, very clear for voters.

Voters are pretty smart on average.

You know, we feel confident in them, but we want to make sure they're aren't excessive double negatives in the wording so that it's very clear. And, lastly, I'll just note as a side note, we are currently studying the issue of non-partisan primaries. So we look forward to coming back with our conclusions later in the year. Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you.

Mr. Fox.

MR. FOX: I thank you for the

opportunity to testify. My name is Richard Fox. I'm an Open Primaries volunteer and a Brooklyn resident testifying to suggest that New York City adopt nonpartisan primary elections to the city charter through a ballot proposal in November. Currently, voters not registered with a party have no say in the choice of candidates that go to general election.

They're entirely blocked out of the primary election. And the nonpartisan primary system allows all voters, regardless of party affiliation, to participate in selecting the candidates who will best represent their interests. This change would increase voter turnout and ensure a more representative and inclusive process.

So some reasons why nonpartisan primaries are necessary: they would lead to majority support for winning candidates. Nonpartisan primaries allow candidates to reflect the preferences of the broader electorate rather than appealing solely to party members, ultimately leading to a more diverse and well-rounded candidates. It also combats the issue of a spoiler candidate to ensure that no vote is wasted.

Second point, it encourages positive campaign. Candidates will be incentivized to appeal

to a broader range of voters, fostering a more civil and constructive electoral environment. Third, it increases voter participation. Nonpartisan primaries will allow voters, including voters not registered with a party, to have a say in the selection of candidates, leading to greater voter engagement and a broader electorate, and, lastly, a reduction of polarization.

Holding nonpartisan primaries would force candidates to appeal to a wider range of voters. And this can help reduce partisan divisions and cause more collaboration, stability, and bipartisan cooperation. By adopting non-partisan primaries, New York City can build on the success of ranked choice voting and ensure that our primaries are more representative of the will of the people.

In addition, by adopting nonpartisan primaries, we can foster a political environment where voters' voices are heard and the election process becomes more reflective of our collective values.

This legislation represents a crucial step towards enhancing democracy, fostering voter engagement, and promoting fair and more representative elections.

Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.

Ms. Wang, I have a question. You mentioned research showing that even year elections would lead to a more inclusive electorate, including giving greater voice to renters. Can you just speak more to that evidence?

MS. WANG: Yeah. So I think overall, right, we know that it's -- we talk about lower turnout; right? But lower turnout is not spread equally across the population. We know in general more privileged populations, White, older, homeowners, that kind of thing, are simply more likely to vote in all of these elections.

You know, we were looking at the history of -- of why elections are currently at odd years and the thought was, well, if we split them up, we'll make sure that people are get every issue with it's chance -- it's time to shine. We'll be able to have more time and focus on these issues.

But what we've actually been finding is that the media market is disintegrating before our eyes, that it's very hard to get local news, and that younger and less privileged voters are simply less likely be learning in the first place about these issues. So basically anytime you have turnout go up, you're more likely to have a representative

electorate. And that has a lot of downstream impacts, we think, on everything from how we handle the budget to educational and other issues.

MR. BUERY: And you spoke to this I think just instinctly in your answer, but you've heard some testimony or some concerns that with even year election, that might lead to less attention to local election and local issues because it would be dominated by the statewide or national election. Can you speak a little bit more about your perspective on that?

MS. WANG: Yeah. Sure. So it is interesting, right, because I think Citizens Union will say, you know, that was why they supported the switch back in the old progressive era days; right? And it just didn't pan out. You know, we did -- our study, we do a little bit of a review of, you know, the New York Times and other kind of major local newspapers.

How much coverage did they have of city council races comparing that to coverage of, for example, assembly races, which also tend to be somewhat lower profile and sort of during the even year equivalent. And it was kind of the same; right? All of the -- the attention went to mayoral and a

much, much larger portion went to presidential and federal elections.

But when we think about city council elections, assembly elections, that's something where we believe that the -- the attention on the election in the first place, the boost from that level of natural attention increased, frankly probably just outweighs the -- the loss of -- of attention to the city council race. Because frankly neither assembly races nor city council races were getting covered in the first place, which is a shame, but I think a little bit out of scope of this particular ballot question.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Any questions? Thank you.

MS. LAREMONT: I had a question that related to what we heard previously about, you know, advocating for either single round ranked choice voting or open primaries, which are different things. And you talked about open primaries and can you at -- at all give us some sense of why you think that that's preferable to the single one?

MR. FOX: So I actually was advocating for non-partisan primaries. Open Primaries is the organization that I'm with. So I'm advocating for

non-partisan primaries. So that would mean that just all different parties, Independents, can all vote in one election. This doesn't specify whether it would be only one election. It could be primaries in general.

Personally, I think one election would be better as the gentleman before mentioned. But nonpartisan would be the route to go, I think. I think open primaries would -- you know, obviously that's the organization name, but as a policy, open primaries is different. I don't think that would go as well as non-partisan. Thank you.

MS. WHITE: Hi. Thank you both for your testimony, Ms. Wang -- Wang, sorry. You -- thank you for your explanation in response to your -- your question about the even year and the anecdotal evidence for more inclusivity, not just racially and gender, but renters versus homeowners. It -- I don't know -- and if this was in your prior testimony, forgive me. I don't know if you have any specific statistics on that that could be helpful in, you know, us looking at this.

You also mentioned that you're in the process of doing a, you know, non-affiliate open primary, whatever the term is, or looking at all the

other options. When you do that analysis, if you can also include any statistics as it relates to more diversity in -- in participation, that would be helpful as well.

MS. WANG: Yeah, absolutely. So I think we -- you know, we did some research and we spoke to -- I've forgotten her name unfortunately. I'm going to send that to you afterwards. But there is a researcher at Berkeley, who was looking at school board election timing in California. Because they've got a useful kind of research position because they have -- they don't regulate whether school boards happen in even and odd years.

And there's been a fair amount of movement in California among those school boards where some localities have been switching; right? So there's some ability to actually track that in a way that's reasonably trackable with the data and therefore being less anecdotal. What they found particularly was that the Latino share of voters increasing by about 6 percent during even years. Asian share increases by a couple of percentage points.

The share of younger Americans almost doubles in presidential years. And there's a modest

Page 40 1 increase in renters. This particular effect also was 2 noted in that paper, to increase particularly in 3 regions with a very diverse population, which is 4 pretty much what you see here. So, for example, we 5 found in New York City when we were looking at just 6 the numbers, districts that have over 90 percent 7 minority populations have turnout increases of an average of 232 percent in even year elections compared 9 to odd years. 10 And so, yeah, you know, in -- in recent 11 presidential cycles, that means that turnout on 12 younger voters end up being something like 60 percent. 13 Obviously it's just way, way huger than it is for just 14 overall turnout for odd years. And, again, because 15 the increase is so much larger for those particular 16 populations, you see them just naturally having a 17 larger vote share. 18 MR. BUERY: Thank you. And you said 19 that research is detailed in your written testimony --20 MS. WANG: Yes. And I can email you 21 all the paper. 22 MS. LAREMONT: Thank you. 23 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. 24 And, again, when you MS. LAREMONT:

look at the open primary, non-partisan primaries,

	Page 41
1	semi-open, whatever it is that you're looking at,
2	hopefully all of them, you could include
3	MS. WANG: Yes. We're looking at it
4	right now
5	MS. LAREMONT: support.
6	MS. WANG: Yeah. We're happy to circle
7	back. I think we have a we have a sort of a
8	grassroots concurrence process that we do. So it's
9	currently going through our membership right now.
10	MS. LAREMONT: Thank you.
11	MR. BUERY: Thank you.
12	Next testimony will be from thank
13	you. Any further questions? I apologize.
14	Thank you so much for your testimony.
15	Thank you and appreciate it. Next we'll hear from
16	Michelle Jackson and Candace Prince-Modeste. So that
17	they're ready, they'll be followed by Janet Wootten
18	and Elyse Mendel.
19	MS. JACKSON: Hi. Good evening. My
20	name's Michelle Jackson. I'm the executive director
21	of the Human Services Council. Thank you so much to
22	the commission for having me back for another
23	opportunity to testify about issues important to the
24	nonprofit human services sector. As the director of
25	the Human Services Council we represent over 180

human	services	nonprofits	in	New	York	City	and	state
-------	----------	------------	----	-----	------	------	-----	-------

And one of our primary issues is around procurement reform. As many of our members -- well, all of my members contract with the city and state to provide essential lifesaving services. I was really thrilled to see nonprofit procurement and payment as part of the commission's preliminary report. I've been testifying at commissions since 2008 and this is the first time we ever made it past the first hurdle.

So I'm really grateful for the attention that this commission is paying to this issue. And while systems changes like HHS Accelerator and Passport have improved certain structures in nonprofit contracting, payment delays persists despite changes in administration and engagement of the nonprofit sector.

While there are many pathways that could lead to reform, I want to focus my testimony on two issues: making MOCS a charter -- an agency in the charter, and also empowering the PPB to be required to have public meetings to help with their authority.

This -- the charter, as is in the preliminary court, should establish a mandate describing the specific responsibilities for MOCS. It's crucial for MOCS to have charter authority.

Having one unified agency that deals with all of contracting similar to OMB that deals with all financials and budgeting would be remarkably helpful as we see different city agencies have different approaches to invoicing and claiming they get to have a little bit of interpretation. Deputy mayor's change. Who oversees those agencies changes. So that would be really important.

The Procurement Policy Board is also a really important vehicle for the public and for city council, controller, and the mayor to have some sort of authority or convening around procurement rules. And they do not have very -- they often do not have public meetings. And sometimes those public meetings are about one specific issue, so there's not a lot of opportunity for the public to weigh in.

And they could also be a really good check on a charter level agency like the Mayor's Office of Contract Services to be able to address issues if the public or the nonprofit sector felt that MOCS wasn't doing everything that needed to be done. And my testimony by just saying, one, we do know that the city council and the mayor have announced recent initiatives and happy to answer questions about them, but we don't know that those pieces of legislation

wi	1	1 ı	рa	ss	

And we don't know that if a future administration will adhere to the standard advance policies and things like that. And since I last testified, things have actually -- the data shows that things have gotten worse with over 865 million in just unpaid invoices to the sector and delays across all of the human services agencies. So it's even more urgent than it was a couple months ago for the charter to submit some recommendations. And agency would be happy to answer questions about that. Thank you so much for your time.

MR. BUERY: Thank you.

MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: Okay. Awesome. Good evening, everyone. My name is Candace Prince-Modeste and I'm speaking tonight in my capacity as president of the Jamaica branch NAACP. I join you this evening to express my deep concern and distrust in the proposal to introduce open primaries in New York City elections.

As a representative of a local arm of the nation's oldest and most impactful civil rights organization, my concern primarily focuses on the potential for open primaries to dilute the Black vote in New York City. Black people make up roughly 23

percent of the population of New York City. And Black voters in New York City are overwhelmingly registered Democrats.

We recognize -- we have been increasingly recognized as the base of the Democratic Party. Black-led organizations and their diverse allies have fought tirelessly to build political power and equity within the Democratic Party. And in this current political climate, it's difficult to ignore the suspicion that open primaries is a proposal designed merely to weaken or roll back the advances that we have made, ultimately allowing for greater infusion of special interest involvement in our local races.

Am I being paranoid? Maybe a little.

But as a Black woman who can constantly has to justify her desire to take up space among others in our modern society, I hope you can understand why. I'm all for efforts to expand voter access and increase voter participation, but at what cost? With so many different primary models to choose from, how will this commission determine which one will best serve New York City voters?

How will the commission ensure that this effort does not dilute the voting strength of

black voters and other groups? How will the commission convince New Yorkers that voters with no vested interest in the policy platforms of a particular party be given the power to help elect the leaders of that party? I look forward to continuing this discussion and hope that this commission heeds the opinions and preferences shared here today. Thank you all very much.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Are there any questions for either Ms. Jackson or Ms. Prince-Modeste?

MS. BONILLA: Thank you, Ms. Jackson for testifying. I have a quick question. There's been implications to -- around whether making MOCS a charter -- charter agency would create any confusion around the PPB and the -- the responsibilities of MOCS. Do you agree and what would you say would be the division of responsibilities among these two entities?

MS. JACKSON: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you for the question. I don't think there's confusion. There's certainly overlap, which is something we see often in city government. And I think checks and balances are a good thing for there to be shared responsibility and oversight. The

Procurement Policy Board is really designed to deal with procurement, which is how do we do competitive bids, how are we, you know, structuring oversight on the bidding process and who receives contracts?

Whereas MOCS is really responsible for the day-to-day invoicing. The PPB does not have a role, especially on a daily basis or even, you know, within its mandate, to tell city agencies how to submit budgets or how to implement something like the cost of living adjustments that human services workers got. And so there really is a division of Procurement Policy Board does a wonderful set of work that does influence and mandate MOCS to have certain responsibilities in terms of procurement.

But on the flip side, MOCS does all the invoicing, auditing, you know, all of those kind of daily insights. And -- and so there's certainly a division of those two responsibilities. And the PPB does have an oversight role if MOCS were to overstep or not implement rules that the public saw as satisfying.

MS. BONILLA: And as a follow-up question, your -- your testimony pointed to the fact that things are worse right now and that the sectors getting paid at even lesser rate than even last time

you	testifi	.ed. :	If MO	CS were	a	charter	agency	today,
how	do you	think	that	would	be	differer	nt?	

MS. JACKSON: Well, one of the things -- so I'm using data from the recent controller report. Just, you know, I didn't do this myself. And they found that in eight agencies it's kind of the worst that's ever been. Or they are seeing, you know, more delays than they were at this time last year.

And those agencies include HPD, which is not under the Deputy Mayor for Health and Human Services, but is under the Deputy Mayor for Housing, Small Business Services, which is under the Mayor's Office of Operations. And you know, DYCD is under the Deputy Mayor for Strategic Initiatives and not health and human services. The next mayor will divvy up the agencies in a different way to different deputy mayors.

And so there isn't cohesion among who has authority amongst deputy mayors to be able to implement something across the system. So MOCS today could say we're streamlining invoicing, we're doing it this way, we are going to establish a SWAT team to come in and, you know, clear the backlog, we're going to register contracts this way, we're going to open renewals this way.

And by having that authority similar to OMB tells people how to submit their money to them, MOCS would be able to say across deputy mayors and across agencies the ways in which things could work. And ideally, and, you know, I think especially in this current administration, I think that would be remarkably helpful for there to be one agency really dictating those processes.

MR. BUERY: Thank you.

MR. WEISBROD: Just a follow up on -on those questions. I mean, doesn't MOCS have that
power today? I mean both MOCS and the procurement
board are effectively under the control of the mayor;
correct?

MS. JACKSON: Well, the Procurement
Policy Board is quasi under the control of the mayor;
right? So there's appointees from the mayor's office
and the -- from the mayor and the controller. But
MOCS certainly is, but it only has the authority that
the mayor establishes. Whereas by having it be a
charter -- you know, an agency in the charter, it
would have clear authority and, you know, the next
mayor could decide that there's not -- there shouldn't
be a MCS. So when we think beyond this administration
and to administration's --

MR. WEISBROD: No mayor has decided that there shouldn't be a MOCS. And isn't -- isn't the failures so far of MOCS or the lack of exercise of its powers really within the jurisdiction, power, and responsibility of the mayor -- whoever the mayor is to address? And, I mean, one of my concerns is just looking at the history of procurement, which is a very -- as you say, a very sad history in the city going back several mayors, the more -- sometimes the more we require, the more problems we create.

MS. JACKSON: So certainly I think systems are only good -- as good as the people behind them. And so I in no way think that establishing MOCS as an agency is going to be, like, the sunshine and rainbows of the procurement reform system. What I would say is from my own experience under Mayor Bloomberg, Deputy Mayor Linda Gibbs, the MOCS -- head of MOCS, Marla Simpson, they worked very cohesively together and were able to establish HSS Accelerator.

So just to speak in this very one specific way is because they partnered and they were able to. Where -- where the MOCS chair did not have authority to compel an agency to change the way they did billing and claiming or procurement, Deputy Mayor Gibbs agreed with the MOCS director and they forced

agencies to do that. Forced maybe being a strong word, although I was in some of those rooms, maybe not -- maybe not strong enough word.

And so this is something that hasn't been tried. The charter commissions have not picked up this as an issue. And so I think it's something that certainly should be tried. And I think it would create more authority within MOCS then, you know, the agency level it has now. And I don't know that it creates, like, more barriers to success and would certainly allow a MOCS, you know, director more influence across the different human services agencies.

MR. WEISBROD: I -- I guess my concern is, and you're sort of making my point, which is it's as good as the people behind it. And as you say, under Mayor Bloomberg and when Marla Simpson was the director, MOCS functioned in a much more -- much better way. The problem with creating a charter change is it's not something to try. It becomes embedded in an effect in the constitution of the city and it becomes calcified. And -- and isn't this principally a management issue as opposed to a structural issue?

MS. JACKSON: Well, I would say it's a

Page 52 1 structural issue for sure. I mean, procurement -when we look at the size of the MOCS budget, when we 2 look at the staff -- you know, the staff of the MOCS 3 team and what they're charged with, all, you know, the 4 billion dollars' worth of spending that New York City 5 6 does, not just in human services but across agencies, 7 goes through MOCS. That's very structural. And so the 8 9 idea of having them outside of the human services 10 issues that I complain about on the daily, having MOCS 11 as a -- in our -- embedded in our constitution would 12 be a great thing for me. Not something to just try, 13 but because it is the essence of, like, how we procure 14 goods and services in New York City. 15 And so in a way I almost think it's 16 been an error of our charter to not include something 17 like that at all, how we do all of the contracting and 18 contracting documents, to have it embedded in the way 19 that the city operates on a daily basis. 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. You kind 21 of answered everybody --22 I think commissioner --MR. BUERY: 23 we'll go down the line.

for the lady from the NAACP. You know, we're very

MS. LAREMONT: I -- I had a question

24

concerned about any impact that changing the nature of how elections are handled would be experienced by various populations here. And so, you know, to hear you assert that this would, you know, adversely impact, you know, Black communities is -- is concerning. And so I think it would be helpful to us if you had any data to support those claims because we would very much want to see anything like that.

MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: Absolutely. And I appreciate the request or the question rather. I think that anytime we are venturing into anything new, you wish, right, for us, looking at past experiences will always help to inform. But also listening to the people. And just in the short time that this has come up, anecdotally the people don't understand it. They don't trust it. They don't like it.

Does that necessarily mean that automatically it's not good for us? Not necessarily. But I would simply ask of this body to put in and certainly not -- certainly just not on you all. I'm here as a partner with my colleagues around the city, around the state, but honestly are here as partners to help us find what works best for all of our communities. But also just keeping in mind that the concern is about the dilution of the Black vote. It

Page	54

has come up and it's going to continue to come up with.

MS. WHITE: Thank you both for your testimony. What also would be helpful is to see if there is a statistical movement for younger -- younger people in particular. 'Cause you're NAACP; right? Black people that are moving toward not -- a non-affiliation registration. Because that's also -- you know, do you have sort of a natural dilution that's happening because of what's changing in society? If that's not an issue that would -- or if it is an issue, that would be good data for us to have.

MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: Sure. I can definitely look on -- for both of those data points.

MS. WHITE: Thank you.

MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: How are you doing? Thank you both for your testimony. Michelle, I just wanted to -- 'cause you kind of -- everybody asked excellent questions and you kind of got to a lot of what was on my mind, so I appreciate that. I think just so I can have a understanding, first I would ask if you -- I'm pretty sure you got testimony written that you're going to send with more of your suggestion.

I'm -- I'm going to ask, do you think that this adoption from the charter level is going to help to streamline the process? And you're saying create sort of, like, a separate agency with more authority. Do you think that there's a way that this is going to sort of, like, streamline -- streamline the processes to make sure that these things function and also does it still allow for checks and balances in the way that it should?

MS. JACKSON: Yeah, absolutely. So I'll answer the second part first because I think there's the Procurement Policy Board, also there's the city council who -- you know, MOCS issues a directive and the city council doesn't agree with that directive, they can certainly legislate. I mean, we're seeing that right now in the sense that the mayor announced fifty -- you know, 50 percent-ish advances for next year.

The council has legislation for 80 percent advances. So there's always going to be the check and balance of the city council and the controller obviously in terms of their oversight role and then additionally the procurement policy board.

And I think it would streamline things. Because right now the Mayor's Office of Contract Services, when they

want to do something like standardized invoicing, they don't get to just say, "This is how you should invoice."

And, you know, for a very specific example, nonprofits get their invoices rejected one at a time. And if you have a million dollar invoice that you submit to the city and they find -- this is a true story. Not the million dollars, but it's about 250,000 -- 92 cents difference on a receipt, the whole invoice was rejected and sent back for the nonprofit to correct that error. They did not get paid that 250 until that error had been corrected.

The Mayor's Office of Contract Services wants to do and -- and it has a issued a directive around partial payment. Pay the part of the invoice that is not contested and then wait for the other piece. So the 92 cents will, you know, hold that for a while. They don't get to just issue that directive across agencies.

They have to go to the different deputy mayors and the different agencies and negotiate that.

And we have seen in the past, over the years, certain agencies have tried to opt out of some of those directives or say, "But we're special or we have a different way of doing this." And so MOCS should have

the authority to say, "We're the ones who receive invoices and send them onto OMB; we should be able to have a uniform policy around things like that."

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So -- so clearly, you know, that data that shows that this simple process -- or not a simple process, but this process actually delayed payments, which is the main issue and -- and caused -- because you have to go through these other mechanisms. So I think someone was speaking to -- one of the commissioners was speaking to, does that -- can that get handled on the -- well, there's the mayor's side of things, from that level, even if it's legislated through the city council, or does it require a charter?

MS. JACKSON: Well, something like the -- you know, if -- if the mayor and the city council agree on something, an invoice policy, although a lot of that -- you know, MOCS could do that now, but they have to go through the different city agencies and different deputy mayors. And so it depends on kind of -- like, something around late payments really couldn't be legislated.

It is a management issue, which is why having MOCS as, like, a level agency in the charter would allow for a clear stream of who's in charge and

management. And so in that sense it streamlines the process. I don't know if that's your exact question, but there's -- you know, OMB still has an oversight role. Legal still has an oversight role, Department of investigation.

So all those things would still exist. And MOCS, even as a charter level agency, wouldn't be able to, like, usurp that. And the city council could certainly legislate around issues of accountability and oversight and kind of components of that whole process in terms of get -- from the time you get a contract till the time you get audited. But MOCS as an agency would have more authority to just streamline those processes.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. Again, thank you both for testifying for Ms. Modeste. We -- we've heard some testimony suggesting that Black voters are still grappling with ranked choice voting and introducing something -- another change at this time would only kind of compound that confusion. I -- I noticed that you didn't take that position necessarily, but I will be interested to know what you think about that viewpoint.

MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: I appreciate that.

As someone who, another hat, has worked as a ranked

choice voting trainer, I push back against that notion. I -- the evidence that I've seen does not suggest that any group of people have any particular hardship with ranked -- with understanding ranked choice fully. I understand where folks are coming from, but that's not the position that I do.

MR. BUERY: Thank you. Commissioner
Wylde, do you have any questions, before I -- I have a
few others, but --

MS. WYLDE: No.

MR. BUERY: Question for Ms. PrinceModeste. Is that right? Thank you so much. Thank
you for your testimony. One thing I just want to note
is that as part of our analysis, some of the things
that we are doing about trying to evaluate whether
there are any evidence for the idea that any of the
changes to the primary rules would have the effect of
the dilution of the votes -- dilution of Black vote as
I think is required for -- under the state voting
rights law.

So I appreciate you raising the issue, but, again, I think that -- I think we all want to make sure that decisions here are driven by data. You know, we all have reasons to be concerned about movement but I -- I think we can access that data.

And so, again, I'll just sort of repeat to the extent that you have data that suggests that it's the case, that would be helpful.

One of the things I do want to clarify is -- and I think one of the things that we're hearing about this challenge is language, because open primaries can be interpreted in different ways. And so I just want to just clarify your concern. Is your concern primarily with the idea that opening up a Democratic primary, for example, to non-registered Democrats would have a dilution of Black voting power as opposed to having a single primary, not Democrat or Republican, a single primary open to all voters? Is your objection to the former or the latter or both?

MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: So your first example, particularly because Black voters are overwhelmingly registered Democrats.

MR. BUERY: But so to clarify, the objection is not to having a single primary where anyone of any registration can vote regardless of your primary -- or your party affiliation?

MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: The -- so the -- and I promise I'm not being difficult. The ultimate objection is to not dilute the Black vote. So any mechanism which would do that, whether on purpose or

by accident, we would -- I personally, and obviously speaking from our organization, would not.

So, again, I understand that there are lots of different models for open primaries, but certainly one that would allow voters who are not registered to a party to make decisions along with voters who are registered to that party, I believe would further dilute the power of the Black vote in New York City.

MR. BUERY: Thank you. Can I just ask it again because I just want to be clear for my -- I think I for one would not be in favor of any rule that would dilute Black voting power. So I -- I don't want to speak for my colleagues -- and so that's why I want to get clear about different proposals which operate differently.

So I understand you to be saying that in a Democratic primary, in a world where we have -- we have today a Democratic primary, Republican primary, I understand to you have an objection to allowing non-Democrats to vote in a democratic primary for fear that -- that there could be all sorts of malfeasance and interference with the operation of that primary, if I understand that objection.

MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: Correct.

MR. BUERY: I'm asking about a different model which would not have a Democratic primary or Republican primary. It would simply be one -- wouldn't even call it a primary. Just a -- a first round of voting where Democrats could vote in that first one, Republican could vote, Independents could vote, socialists could vote, conservatives could vote. Is your objection to that model -- I understand what -- but do you -- maybe put it differently. Do you have a concern that that model would dilute Black voting power?

MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: To an extent simply because Black voters in New York City are affiliated voters and so take it for what it is, but --

MR. BUERY: But they can still vote -MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: No, I understand
that they can still vote. But when you -- I am
worried that when you open it up to everybody, it
creates the potential for the Black vote to get lost
in the sauce. I'm sorry. I would -- let me -- just
to be perfectly clear, I -- I'm more familiar with the
first example that you spoke about more so than the
second example. I think the first example is used
where -- where open primary are, I guess, I think that

	Page 63
1	first example is used more widely across the country,
2	but I do want to be able to come back to
3	MR. BUERY: I don't know that's the
4	case, but I'm
5	MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: I'm more familiar
6	with the first example.
7	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. I
8	appreciate it.
9	MR. WEISBROD: Can I just just
10	follow up on chairman's question? If I understand
11	that you're saying the first one which is non-party
12	people being able to vote in a party primary is your
13	greatest concern. You may have concerns about the
L 4	others as well. Is that
15	MS. PRINCE-MODESTE: That's exactly
16	correct. Thank you.
17	MR. BUERY: All right. Thank you both
18	so much for your testimony. I appreciate it.
19	Next Janet Wootten and Elyse Mendel.
20	Following them will be Caroline DiNola and Cariage
21	Paul. And as always, forgive my generally terrible
22	pronunciation. I apologize. Thank you.
23	MS. WOOTTEN: Good evening and thank
24	you for giving us a chance to to speak to you. And
25	it's great to have heard you know 15 erudite meonle

Page	64
------	----

MS. WOOTTEN: I've worked with many educational and cultural and civic institutions for years and years and years. So I'm an activist in the sense that I am a, you know, rebellious Independent and have been since I was 18 when I registered as an Independent. Didn't even know what that meant, but it is who I am.

And I'm here to tell you a couple of things that I've seen since I last sat before the charter revision commission in 2003 when there was up for grabs -- I think it was Mayor Bloomberg at that point, I think it was, who put it on the docket for consideration. And now 22 years later, it seems like this time has come for something akin to letting everybody in the city vote in the primary process since that in our town tends to be where the decisions get made.

I had a couple of statistics I'm bringing to you that, Ms. White, I heard you speaking

to the issue of young voters, and Ms. Laremont, I heard you speaking to the primary concern of housing -- housing and low voter turnout being the kind of focal points of -- of this moment. And I think these stats speak to both of those issues.

There -- as I think one of our colleagues said earlier, there's now 1.1 million unaffiliated non-party connected voters in New York City. But what's so stark is that close to 500,000 of them are younger than the age of 40. I'm grabbing these stats from the CFB voter analysis report. There was lone in '22 and there was one in '24. So these are good stats.

So half of the unaffiliated non-party people in this city are young. They're under 40.

Okay. It's people in my age bracket who are voting.

So the other stark statistic was that 50, close to 55 -- it's 54.6 percent of primary voters were over the age of 50. And in the last election, the average age of voters in the primaries was 57.

So you've got this -- you've got this confluence of all these young people coming in to register to vote and then you have a lockout in terms of when they get there. I'm giving you an anecdote because I feel very passionately about this. I stood

Page 66 1 at the polls as I often do -- that during the --2 Obama's --3 MR. BUERY: I'm sorry. You're at time. 4 So you can just wrap up with --5 MS. WOOTTEN: I'm wrapping now. And I 6 had to turn voters away who come out to vote for 7 President Obama and could not vote because they were registered Independents. That is not a good -- that's not a way that we should continue. Thank you for the 10 chance to speak. 11 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. 12 MS. MENDEL: Hello. 13 MR. BUERY: Hi, how are you? 14 MS. MENDEL: Hi there. Okay. So first 15 thanks for the opportunity to testify. This is the 16 first time I've ever done anything like this before in my life. And my name is --17 18 MR. BUERY: Welcome. 19 Yes. And my name is Elyse MS. MENDEL: 20 Mendel. And I live in Brooklyn and I'm retired from 21 I worked there for 30 years. And I now work as OME. 22 an emotional development coach. And I've been an 23 Independent voter ever since I've registered to vote 24 like -- like Janet here. I don't feel that having an 25 allegiance to a party is helpful in supporting the

growth of the American people.

And I don't want to have to be affiliated with a party. I want to be affiliated with the American people. And I believe what's "growthful" is focusing on the issues and working to elect people that can make, you know, what we need and what we want -- to make that happen. And I feel deeply -- deeply that people deserve to get what they need to leave -- to live a decent life.

I'm going to slow down. Sorry. And that that goes beyond party politics. And that part of what people need is the capacity to shape policies and programs in their city. And they need to be able to participate in every election. And here's the problem. My capacity to express my beliefs is totally blocked in a city where as -- as was mentioned, the primaries are almost always determined -- determines the winner.

I can't vote. And I'm -- I'm locked out. And I worked in -- you know, for the city for 30 years and all my taxes, you know, were taken out and I pay my taxes every year and that supports elections that I can't participate in. So I -- I feel this is a critical issue and I'm one of those 1.1 million Independent voters, you know, in the city. And I

	Page 68
1	think we have the right to to vote in in the
2	elections.
3	And, again, especially when the
4	primaries do really determine, you know, who's going
5	to be running in the general. And you have the power
6	to do something about that. And you could put this
7	issue on the ballot in November and and I think
8	that's urgent for democracy. It's urgent for the
9	the betterment of the city. And I I really believe
10	that all New Yorkers have the right to to vote and
11	not have to be have to join the party as a
12	prerequisite to participate in democracy. So thank
13	you so much.
14	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. So for
15	your first time doing that, that was excellent. Thank
16	you.
17	MS. MENDEL: Oh, thank you so much.
18	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Any questions
19	for the panelists? Thank you so much for your
20	testimony. I appreciate it.
21	Next I'll invite Caroline DiNola and
22	Cariage Paul. You'll be followed by Alton Smith and
23	Mike Tagliaro [sic].
24	MS. DINOLA: Good evening. My name is
25	Caroline DiNola. I live in Bay Ridge in Brooklyn.

I'm a freelance writer, an editor, and I've been involved in supporting political reform efforts for more than 40 years of my life. And one of those issues I've been involved in is the issue of open primaries. I'm a native New Yorker but I lived in California in the two thousands -- early two thousands.

And in 2010, I actually volunteered on the campaign for California proposition 14, which was for top two primaries. At the time, I had a full-time job, busy job, but I believed in the cause. And I went into one of the campaign offices every Sunday for many months and I called other Independent voters. By the way, in California an Independent voter was called declined to state.

Now we didn't really decline to state anything. We were Independents. We were stating what we were. But in any event, that's an example of how Independent voters often feel, that they don't even count. So we made the calls and amazingly enough that election was won. We won by 53 percent of the vote. Nobody thought it was going to be possible.

There was a tremendous campaign and a lot of money to try to prevent it, but it passed.

Well, now here I am back in New York. I moved back in

2011, which means although we succeeded in passing open primaries in California, I never got the benefit of it 'cause I moved to New York City where there was no such thing. It doesn't feel reasonable to me.

Because I think New York City should be in the lead of doing more to -- to improve our democracy, to broaden the number of people who participate. To me, the -- the level of participation is the most important issue. The more people that vote, the more voices there are in politics. We all know and we've heard today that voter turnout is not good. And we all do know that when everyone can vote, more people participate.

And that includes everybody. So in every community, there's a whole population of people who don't vote for all kinds of reasons. We need to give those people a reason to vote as well. Every year in my neighborhood there are people petitioning to get candidates on the ballot and they ask me to sign and I can't sign a petition because I'm not a registered Democrat.

I'm a registered Independent. And when I say that to the petitioners, many of them are young people and they're shocked to learn that we Independents can't vote in every election. So I think

it's time for New York City to catch up. I think we can't keep waiting for the perfect moment. This is the moment to open up the process to everybody. Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Despite your concerns, congratulations on making the wise choice to return to the correct state.

MS. DINOLA: Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Mr. Paul.

MR. PAUL: Thank you to the commission for the opportunity to share my voice today. My name is Cariage Paul. I'm a volunteer for Veterans for All Voters. I proudly served as a Navy corpsman for five years and helped build out Javits as a hospital in the city during the height of the COVID-19 crisis. I was also raised prior in Queens about two blocks down there.

And I've had the privilege of interning at the New York City's mayor office while pursuing my studies at John Jay College. I'm also one of the 1.1 million Yorkers who identify as an Independent voter, those who have chosen not to affiliate with any political party. Like many veterans, my sense of service did not end when I left the military. I still believe in giving back just now in a different form.

I see voting as one of the most essential responsibilities we have in democracy. But here in New York City, that responsibility isn't fully respected because I'm an Independent. I don't get a say in the election that often matter the most, the primaries. Nearly half, 49 percent, of New York City's Independent voters are under the age of 40. Young voters aren't apathetic.

We're either shut out of voting or opting out because the political system isn't working for us. The same is true for the military community as well. Fifty-five percent of post-9/11 veterans identify as Independents, yet we're locked out of the same elections we served to protect, elections that other veterans have sacrificed their life for.

In the military, I learned to work with people of every background. We didn't ask who you voted for, where you came from. We asked whether you showed up for each other. And I think these values are representative of how our democracy should work too. When we talk about open primaries, we aren't talking about weakening parties. We're talking about stirring participation.

We're taking -- we're talking about welcoming the voices of the next generation and the

veterans and public servants who have already proven their commitment to our country. When is it ever acceptable to live in competition, whether in business, ideas, or elections? The answer is never, especially not in these United States. This is a practice we should no longer accept.

New Yorkers deserve a system that reflects the city we serve, not one that shuts out over a million of us or forces the people of the city to align with candidates that they may not agree with in the future. I urge you to keep open primaries on the table for -- ballot because our democracy deserves it. We're not asking for anything special. We're just asking that New Yorkers have the right to vote however they see fit. Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you. Any questions for the panel? I do want thank you, Mr. Paul, for your service to the country and also to our city during difficult times. It's deeply appreciated. Thank you both for your testimony.

Next, Alton Smith and Mr. Mitagliaro, who will be followed by Kimberly Cruz and Shane Moynihan. Are you Alton or Mike [sic]?

MR. MITAGLIARO: Hello, Richard Mitagliaro. And I want to compliment you on

	Page 74
1	pronouncing my name correctly. Thank you very much.
2	MR. BUERY: I have so you have no
3	idea how much anxiety I have thank you for that. I
4	appreciate it.
5	MR. MITAGLIARO: Like like a few
6	other people here today, this is my first time
7	speaking at a function of the sort. So I thank you
8	very much for this time. I'm here with Veterans for
9	All Voters and I've lived in New York for ten years.
10	During that time I vote. I vote early.
11	Unfortunately, I vote early in the general election
12	and I'm an Independent voter.
13	So I have a curious experience of
14	walking to the ballot box and seeing most the
15	decisions made for me already. So I really just want
16	to highlight that feeling of doing that and
17	understanding that a fraction of the voters in the
18	city are making the decisions. And that just feels
19	wrong. Like other people have said here today, you
20	know, no group should have any more say at the voting
21	box than others.
22	I feel that to my heart. And that is
23	why I'm speaking here today. So I'm still going to
24	vote early this year again in the general election. I

just -- I hope that I -- I can vote for this proposal

Page 75 1 to add nonpartisan primaries to -- to our voting here 2 in New York. Thank you. 3 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. 4 questions? Thank you so much, Mr. Mitaglario. 5 appreciate it. 6 Is Alton Smith here? Okay. Next, 7 we'll have Kimberly Cruz and Shane Moynihan. Hello. 8 MS. CRUZ: Happy memorial 9 Happy mother's month. And my family's from 10 Columbia, so (speaking Spanish). Religion, spirit, 11 everything is right now coming to us all as the United 12 States of America was founded by Christian fathers 13 who -- Thomas Jefferson, he studied the Quran 11 years 14 before he wrote the amazing living document that is 15 getting destroyed in front of our eyes. 16 So I wanted to start with this amazing 17 little excerpt because we need to bring the 18 intellectual conversation to the spiritual world that 19 we're in. And we are in a civil war. And the Soviet 20 Union never really ended. And everyone is under 21 attack, 195 nations, because we're letting our 22 children's brain rot. Right now, federally, the same 23 leaders that regulated the internet is regulating 24 artificial intelligence.

We have at the federal level, Senator

Cruz, who carries my last name, saying that we, the

Page 76

United States, did everything right. We did not. The internet, I was eight years old, I was on Myspace.

That is not okay. So now when the EU has had privacy data regulations, laws, that we could also adopt and have civic conversations around, we're not doing it.

We're focusing on primaries, which is what the -- want. So I'm going start with this. We have a finer body. The body which we see is the gross body. It's just like a shirt and a coat. Within the coat, there is a shirt. And within the shirt, there is a body. Similarly, the pure soul is covered by a shirt and a coat. The garments are the mind, intelligence, and false ego. False ego means the misconceptions that I matter, that I'm a product of this material world.

This misconception makes me localize.

For example, because I've taken my birth in India, I thank myself Indian. Because I've taken my birth in America, I thank myself American. But as a pure soul, I am neither Indian nor American. I am a pure soul. These other designations, American Indian, German, Englishman, cat, dog, bee, bad, man, or wife, these are all designations.

In the spiritual consciousness, we

become free from all such designations. That freedom is achieved when we are constantly in touch with the supreme spirit. So no matter what religion, what culture, what country, what your mother tongue is, if you speak -- if you speak Spanish, if you speak Chinese. And these country (speaking Spanish). And so Columbia fell in 2022.

Panama has fallen before because people, leaders in history, have decided to go into people's homes and tell them what they should believe. And you are all amazing leaders up there, all intellectuals from my universities, Ivy leaguers are going under because of our administration. So I've got five seconds, but I would love a question because I'm a civilian that is intellectual and I'm tired of these disrespectful conversations of just focusing on primaries during the civil war.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.

Mr. Moynihan.

MR. MOYNIHAN: Hello. Thank you for having me. Thank you for coming to Queens. I live just down the block. I spoke with you -- I spoke to you, several of you, maybe all of you a couple months ago. I'll try not to rehash everything I said back then. I agree with what everybody here has said since

I've	gott	en here	15	minut	tes ag	go abou	t open	primarie	es.
I th	nink e	verybod	y i	n the	city	should	have	a voice.	

I think primary -- you know, closed primary system is extremely flawed. It's obvious that, you know, people mention, like, oh, you know, maybe it turns -- we know it determines the election. We know that's what matters. But I don't want to believe that. I actually -- I came here today to reiterate that, but also to express my preference for the system of open primaries.

If you were to choose to put one on the ballot, I know people from Common Cause -- I saw John Admon [ph] last week or a couple weeks ago voiced his support for the top two system, which I don't agree with. Right now, we're going to have a general election with -- if Zohran doesn't win primary, you know, probably him, Working Families, Adams Independent, Sliwa Republican, and Cuomo Democrats.

We have four. Why are we going to turn that down to two? Maybe, you know -- personally, I don't want Adams or Cuomo in the race at all. But let's say we had someone else that was good, libertarian, Green Party. It's almost -- it's a very strong probability that a Democrat is going to make it and a Republican. Maybe two Democrats if they go hard

		-	
on	the	doors	

But why are we going to say -- why are we going to block that -- block out that third person, that third option? Alaska has the top four system.

It's -- you know, it's fairly new, been used twice, but it's proven. They tried to -- they tried to tear it back. The last ones came out and they reiterated, like, no, we want -- we want freedom to choose, put a vote for -- we don't -- we don't want to be told we have to identify with a party.

So just use that system. If you -- if some of you have been thinking about the top two and leaning towards it, I think that will actually destroy -- have the possibility to destroy the electoral reform movement, the open primary movement. It helps that it has ranked choice voting compared to California where it didn't and shift -- boost -- you know, put millions on his Republican candidate and that gives a bad name, too. But even with RCV, it's too restrictive, and it's just why? Thank you for your time.

MR. BUERY: Thank you much for your testimony. Any question for the panelists? Thank you so much for your testimony. We deeply appreciate it.

MS. CRUZ: I just say one last thing?

You are here in the Queens Borough Hall --

MR. BUERY: We have to keep --

MS. CRUZ: -- and we have immigrants that are getting hurt and a healthcare system that is a new type of slavery. This is disrespectful. I saw melanated women here --

MR. BUERY: Ma'am, we have other -- we have other people who want to testify. Thank you so much. We're going to move on to the next Zoom testimony. First, Levi Lechak Anthony [ph] and Marialenna Giampino [ph]. I apologize. So, Levi Anthony [ph], you're up first.

MR. ANTHONY: I wanted to bring up three issues with the ranked choice vote. It should -- I don't know if there'll be time for all that tonight. I'll go with one and we'll see how long -- how time we have. Issue number one is in those of the states that have ranked choice voting, they allowed for ranking of all candidates. We'd only being able to rank five candidates.

You -- you got to have a full, complete say who wins or who loses the -- the person you want to win or the person you want to lose. And it's that -- and the 50 percent that the person reaches at the end of the -- you know, the round, is that a true

Page 81 1 50 percent of the people. Why -- that's issue one. So we should be able to rate all candidates. 2 3 questions or should move onto number two? 4 MR. BUERY: Please continue. Hello? 5 MR. ANTHONY: Yes. 6 MR. BUERY: You can continue. 7 MR. ANTHONY: Okay. Issue number two, 8 batch elimination. As far as I'm aware, I think New York City is the only plate that has batch 10 elimination. Batch elimination also takes away from 11 the voters' -- from the voters' attention. As far as 12 I read from -- I forgot from -- from which site it 13 was -- the law -- the law site that gave the rules of 14 the ranked choice tabulation is that in order to, what's it called -- to do batch elimination round, you 15 16 need to make sure that it's not possible for any candidate to be able to surpass the ones before them. 17 18 But in order to do that, you need to be 19 counted all -- all choices, you know, and not 20 eliminating multiple candidates. So I -- and in order 21 to know which -- where the vote goes after the next 22 person, the next person, you need to do it one person 23 at a time. And the -- since I assume this is already

been -- being done, unless the -- you know, the Board

of Elections is lying to the public, just release

24

Page 82 1 that -- that information. That's issue number two. Any question or should I continue? 2 3 MR. BUERY: Please continue. 4 MR. ANTHONY: Issue number three --5 MR. BUERY: And I'm sorry. We're --6 we're actually at time. 7 Are there any questions for 8 Mr. Anthony? No. 9 Well, thank you so much for your 10 testimony. We deeply appreciate it. Next, I'd like 11 to invite Marialenna Giampino [ph]. No? Okay. Next, 12 Mr. Chad Peace. 13 Thank you commissioners for MR. PEACE: 14 First, I'd like to thank you for having having me. 15 this conversation. I think it's one of the most 16 important that we could be having despite some other I'm Chad Peace. I've been the strategic 17 opinions. 18 advisor and council for the Independent Voter Project 19 for 15 years. So, again, the I'd like to thank you 20 for having a San Diegan come and testify. 21 As the authors of California's top two, 22 which has been pointed out by a number of folks, there 23 are unintended consequences to a top two nonpartisan One thing that I'd like to, you know, really 24 system. focus on is that it's the fundamental right that's at 25

stake. Right now, our organization's actually advocating in California to move from a top two to a top five system to advance five candidates out.

That's not because top two's not working. I know the councilmember that spoke before suggested that the top two system in California has been a travesty, but then pointed to cities like Oakland and -- and San Francisco as examples of good governance, I suppose. I think as a Californian I would find that kind of interesting perspective.

But what's most important to us is the fundamental right that is at stake. It's that when you don't allow certain voters, because they choose not to affiliate with a party, to participate in the primary, which is a fundamentally important stage of the election, we're telling them that their vote is less meaningful. And to, you know, to address the perspectives that have been presented by the NAACP.

Independent voters, for example, are largely minority voters. Black voters, Hispanic voters, Latino voters are -- are in more numbers Independents than they are Democrats or Republicans in some states. And so the -- but the point being that if we're going to have a fair election process to everybody, our -- our first principle is that

everybody ought to have the right to participate.

In that when you're talking about an open primary, just the top two was opposed by both major parties, and some of the institutional forces may oppose open primaries. Open primaries are actually good for representatives in our view. And I think as -- as the top two has been in play over time in California, you see that representatives actually feel like they can govern better.

Some people may view nonpartisan reform as -- or advocating for Independent voter rights as anti-party. I think it's actually the opposite. It's that in the long run, the parties become more responsive to the electorate. They invite more voters in when they open their primaries. In fact, prior to our nonpartisan primary, California had a semi-open primary in which the Democratic party allowed voters to participate and the Republicans disallowed.

I don't think it's a coincidental that the Democratic party has succeeded in much -- much greater in California, because they've invited non-members to participate in the process since the beginning, I think in the state as a whole. Should not look at opening the primary system as one, frankly, revolutionary or -- or two have a negative

Page 85 1 effect on -- on the process as a whole --2 MR. BUERY: Thank you. Apologies. 3 We're at time. Are there any questions for Mr. Peace? 4 Really appreciate your testimony. Okay. Next 5 testimony is Dareth Ogle [ph]. 6 MS. OGLE: Hello. Good -- good 7 I apologize. I'm having trouble with my evening. I thought it worked, but now that I'm 8 talking, it doesn't work. Nonetheless, my name is 10 Dareth Ogle. I was born in Queens, raised in 11 Brooklyn, and lived in New York City all of my life 12 thus far. And I'm now 28 years old. I have three 13 members of law enforcement a part of my family, 14 albeit, all retired. 15 And I'm here today to testify and ask 16 the charter review commission to adopt key to give the Civilian Complaint Review Board real power to make --17 18 I'm sorry, to move New York City from symbolic 19 oversight to real and effective accountability. As an 20 everyday citizen, as a prosecutorial paralegal, 21 previous prosecutorial paralegal, as a criminal 22 defense paralegal and as a paralegal/civil servant 23 handling civil litigation, I know that this is 24 necessary.

As an everyday citizen, I watch

Page	8	6
------	---	---

officers -- not all, but a significant amount, engaging excessive and brute -- brute force against vulnerable populations and demographics. I watch how they are able to seize an individual's bodily autonomy, how we'll have three sets of hands on body -- officers tackling one person who only has two arms and two legs.

I see officers intentionally escalate interactions, then throw people to the ground, pressing citizens' faces and bodies to the filthy pavement. Then those very same officers hold themselves as heroes while they smirk and make disrespectful remarks and -- with condescending tones.

I -- I see over time more policing with an ego as the norm and less as -- I'm sorry -- as an offset.

They -- they fully understand in those smirks and in those comments and in their body language, they fully understand that there are no consequences, no recourse to citizens. As a paralegal in the prosecutorial role, I immediately became aware of the systemic advantage with which officers and law enforcement have, immediate access to body-worn camera footage and resourceful criminal justice databases.

I would listen to officers casually disregard civilians' conditions in relation to

poverty. And often some of them remark that they
would make that lesser known that they really don't
care about public safety a lot of the time. Again,
it's about their own ego and just getting a collar.
And again, this is not all officers, but a significant
amount.

As a paralegal in the criminal defense capacity, I watched how these interactions can have lasting and drastic effect in the lives of New Yorkers. And as a paralegal who handles civil litigation, I see how it is a burden that is passed on to, excuse me, the taxpayers of the City of New York through misconduct settlements and through salaries that are paid to the o--

MR. BUERY: And I apologize, we're -we're at time for your testimony. And I apologize.

Is there any questions -- are there any questions for
Ms. Ogle [ph]? Really want to thank you for your
testimony for sharing your experience with us. We
deeply appreciate it. So that is our last testifier.

In a moment, I'm going to ask for a motion to approve the minutes for the May 19th meeting, but before I do, I want to briefly take the chair's privilege. I read -- opened the newspaper a few days ago to read the quite alarming news that

Kathy Wylde was planning to retire as the leader of the New York City Partnership. And I have to say, I really can't imagine New York City without Kathy Wilde as the chair of the New York City Partnership.

I know there'll be many -- I don't know if Kathy's still on the line. I'm sure there'll be many more opportunities to celebrate her incredible work on behalf of the city. I -- I also do want to say just personally, I -- I'm just deeply appreciative of her mentorship, guidance, leadership, brilliance. I don't always agree, but I always learned.

And there'll be many more opportunities to say that, but I -- this is the first time I'm seeing you since I saw that news. I almost dropped my phone. And I could not let this opportunity pass before saying what I hope will be the first of many times. Thank you, thank you, thank you, thank you,

MS. WYLDE: Thank you. With you from Puerto Rico.

MR. BUERY: And I -- and I'm also -- I was always jealous of you. With that, I'll entertain a motion to approve the minutes of the May 19th meeting. And with minute -- and with time to spare, happy to, in Kathy Wylde's honor, entertain a motion to adjourn or meeting early. Is there a second.

	Page 89
1	Thank you all so much. Thanks for being here. Thanks
2	for being part of our democracy. It's deeply
3	appreciated. Thank you.
4	(Off the record.)
5	MR. BUERY: I call the meeting back in
6	order. I'll once again entertain a motion to approve
7	the minutes. Is there a second? All in favor?
8	MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
9	MR. BUERY: Any opposed? The motion
10	passes. We are adjourned.
11	(Whereupon, at 7:24 p.m., the
12	proceeding was concluded.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	
т	

3

2

17

18

16

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

CERTIFICATE

I, OWEINAMA BIU, 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.

OWEINAMA BIU

Notary Public in and for the

State of New York

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, RONALD MOORE, 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.

In-

RONALD MOORE

[1.1 - active] Page 1

1	2024 18:22	53 69:21	86:4
	25:4	54.6 65:18	above 12:17
1.1 65:7 67:24	2025 1:6	55 65:18	absolutely 10:3
71:20	22 26:6 64:19	57 65:20	39:5 46:20
11 75:13	65:12	5:37 1:7	53:9 55:10
11415 1:12	23 18:23,24	6	accelerator
12 6:2	44:25	_	42:12 50:19
120-55 1:11	232 40:8	6 39:21	accept 73:6
14 69:9	24 65:12	60 40:12	acceptable 73:3
15 63:25 78:1 82:19	250 56:11	63 26:16	access 30:17
16 26:6	250,000 56:9	7	31:9,10 45:19
18 26:6 64:11	28 1:6 85:12	7359714 1:22	59:25 86:22
180 41:25	29th 9:13	79 18:21	accessibility
19 71:15	3	7:24 89:11	30:17 31:6
195 75:21	30 10:2 19:21	8	32:3
19th 87:22	66:21 67:20	8 8:8	accessible 25:1
88:22	30626 91:14	80 55:19	accident 61:1
1one 65:12	32756 90:18	865 44:6	account 26:25
2	38 28:1	9	29:3,6
_	4		accountability
20 26:6	_	9/11 72:12	58:9 85:19
200 26:22	40 19:22 26:21	90 40:6	accountable
28:16	65:10,15 69:3	92 56:9,17	16:21
2002 9:10	72:7	a	accurate 90:9
2003 64:16	42 25:19 26:17	ability 19:4	91:5
2008 42:8	28:18	22:22 39:17	achieved 77:2
2010 69:8	49 72:6	90:10 91:7	acknowledges
2011 70:1	5	able 23:8 27:24	27:8
2014 26:6	50 26:15 55:17	28:9 35:17	act 20:23 28:10
2016 26:16,18	65:17,19 80:24	43:19 48:19	31:8
2021 26:11	81:1	49:3 50:19,22	action 90:12,16
2022 26:10,16	500,000 65:9	57:2 58:8 63:2	91:8,12
77:7		63:12 67:13	active 30:3 31:4
		80:20 81:2,17	

activist 64:9	adoption 55:2	agency 20:17	allowed 80:19	
actually 9:12	advance 21:9	24:18 42:19	84:17	
9:19 14:13	44:3 83:3	43:1,18 44:10	allowing 45:12	
31:1 32:2	advances 45:11	46:15 48:1	61:21	
35:19 37:23	55:18,20	49:7,21 50:14	allows 33:10	
39:17 44:5	advantage 21:7	50:23 51:9		
57:7 69:8 78:8	31:24 86:21	55:4 57:24	alongside 25:13 alternate 13:11	
79:13 82:6			alternative	
	advantages 30:15	58:7,13		
83:1 84:6,8,12		ago 44:9 77:24	10:25	
adams 78:17,21	adversely 53:4	78:1,13 87:25	alton 68:22	
add 75:1	advisor 82:18	agree 5:12	73:21,23 75:6	
addition 34:17	advocacy 30:5	46:17 55:14	amazing 75:14	
additional	advocate 22:6	57:17 73:10	75:16 77:11	
15:11 25:25	advocates	77:25 78:14	amazingly	
additionally	16:20	88:11	69:20	
55:23	advocating	agreed 50:25	amendment	
address 43:19	37:18,23,25	akin 64:20	21:7,10,11	
50:6 83:17	83:2 84:11	alabama 11:8	america 10:12	
adhere 44:3	affiliate 38:24	alarming 87:25	31:8 75:12	
adjourn 88:25	71:22 83:14	alaska 79:4	76:20	
adjourned	affiliated 62:14	albany 16:20	american 2:3	
89:10	67:3,3	21:14,21	14:2,13,15	
adjustments	affiliation	albany's 17:21	67:1,4 76:20	
47:10	33:10 54:8	albeit 85:14	76:21,22	
administration	60:21	align 73:10	americans	
42:15 44:3	affordable 6:14	aligning 29:9	15:13 39:24	
49:6,24 77:13	age 65:10,16,19	allegiance	amount 39:14	
administratio	65:20 72:7	66:25	86:1 87:6	
49:25	agencies 20:22	allies 45:7	analysis 24:22	
admon 78:13	43:4,7 44:8	allow 10:18	25:10,15,21	
adopt 33:3 76:5	47:8 48:6,9,16	33:18 34:4	26:4 29:6 39:1	
85:16	49:4 51:1,13	51:11 55:8	59:14 65:11	
adopting 34:13	52:6 56:19,21	57:25 61:5	analyst 24:16	
34:17	56:23 57:20	83:13		

anecdotal	appealing	arms 86:7	auditing 47:16
38:16 39:19	33:19	artificial 75:24	august 25:4
anecdotally	apple 12:7	artist 27:15	authority 20:21
53:15	appointees	asian 14:2,13	42:21,25 43:12
anecdote 65:24	49:17	14:15 15:13	48:19 49:1,19
anita 2:16 5:5	appreciate 8:23	39:22	49:22 50:23
announced	16:16 24:7	asked 7:20	51:8 55:5 57:1
8:11 43:23	29:22 41:15	54:20 72:18	58:13
55:17	53:10 54:21	asking 62:1	authors 82:21
answer 20:24	58:24 59:21	73:13,14	automatically
27:12 36:5	63:8,18 68:20	assembly 36:22	53:18
43:24 44:11	74:4 75:5	37:4,9	autonomy 86:5
55:11 73:4	79:24 82:10	assert 53:4	available 7:9
answered	85:4 87:20	associated 14:8	average 26:5
52:21	appreciated	25:16	26:16,20 32:15
anthony 2:8	73:19 89:3	assume 29:8	40:8 65:19
4:5 6:7 80:10	appreciative	81:23	aware 29:11,17
80:12,13 81:5	88:9	assumed 25:21	81:8 86:20
81:7 82:4,8	approach 6:11	attack 75:21	awesome 44:14
anti 84:12	approaches	attend 6:19	aye 89:8
anxiety 74:3	43:5	8:17	b
anytime 35:24	approve 87:22	attended 7:15	back 32:21
53:11	88:22 89:6	attendees 2:2	36:15 41:7,22
anyway 10:16	approved 20:9	3:2 4:2	45:11 50:9
64:1	approximately	attention 36:7	56:10 59:1
apathetic 72:8	25:19	36:25 37:5,7,8	63:2 69:25,25
apologies 85:2	april 9:13	42:11 81:11	71:25 77:24
apologize 13:13	12:24	attorney 90:14	79:7 89:5
16:13 41:13	archival 8:19	91:10	background
63:22 80:11	areas 7:8	attractive	72:17
85:7 87:15,16	argue 14:12	18:18	backlog 48:23
appeal 33:25	arm 44:21	audio 90:8 91:3	backroom 9:16
34:10	armed 24:25	audited 58:12	

[bad - broader] Page 4

bad 76:23	30:23 37:5	birth 76:18,19	bodies 86:10
79:19	61:7 67:4 68:9	bit 10:11 13:14	bodily 86:4
bait 12:20	71:25 77:10	22:12 32:1,6	body 6:13
balance 31:3	78:8	36:10,17 37:12	53:19 76:9,9
55:21	believed 69:11	43:6	76:10,12 86:6
balances 46:24	bella 3:18	bites 12:7	86:17,22
55:8	24:12 29:17,20	biu 1:21 90:2	boe's 26:25
ballot 11:22	benefit 70:2	90:19	bold 20:13
12:2,24 17:23	benefiting	black 14:18	bonilla 2:10 6:6
31:9,10 32:2,8	30:25	44:24,25 45:1	46:12 47:22
33:5 37:12	benefits 15:11	45:6,16 46:1	boost 37:6
68:7 70:19	berkeley 39:9	53:5,25 54:7	79:17
73:12 74:14	best 5:17 8:6	58:17 59:18	born 85:10
78:12	33:11 45:22	60:11,16,24	borough 1:10
barriers 51:10	53:23 90:9	61:8,13 62:10	5:19 29:4,5
base 45:5	91:6	62:13,20 83:20	80:1
based 29:4	better 12:21	block 77:22	bottom 12:22
basic 17:7	38:7 51:19	79:3,3	boulevard 1:11
basically 22:14	84:9	blocked 33:8	bound 5:24
35:24	betterment	67:16	box 74:14,21
basis 47:7	68:9	blocks 71:16	bozorg 2:24 6:5
52:19	beyond 49:24	bloomberg	bracket 65:16
batch 81:8,9,10	67:11	50:17 51:17	brain 75:22
81:15	bidding 47:4	64:17	branch 44:17
bay 68:25	bids 47:3	blue 11:20	briefly 87:23
bee 76:23	big 18:5	board 10:1	brilliance
beg 12:17	biggest 17:13	26:22 28:16,22	88:10
beginning	billing 50:24	39:10 43:9	bring 75:17
84:23	billion 52:5	47:1,12 49:13	80:13
behalf 25:8	bills 16:23	49:16 55:12,23	bringing 64:25
88:8	bin 27:19	81:24 85:17	broad 5:16
beliefs 67:15	bipartisan	boards 39:12	broaden 70:7
believe 23:10	34:12	39:15	broader 33:19
27:23 28:8	31,12	37.13	34:1,7
27.23 20.0			JT.1,/

	I		
brooklyn 33:2	71:14	camera 85:8	carlin 11:2
66:20 68:25	bulk 26:25	86:22	caroline 3:23
85:11	bundle 19:20	campaign 12:7	63:20 68:21,25
brute 86:2,2	burden 87:11	33:25 69:9,12	carries 76:1
budget 24:16	business 22:21	69:23	carry 27:18
24:17,21 25:1	23:11,12,15,17	campaigned	case 60:2 63:4
25:12 36:2	48:12 73:4	28:5	cases 11:19
52:2	busy 69:11	candace 3:20	cassandra 3:15
budgeting 43:3	buy 23:17	29:18 41:16	24:10,11,13,15
budgets 47:9	c	44:15	casually 86:24
buery 1:5 2:12	c 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	candidate	cat 76:23
6:4 13:15,17	calcified 51:22	19:11 22:14	catch 71:1
16:8 20:25	calculated 26:5	33:22 79:18	cause 34:11
21:25 24:3	calendar 26:9	81:17	54:6,19 69:11
28:12 29:7,13	26:14	candidates	70:3 78:12
29:16 32:23	california	9:16 11:6 13:7	caused 57:8
34:25 36:4	39:10,15 69:6	19:9,14,16	celebrate 88:7
37:14 40:18,23	69:9,14 70:2	33:7,11,17,18	centeno 3:12
41:11 44:13	79:17 83:2,6	33:21,25 34:6	13:19,20,22
46:9 49:9	84:8,16,21	34:10 70:19	16:11
52:22 59:7,11	california's	73:10 80:19,20	center 1:10
60:18 61:10	11:13,17 82:21	81:2,20 83:3	13:23
62:1,16 63:3,7	californian	capacity 44:16	central 6:16
63:17 66:3,11	83:9	67:12,15 87:8	cents 56:9,17
66:13,18 68:14	call 7:22 19:3	care 9:10 19:19	century 30:1
68:18 71:5,9		87:3	certain 31:10
73:16 74:2	24:9 62:4 89:5 called 10:25	career 64:3	42:13 47:13
75:3 77:18		carefully 20:20	56:22 83:13
79:22 80:2,7	16:24 69:13,14 81:15	cariage 3:24	certainly 23:25
81:4,6 82:3,5		63:20 68:22	46:22 47:17
85:2 87:15	calling 12:18 calls 18:2 69:20	71:12	49:19 50:11
88:20 89:5,9		carl 2:14 6:7	51:7,11 53:20
build 21:17	caltech 13:23	21:1	53:20 55:15
34:14 45:7			58:9 61:5

certificate 90:1	character 9:17	chinese 77:6	city 1:1 2:4,6,8
91:1	charge 57:25	choice 9:8,15	2:10,12,14,16
certify 90:3	charged 52:4	9:24 10:5,9	2:18,20,22,24
91:2	charged 32.4 charter 1:2 2:5	11:2 12:5,13	3:3,5,7,9 5:7
cfb 65:11	2:6,8,10,12,14	12:23 13:13	6:14,24,24 9:1
chad 82:12,17	2:16,18,20,22	18:4,8,11	9:10,14,23
chair 2:12,22	2:24 3:3,5,7,9	19:13 22:7	10:8,10,12
6:4,5 50:22	5:4,10,13 6:9	26:4 30:11	12:25 14:19,20
88:4	7:9 8:3,12 9:2	33:7 34:14	16:23 17:11,18
chair's 87:24	9:9 17:22	37:18 58:18	19:24 20:19
chairman's	19:25 20:1,2	59:1,5 71:6	21:5,12,14,23
63:10	21:8,16,17,23	79:16 80:14,18	22:3,5 23:8
chairperson	24:15,19 33:4	81:14	24:17,19 25:20
8:24	42:19,20,22,25	choices 13:8	27:15,16,22
challenge 6:13	43:18 44:9	81:19	29:21 30:2,18
60:6	46:15,15 48:1	choose 11:7	30:19 31:5
challenges 26:3	49:21,21 51:5	45:21 78:11	33:3,4 34:14
chance 35:17	51:19 52:16	79:8 83:13	36:20 37:3,9
63:24 66:10	55:2 57:14,24	choosing 20:8	37:10 40:5
change 18:5	58:7 64:16	chosen 71:22	42:1,4 43:4,10
19:25 20:2	85:16	christian 75:12	43:23 44:20,25
21:8,16 25:23	charter's 6:11	christine 2:3	45:1,2,23
27:9 33:12	charter s 0.11	chronically	46:23 47:8
43:7 50:23	8:16	6:23	50:8 51:21
51:20 58:19	chat 8:5	circle 41:6	52:5,14,19
changed 18:9	check 43:18	cities 12:12	53:21 55:13,14
changes 5:11	55:21	18:6 24:1 83:7	55:21 56:7
5:12,13 17:22	checks 46:24	citing 28:15	57:13,16,19
42:12,15 43:7	55:8	citizen 27:18	58:8 61:9
59:17	chicago 10:13	28:8 30:3	62:13 64:21
changing 53:1	chief 2:4	85:20,25	65:9,15 67:13
54:10	children's	citizens 25:10	67:16,20,25
channel 11:2	75:22	36:13 86:10,19	68:9 70:3,5
		, -	71:1,15 72:3
			71.1,13 72.3

73:8,9,18	62:22	82:20	commissions
74:18 78:2	clearly 57:5	coming 32:21	42:8 51:5
81:9 85:11,18	click 8:3	59:5 65:22	commitment
87:12 88:2,3,4	climate 45:9	75:11 77:21	73:2
88:8	close 6:22	comment 16:15	committed 5:15
city's 5:8,24	11:17 65:9,17	commenters	committee 2:5
9:11 17:3	closed 14:5,7	17:4	22:3 23:24
18:22 20:1	14:12,23,25	comments	common 11:9
24:20 25:12	15:7,23 16:4	86:17	23:22 78:12
71:19 72:7	22:11 78:3	commerce	communities
citycharter.n	coach 66:22	22:22	14:21 24:25
8:16	coat 76:10,11	commission 1:2	30:25 32:10
citywide 17:20	76:13	2:7,9,11,13,15	53:5,24
civic 6:25 27:23	cohesion 48:18	2:17,19,21,23	community
28:1 64:8 76:6	cohesively	2:25 3:4,6,8,10	5:19 70:15
civil 12:17 34:1	50:18	5:4,6,23 6:2,10	72:11
44:22 75:19	coincidental	6:22 7:5,7,24	compared
77:17 85:22,23	84:19	8:15,25 9:3,6,9	26:19 40:8
87:10	collaboration	11:12 13:20	79:16
civilian 77:15	34:12	16:6,17 17:10	comparing
85:17	collar 87:4	24:15 28:10	36:21
civilians 86:25	colleagues	32:12 41:22	compel 50:23
claim 12:10	13:25 53:21	42:11 45:22,24	competence
claiming 43:5	61:14 65:7	46:2,6 64:16	10:22
50:24	collective 34:20	71:10 85:16	competing 9:17
claims 53:7	college 71:20	commission's	competition
clarify 60:4,8	color 30:25	5:6,9 8:17 42:7	73:3
60:18	columbia 75:10	commissioner	competitive
clarity 12:4	77:7	52:22 59:7	12:16 17:17,19
clean 9:18 12:8	combats 33:21	commissioners	47:2
clear 10:3 11:4	come 19:10	5:15 6:3 7:24	competitiven
32:9,14,18	48:23 53:14	29:23 57:10	18:17,18
48:23 49:22	54:1,1 63:2	82:13	complain 52:10
57:25 61:11,15	64:20 66:6		

complaint	conclusions	conservatives	contract 20:16
85:17	32:21	62:7	42:4 43:19
complete 32:11	concurrence	consider 16:7	55:25 56:13
80:21	41:8	18:1	58:12
completely	concurrent	consideration	contracting
11:22	31:11	5:11 64:19	42:14 43:2
compliance	condescending	considering 6:9	52:17,18
31:8	86:13	consistently	contracts 47:4
complicated	conditions	6:25 27:4	48:24
16:25	21:11 86:25	consists 18:3	contrary 12:9
compliment	conduct 29:3	constant 31:22	control 49:13
73:25	conducted 9:22	constantly	49:16
compliments	25:9,23	45:16 77:2	controller
16:16	confident 32:16	constitution	43:11 48:4
components	confluence	27:9 51:21	49:18 55:22
58:10	65:22	52:11	convening
compost 27:19	confounding	constitutional	43:12
compound	18:25	21:7,10	conversation
58:20	confuse 13:2	constitutional	75:18 82:15
comprises 27:4	confused 10:25	19:6	conversations
concern 44:18	confusion	constrain 19:6	76:6 77:16
44:23 51:14	46:15,22 58:20	constructive	convince 46:2
53:25 60:8,9	congratulations	34:2	cooperation
62:10 63:13	71:6	cont'd 3:1	34:13
65:2	connected	contain 26:8	corpsman
concerned 53:1	23:19 65:8	contains 26:12	71:13
59:24	connection	contested 56:16	correct 49:14
concerning	22:21,23	context 26:21	56:11 61:25
53:6	consciousness	continue 7:11	63:16 71:7
concerns 17:3	76:25	54:1 66:9 81:4	corrected 56:12
36:6 50:6	consequences	81:6 82:2,3	correctly 74:1
63:13 71:5	82:23 86:19	continuing	cost 12:4 25:16
concluded	conservative	46:5	25:21 26:8,10
89:12	12:1		26:13 27:4,7

30:21 45:20	coverage 36:20	cycle 25:20	decent 67:9
47:10	36:21	27:11	decide 49:23
costs 6:16 26:1	covered 31:21	cycles 40:11	decided 50:1
26:2,6,14,17,21	37:10 76:12	d	77:9
26:24,24,25	covid 71:15	d 5:1	decipher 16:25
27:1,2,3,5 29:3	cow 12:18	d.c. 20:10	decisions 59:23
29:4	create 46:15	dabaron 2:18	61:6 64:22
council 9:2,14	50:10 51:8	6:6	74:15,18
22:15 36:21	55:4	daily 47:7,17	decisive 12:8
37:3,9,10	creates 51:10	52:10,19	decline 69:16
41:21,25 43:11	62:20	dallas 10:14	declined 69:15
43:23 55:13,14	creating 51:19		decoder 13:3
55:19,21 57:14	criminal 85:21	dangerously 10:25	dedicated 32:7
57:17 58:8	86:23 87:7	dareth 4:6 85:5	deep 11:20
82:18	crisis 5:9 6:15		44:18
councilmember	6:18 71:15	85:10	deeply 9:11
8:20 13:18	critical 67:24	darwinism	67:7,8 73:19
18:5 83:5	crucial 34:21	12:4	79:24 82:10
counsel 90:10	42:24	data 14:3,4	87:20 88:9
90:13 91:7,10	cruz 4:3 73:22	39:18 44:5	89:2
count 69:20	75:7,8 76:1	48:4 53:7	defense 85:22
counted 81:19	79:25 80:3	54:12,14 57:5	87:7
counter 11:1	cultural 1:10	59:23,25 60:2	definitely 13:12
country 7:18	64:8	76:5	31:3 54:14
11:11 63:1	culture 77:4	databases	definition 11:5
73:2,18 77:4,6	cuomo 78:18	86:23	delayed 57:7
counts 13:6	78:21	day 47:6,6	delays 42:14
couple 39:22	curious 74:13	days 36:15	44:7 48:8
44:9 64:14,24	current 45:9	87:25	demobilizing
77:23 78:13	49:6	deal 47:1	14:1
course 14:24	currently 32:19	deals 9:16 43:1	democracy
15:18 19:20	33:5 35:14	43:2	9:12 10:7 12:3
court 19:7	41:9	decade 30:8	12:18 34:22
42:22			68:8,12 70:7
. = . = =			00.0,12 / 0.7

72:2,20 73:12	designed 45:11	60:7 61:4,15	disengaged
89:2	47:1	62:2 71:25	15:25
democrat 22:17	desire 45:17	differently	disintegrating
60:12 70:21	despite 42:14	61:16 62:9	35:20
78:24	71:5 82:16	differing 22:19	disparities
democratic	destroy 79:14	difficult 45:9	15:21
17:19 22:15,15	79:14	60:23 73:19	disregard
22:25 45:5,8	destroyed	dig 30:13	86:25
60:10 61:18,19	75:15	digital 90:8	disrespectful
61:21 62:2	detailed 40:19	91:3	77:16 80:5
84:17,20	details 17:25	dilute 19:4	86:13
democrats 12:1	determine	44:24 45:25	distort 13:4
45:3 60:11,17	45:22 68:4	60:24 61:8,13	districts 11:21
61:21 62:5	determined	62:10	40:6
78:18,25 83:22	67:17	dilution 53:25	distrust 44:18
demographics	determines	54:9 59:18,18	diverse 31:5
86:3	67:17 78:6	60:11	33:20 40:3
department	development	dinola 3:23	45:6
58:4	66:22	63:20 68:21,24	diversity 39:3
depends 57:21	developments	68:25 71:8	division 46:18
deputy 43:6	31:17	directive 55:13	47:11,18
48:10,11,14,16	diane 3:7 6:7	55:15 56:14,18	divisions 34:11
48:19 49:3	dictating 49:8	directives	divvy 48:15
50:17,24 56:20	diegan 82:20	56:24	docket 64:18
57:20	diego 10:14	director 41:20	doctoral 13:22
describe 11:13	difference 19:2	41:24 50:25	document
describing	29:8,10 56:9	51:11,18	75:14
11:15 42:23	different 14:4	disallowed	documented
deserve 12:21	15:10 19:2	84:18	11:19
67:8 73:7	37:19 38:2,11	disaster 11:18	documents
deserves 73:12	43:4,5 45:21	discussing 17:5	52:18
designations	48:2,16,16	discussion 46:6	dog 27:19
76:22,24 77:1	51:12 56:20,21	disenfranchis	76:23
	56:25 57:19,20	11:22	

dogs 27:20 doing 16:3 18:7 18:8 20:2	dropped 88:14 duly 90:5 dycd 48:13	efficient 9:19 effort 45:25 efforts 45:19	election's 17:15 elections 6:24 7:1 9:7,22,24
doing 16:3 18:7	duly 90:5 dycd 48:13 e e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1 4:1 5:1,1 earlier 16:9 65:7 early 69:6 74:10,11,24 88:25 easier 18:15 easily 19:10 easy 18:15 eat 12:19 economy 24:21 editor 69:1 educate 31:24 education 23:13,16 30:6 31:20 32:8 educational 36:3 64:8 edward 2:6 effect 5:14 14:1 40:1 51:21 59:17 85:1	effort 45:25	elections 6:24
drive 7:11 17:14 driven 7:10 59:23 drop 8:4 19:10	87:9 effective 85:19 effectively 49:13 effects 30:20	65:19 67:14 69:21 70:25 72:5 74:11,24 78:6,16 83:16 83:24	79:15 electorate 30:25 33:19 34:7 35:3 36:1 84:14

eligible 18:14	ended 75:20	erudite 63:25	62:19 64:21
28:7	ended 75.20 enforcement	er unite 03.23 es 90:4	70:14 71:3
eliminate 18:12	85:13 86:22	escalate 86:8	77:25 78:2
eliminating	engage 24:24	especially 6:17	83:25 84:1
81:20	engaged 15:17	9:3 14:21 15:3	everyday 85:20
elimination	15:25	47:7 49:5 68:3	85:25
81:8,10,10,15	engagement	73:5	evidence 17:9
elyse 3:22	34:6,22 42:15	essence 52:13	28:18 31:1
41:18 63:19	engaging 86:2	essential 42:5	35:5 38:17
66:19	englishman	72:2	59:2,16
email 40:20	76:23	essentially	exact 58:2
emailing 8:15	enhance 24:20	14:22 32:10	exactly 9:21
embedded	enhancing	establish 21:6	63:15
51:21 52:11,18	34:22	42:23 48:22	example 25:7
embrace 9:23	enormous 17:8	50:19	26:10 36:22
emotional	ensure 7:2 31:7	established	40:4 56:5
66:22	33:13,22 34:15	11:5	60:10,16 62:23
emphasizes	45:24	establishes	62:24,24 63:1
17:2	ensuring 31:20	49:20	63:6 69:18
employed	entertain 88:21	establishing	76:18 83:19
90:11,14 91:8	88:24 89:6	50:13	examples 83:8
91:11	entire 5:10 6:9	eu 76:4	excellent 17:2
employee 90:13	7:25 27:17	evaluate 14:4	20:18 54:20
91:10	entirely 33:8	59:15	68:15
empower 10:20	entities 46:19	evaluated	exception
24:23	environment	25:11	10:15,18
empowering	34:2,18	evening 5:3 8:9	excerpt 75:17
42:20	equally 35:9	24:14 25:2	excessive 32:17
enable 20:3	equity 45:8	30:18 41:19	86:2
encourages	equivalent	44:15,18 63:23	excited 13:21
30:2 33:24	36:24	68:24 85:7	excludes 26:18
encouraging	era 36:15	event 8:8 69:18	excuse 87:12
19:23	error 52:16	everybody	executive 41:20
	56:11,12	52:21 54:19	

[exercise - focus] Page 13

exercise 50:3	extra 12:8	favor 9:7 61:12	83:10
exist 58:6	extreme 11:11	89:7	finding 35:19
existed 9:9	extremely 78:4	fear 61:22	findings 25:3
existing 14:14	eyes 35:21	federal 17:16	finer 76:9
31:18	75:15	25:14 31:9,10	finish 10:3
expand 45:19	f	31:14,18,25	finished 7:25
expenditure	faces 86:10	37:2 75:25	first 7:19 8:20
19:5	facilitate 27:10	federally 75:22	16:1 17:23
expenditures	fact 10:8 12:10	feel 28:6 32:16	21:22 22:2
26:25	12:15 47:23	65:25 66:24	24:10 30:23
experience	84:15	67:7,23 69:19	35:23 37:6,11
22:13 24:4	factors 17:13	70:4 74:22	42:9,9 54:22
31:21 50:16	19:1	84:9	55:11 60:15
74:13 87:19	failures 50:3	feeling 74:16	62:5,6,23,24
experienced	fair 9:19 34:23	feels 27:25	63:1,6,11
53:2	39:14 83:24	74:18	66:14,16 68:15
experiences	fairly 79:5	fell 77:7	74:6 80:10,12
53:12	fairvote 18:1	fellow 5:14	82:14 83:25
expert 27:14	fallen 12:15	8:25	88:13,16
experts 5:19	77:8	felt 43:20	fiscal 25:11,19
16:22	false 76:14,14	field 19:13,15	26:6,7,12
explanation	familiar 62:22	fifty 55:17	fit 73:15
38:15	63:5	72:12	five 26:5,15,16
explore 7:8	families 6:20	figure 13:3	71:13 72:12
exponential	24:25 78:17	filthy 86:10	77:14 80:20
28:24	family 85:13	final 11:21	83:3,3
express 44:18	family's 75:9	finally 27:7	flawed 78:4
67:15 78:9	far 7:7 18:15	financially 29:9	flip 47:15
extends 31:11	50:3 81:8,11	90:15 91:11	floated 10:24
extensions 12:7	85:12	financials 43:3	focal 65:4
12:8	fathers 75:12	find 5:17 8:2,12	focus 5:8 10:19
extent 60:1	fatigue 31:21	10:15 14:7	10:21 30:12
62:12		15:6 23:22	35:18 42:18
		53:23 56:7	82:25

[focused - go] Page 14

focused 9:4	foster 34:18	80:21	generals 13:1
focuses 44:23	fostering 34:1	fully 59:5 72:3	generation
focusing 67:5	34:22	86:16,18	72:25
76:7 77:16	fought 45:7	function 55:7	gentleman 38:7
folks 29:18	found 29:25	74:7	george 11:2
59:5 82:22	39:19 40:5	functioned	georgia 11:8
follow 24:1	48:6	51:18	german 76:22
47:22 49:10	founded 75:12	fundamental	gerrymandered
63:10	four 11:18 15:9	82:25 83:12	11:10
followed 7:23	26:20 78:19	fundamentally	getting 20:3
41:17 68:22	79:4	83:15	37:10 47:25
73:22	fox 3:17 24:12	furniture 27:6	75:15 80:4
following 63:20	29:16 32:24,25	further 29:13	87:4
food 27:18	33:1 37:23	41:13 61:8	giampino 80:11
footage 86:23	fraction 74:17	90:12 91:9	82:11
force 34:10	francisco 10:10	future 24:24	gibbs 50:17,25
86:2	12:12 18:19	44:2 73:11	give 13:5 20:14
forced 50:25	19:14 83:8	g	22:12 23:20
51:1	frank 3:11 8:21	g 5:1	31:2 37:21
forces 73:9	9:1	gains 15:9	70:17 85:16
84:4	frankly 37:7,9	gaps 15:21	given 26:12
foregoing 90:3	84:25	garments 76:13	30:11 46:4
90:4 91:4	free 77:1	gender 38:18	gives 79:19
forgive 38:20	freedom 77:1	general 12:6	giving 35:4
63:21 64:5	79:8	14:6,9 15:1,3	63:24 65:24
forgot 81:12	freelance 69:1	17:19 18:19	71:25
forgotten 39:7	frequency	19:9 25:16	go 5:13 8:3
form 8:1,5	25:18	26:8,11 33:7	21:22 22:16,25
71:25	frequently	35:9 38:5 68:5	23:1 33:7
former 60:14	16:24	74:11,24 78:15	35:24 38:8,11
forms 19:24	front 28:11	generally 7:15	52:23 56:20
forward 7:8	75:15	30:24 63:21	57:8,19 77:9
32:21 46:5	full 9:23 20:17		78:25 80:16
	27:6 69:10		

[god - helen] Page 15

1 00 10 10	4	41 67 1	20.22
god 23:13,18	government	growth 67:1	happy 20:23
goes 10:11 52:7	5:7 10:22 12:9	growthful 67:4	27:12 41:6
67:11 81:21	16:21 24:18,24	guarantee	43:24 44:11
going 5:2 7:8	30:3 46:23	18:16	75:8,9 88:24
10:17 13:13	governments	guaranteed	hard 35:21
24:8 39:8 41:9	11:11 18:7	31:13	78:25
48:22,23,24	23:23	guarantees	harder 19:12
50:9,14 54:1	grabbing 65:10	31:9	hardship 59:4
54:24 55:1,2,6	grabs 64:17	gubernatorial	hat 58:25
55:20 67:10	grace 2:10 6:6	29:9	hava 31:8,16
68:4 69:22	grappling	guess 51:14	head 50:17
74:23 76:8	58:18	62:25	health 48:10,14
77:13 78:15,19	grass 12:19	guidance 88:10	healthcare 80:4
78:24 79:2,3	grassroots 41:8	guys 21:22	hear 5:19 7:15
80:9 83:24	grateful 42:10	h	7:18 8:6,9
87:21	great 17:4,24	habit 15:4	22:19 41:15
gold 10:6	52:12 63:25		53:3
good 5:3 16:19	greater 23:20	half 65:14 72:6	heard 7:7 18:19
17:8 24:14	34:6 35:4	halfway 10:2	34:19 36:5
27:18 41:19	45:12 84:21	hall 1:10 80:1	37:17 58:17
43:17 44:15	greatest 63:13	handle 12:10	63:25 64:25
46:24 50:12,12	green 11:25	13:12 36:2	65:2 70:11
51:16 53:18	78:23	handled 53:2	hearing 1:1
54:12 63:23	greenberger	57:11	5:16,18 7:12
65:13 66:8	2:22 6:5	handles 87:10	7:14,19 8:2,4
68:24 70:12	gross 76:9	handling 26:3	8:17 60:5
78:22 83:8	ground 23:22	85:23	hearings 5:18
84:6 85:6,6	86:9	hands 86:5	7:7 8:11,13,18
goods 52:14	group 9:16	happen 39:13	heart 74:22
gotten 44:6	59:3 74:20	67:7	heeds 46:6
78:1	groups 14:9,10	happening	height 71:15
govern 84:9	14:10 15:3,11	31:12 54:10	held 25:20
governance	15:12,24 16:5	happens 22:25	helen 1:10
83:9	46:1		1.10
03.7	TU.1		

hell 20:11	holding 34:9	hurt 80:4	immigrants
hello 66:12	homemaker	i	80:3
73:24 75:8	27:15	ibo 24:17,17	impact 14:5,13
77:20 81:4	homeowners	25:3,6,8,9,10	25:11 53:1,5
85:6	31:3 35:10	25:15,25 26:4	impactful
help 16:25	38:18	26:18 27:7	44:22
19:17 21:15	homes 77:10	ibo's 24:19	impacts 36:1
23:23 31:8	honest 13:10	25:21	implement 47:9
34:11 42:21	honestly 10:16	idea 17:8,24	47:20 48:20
46:4 53:13,23	53:22	28:23 52:9	implications
55:3	honor 88:24	59:16 60:9	46:14
helped 71:14	honored 5:5	74:3	important 6:13
helpful 38:21	hope 20:2 24:1	ideally 49:5	21:19,23 22:5
39:4 43:4 49:7	45:18 46:6	ideas 5:17,19	22:8 23:9,22
53:6 54:4 60:3	74:25 88:16	5:25 9:17 73:4	31:18,22 41:23
66:25	hopefully 41:2	identifies 17:6	43:8,10 70:9
helps 79:16	horse 12:18	20:18	82:16 83:11,15
hereto 90:14	hospital 71:14	identify 14:16	importantly
91:11	housing 5:9	15:14 71:21	5:22
heroes 86:12	6:11,15,16,18	72:13 79:10	improve 15:23
hhs 42:12	48:11 65:3,3	identifying 7:8	70:6
hi 13:20 38:13	houston 10:14	ideologically	improved
41:19 66:13,14	howard 64:3	11:11	12:16 42:13
high 18:16	hpd 48:9	ignore 45:9	incentivized
higher 14:17	hss 50:19	imagine 9:19	33:25
highlight 30:16	huger 40:13	88:3	incidental 26:1
30:22 74:16	human 23:13	immediate	include 27:1
hispanic 83:20	23:18 41:21,24	86:22	39:2 41:2 48:9
historically	41:25 42:1	immediately	52:16
15:25	44:8 47:10	86:20	included 25:15
history 35:14	48:10,15 51:12	immigrant	includes 14:3
50:7,8 77:9	52:6,9	14:20	26:10 70:14
hold 7:24 18:12	hurdle 42:9	10	including 34:4
56:17 86:11			35:3

inclusive 26:23	independents	intellectuals	investigation
30:24 33:14	14:16 15:14	77:12	58:5
35:3	38:2 62:6 66:8	intelligence	invite 29:16
inclusivity	69:17 70:25	75:24 76:14	68:21 82:11
38:17	72:13 83:22	intentionally	84:14
income 6:15,17	india 76:18	86:8	invited 7:17
increase 30:4	indian 76:19,21	interactions	84:21
33:12 40:1,2	76:22	86:9 87:8	invoice 56:3,6
40:15 45:19	individual's	interest 30:9	56:10,15 57:17
increased 26:1	86:4	45:13 46:3	invoices 44:7
37:7	influence 47:13	interested 7:2	56:5 57:2
increases 34:3	51:12	31:20 58:22	invoicing 43:5
39:22 40:7	influences 30:5	90:15 91:12	47:6,16 48:21
increasing	inform 53:13	interesting	56:1
39:21	information	29:25 36:13	involved 69:2,4
increasingly	8:12 19:18	83:10	involvement
45:5	25:1 82:1	interests 33:12	45:13
incredible 88:7	informs 30:3	interference	ish 55:17
independence	infrastructure	61:23	issue 9:10 19:4
10:20	25:23	internet 75:23	19:12 22:5
independent	infusion 45:13	76:3	28:4 29:25
5:22 11:24	initial 16:2	interning 71:18	32:20 33:22
14:11 15:10	initiatives	interpretation	35:16 42:12
19:5 22:18	43:24 48:14	43:6	43:15 51:6,23
24:17,18,21	inner 27:22	interpreted	51:24 52:1
27:16,25 64:10	insights 47:17	60:7	54:11,12 56:18
64:12 66:23	instance 19:14	interpreter 2:3	57:8,23 59:21
67:25 69:13,14	instinctly 36:5	interventions	65:1 67:24
69:19 70:22	institutional	17:7	68:7 69:4 70:9
71:21 72:4,7	84:4	introduce	80:17 81:1,7
74:12 78:18	institutions	44:19	82:1,4
82:18 83:19	14:1 64:8	introducing	issued 56:14
84:11	intellectual	58:19	issues 9:4 17:1
	75:18 77:15		23:22 30:4

	T	I	
31:25 35:18,24	johnson 3:14	kind 14:23 15:7	67:21,25 68:4
36:3,8 41:23	22:1,2 24:5	15:9 16:2 17:9	70:11,12 74:20
42:2,19 43:20	join 44:17	25:8 35:11	78:3,5,5,6,7,12
52:10 55:13	68:11	36:18,24 39:11	78:17,20 79:5
58:9 65:5 67:5	joining 6:2	47:16 48:6	79:18 80:15,25
69:4 80:14	7:18	52:20 54:19,20	81:19,21,24
item 32:8	journalists	57:21 58:10,20	82:24 83:5,17
items 27:5	16:24	65:4 83:10	85:23 88:5,5
ivy 77:12	judgment 5:24	kinds 15:20	knowing 21:8
j	julie 3:5 6:7	16:1 70:16	knowledge
jackson 3:19	jungle 11:14	knock 22:18	90:9 91:6
29:18 41:16,19	jurisdiction	know 5:14 11:9	known 87:2
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	50:4	14:14 15:18,20	kudos 16:19
41:20 46:10,12 46:20 48:3	justice 86:23	15:22 16:18	1
49:15 50:11	justify 45:16	19:17 21:4,21	la 10:14
	k	28:21,22,22,25	
51:25 55:10		32:16 35:7,9	labadie 2:4
57:15	kaehny 3:13	35:13 36:14,16	labels 9:16
jamaica 1:12	16:12,14,14	36:17 37:17	labor 23:11,16
44:17	21:13	38:9,19,20,21	lack 50:3
janet 3:21	kathryn 6:8	38:24 39:6	lady 52:25
41:17 63:19	kathy 2:20 88:1	40:10 43:22,25	lake 10:10
64:1 66:24	88:3,24	44:2 47:3,7,16	language 2:3
javits 71:14	kathy's 88:6	48:5,7,13,23	12:18 60:6
jay 71:20	keep 16:2 71:2	49:5,21,22	86:18
jealous 88:21	73:11 80:2	51:8,9,11 52:3	laremont 2:16
jefferson 75:13	keeping 53:24	52:4,25 53:3,4	5:2,5 37:16
job 1:22 10:3	keeps 21:21	53:5 54:9	40:22,24 41:5
16:18 17:4	key 85:16	55:13,17 56:4	41:10 52:24
69:11,11	kiernan 2:6	56:17 57:5,16	65:1
john 3:13 16:12	kim 3:16 24:10	57:18 58:2,3	large 14:21
16:14 71:20	24:12,13	58:22 59:24	15:3 19:13
78:12	kimberly 4:3	63:3,25 64:10	largely 83:20
	73:22 75:7	64:12 67:6,20	
		04.12 07.0,20	

[larger - look] Page 19

larger 14:13	leaning 79:13	levels 14:8 16:5	live 6:19 9:12
19:13 26:3	learn 70:24	levi 4:5 80:10	64:2 66:20
37:1 40:15,17	learned 72:16	80:11	67:9 68:25
largest 27:5	88:11	libertarian	73:3 77:21
lasting 87:9	learning 35:23	11:25 78:23	lived 69:5 74:9
lastly 20:15	leave 67:9	life 6:25 27:17	85:11
32:1,18 34:7	lechak 80:10	66:17 67:9	lives 6:17 87:9
late 57:21	led 11:20 45:6	69:3 72:15	livestreamed
lately 31:17	left 71:24	85:11	8:18
latino 14:2,14	legal 58:4	lifesaving 42:5	living 47:10
14:16 15:13	legally 21:20	likely 35:11,23	75:14
39:20 83:21	legislate 55:15	35:25	local 7:1 10:6
latitude 23:21	58:9	limited 27:1	10:21 12:14
law 31:9 59:20	legislated 57:13	limits 6:18	17:14 18:6
81:13,13 85:13	57:22	19:15	25:5,12,20
86:21	legislation	linda 50:17	27:8 30:20,20
laws 20:3 31:19	34:21 43:25	line 12:22	31:12,15,24
76:5	55:19	52:23 88:6	32:5 35:21
lead 24:16	legislature 21:9	lining 32:5	36:7,8,18
33:16 35:3	21:16	link 8:4	44:21 45:13
36:7 42:18	legs 86:7	lisette 3:3 6:6	localities 39:16
70:6	leila 2:24 6:5	list 2:2 3:2 4:2	localize 76:17
leader 88:1	lengthy 7:6	10:11 19:16	locked 67:19
leaders 5:20	lesser 47:25	22:16 23:1,1,2	72:13
46:5 75:23	87:2	23:4	lockout 65:23
77:9,11	letting 64:20	listen 86:24	logic 18:11
leadership	75:21	listening 53:13	logical 18:11
10:23 88:10	level 8:6 14:25	litigation 85:23	long 9:23 12:7
leading 33:20	18:16 27:10	87:11	80:17 84:13
34:6	31:12,25 37:6	little 13:14	longer 73:6
league 29:21	43:18 51:9	22:12 32:1,6	longstanding
30:2	55:2 57:13,24	36:10,17 37:12	17:2
leaguers 77:12	58:7 70:8	43:6 45:15	look 5:6 6:23
	75:25	75:17	19:1 20:7,20

22:4 32:21 machinery 13:7 management mayor's 20:16 40:25 46:5 made 22:23 51:23 57:23 43:7,18 48:12 52:2,3 54:14 42:9 45:12 58:1 49:17 55:25 84:24 64:23 69:20 mandate 42:23 looked 10:16 74:15 47:8,13 mayoral 18:22 29:2 madeline 2:4 mandated 18:23 20:17 36:25 looking 6:10 magnitude 24:19 36:25 mayors 48:17 38:22,25 39:9 main 57:7 64:2 mahattan mayors 48:17 40:5 41:1,3 major 10:8 marialenna 50:9 56:21 50:9 56:21 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 loses 80:22 majority 11:23 marla 50:18 mean 12:20 lose 80:22 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 <td< th=""></td<>
52:2,3 54:14 42:9 45:12 58:1 49:17 55:25 84:24 64:23 69:20 mandate 42:23 56:13 57:12 looked 10:16 74:15 47:8,13 mayoral 18:22 29:2 madeline 2:4 mandated 18:23 20:17 looking 6:10 magnitude 24:19 36:25 23:25 35:13 19:2 manhattan mayors 48:17 38:22,25 39:9 main 57:7 64:2 48:19 49:3 40:5 41:1,3 major 10:8 marialenna 50:9 56:21 50:7 53:12 30:4 36:18 80:11 82:11 57:20 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 loses 80:22 majority 11:23 marla 50:18 15:1,19 38:1 lost 62:20 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 20:9 55:15 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 material 76:16 materials 26:2 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 meaningful 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15
84:24 64:23 69:20 mandate 42:23 56:13 57:12 looked 10:16 74:15 47:8,13 mayoral 18:22 29:2 madeline 2:4 mandated 18:23 20:17 looking 6:10 magnitude 24:19 36:25 23:25 35:13 19:2 manhattan mayors 48:17 38:22,25 39:9 main 57:7 64:2 48:19 49:3 40:5 41:1,3 major 10:8 80:11 82:11 50:9 56:21 50:7 53:12 30:4 36:18 80:11 82:11 57:20 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 lose 80:22 majority 11:23 51:17 15:1,19 38:1 lost 62:20 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 20:9 55:15 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15
looked 10:16 74:15 47:8,13 mayoral 18:22 29:2 madeline 2:4 mandated 18:23 20:17 looking 6:10 magnitude 24:19 36:25 23:25 35:13 19:2 manhattan mayors 48:17 38:22,25 39:9 main 57:7 64:2 mayors 48:17 40:5 41:1,3 major 10:8 marialenna 50:9 56:21 50:9 56:21 50:7 53:12 30:4 36:18 80:11 82:11 57:20 mcs 49:24 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:18 15:1,19 38:1 15:1,19 38:1 lose 80:22 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lost 62:20 make 5:7 12:2 massachusetts 52:1 53:17 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6<
29:2 madeline 2:4 mandated 18:23 20:17 looking 6:10 magnitude 24:19 36:25 23:25 35:13 19:2 manhattan mayors 48:17 38:22,25 39:9 main 57:7 64:2 48:19 49:3 40:5 41:1,3 major 10:8 marialenna 50:9 56:21 50:7 53:12 30:4 36:18 80:11 82:11 57:20 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 loses 80:23 make 33:16 51:17 market 49:24 lose 80:23 make 57 12:2 markat 50:18 mean 12:20 lose 80:23 make 57 12:2 markat 50:18 mean 12:20 lose 80:22 make 57 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 mascachusetts 52:1 53:17 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 material
looking 6:10 magnitude 24:19 36:25 23:25 35:13 19:2 manhattan mayors 48:17 38:22,25 39:9 main 57:7 64:2 48:19 49:3 40:5 41:1,3 major 10:8 marialenna 50:9 56:21 50:7 53:12 30:4 36:18 80:11 82:11 57:20 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 loses 80:22 majority 11:23 marla 50:18 mean 12:20 loss 37:8 33:16 51:17 15:1,19 38:1 15:1,19 38:1 49:11,12 50:6 15:1,19 38:1 49:11,12 50:6 15:1,19 38:1 15:1,19 38:1 49:11,12 50:6 15:1,19 38:1 15:1,
23:25 35:13 19:2 manhattan mayors 48:17 38:22,25 39:9 main 57:7 64:2 48:19 49:3 40:5 41:1,3 major 10:8 marialenna 50:9 56:21 50:7 53:12 30:4 36:18 80:11 82:11 57:20 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 loses 80:22 majority 11:23 marla 50:18 mean 12:20 lost 62:20 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 massachusetts 52:1 53:17 18:25 20:12 32:13,17 35:16 20:9 55:15 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
38:22,25 39:9 main 57:7 64:2 48:19 49:3 40:5 41:1,3 major 10:8 marialenna 50:9 56:21 50:7 53:12 30:4 36:18 80:11 82:11 57:20 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 loses 80:22 majority 11:23 marla 50:18 mean 12:20 loss 37:8 33:16 51:17 15:1,19 38:1 lost 62:20 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 massachusetts 52:1 53:17 18:25 20:12 32:13,17 35:16 20:9 55:15 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
40:5 41:1,3 major 10:8 marialenna 50:9 56:21 50:7 53:12 30:4 36:18 80:11 82:11 57:20 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 loses 80:22 majority 11:23 marla 50:18 mean 12:20 loss 37:8 33:16 51:17 15:1,19 38:1 lost 62:20 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 massachusetts 52:1 53:17 18:25 20:12 32:13,17 35:16 20:9 55:15 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
50:7 53:12 30:4 36:18 80:11 82:11 57:20 lose 80:23 84:4 market 35:20 mcs 49:24 loses 80:22 majority 11:23 marla 50:18 mean 12:20 loss 37:8 33:16 51:17 15:1,19 38:1 lost 62:20 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 massachusetts 52:1 53:17 18:25 20:12 32:13,17 35:16 20:9 55:15 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
lose80:2384:4market35:20mcs49:24loses80:22majority11:23marla50:18mean12:20lost62:20make5:7 12:2marshall1:1049:11,12 50:6lot14:14 15:2412:24 23:23massachusetts52:1 53:1718:25 20:1232:13,17 35:1620:955:1523:25 28:2344:25 55:7material76:16meaningful36:1 43:1559:23 61:6materials26:283:1754:20 57:1867:6,7 78:24matter11:3means14:1969:24 87:381:16 85:1772:5 76:1531:13 40:11lots61:486:12 87:277:370:1 76:14love77:14makes20:11matters17:15meant64:12low6:15,17,2332:5 76:1720:15 78:7measure24:2
loses80:22majority11:23marla50:18mean12:20lost62:20make5:7 12:2marshall1:1049:11,12 50:6lot14:14 15:2412:24 23:23massachusetts52:1 53:1718:25 20:1232:13,17 35:1620:955:1523:25 28:2344:25 55:7material76:16meaningful36:1 43:1559:23 61:6materials26:283:1754:20 57:1867:6,7 78:24matter11:3means14:1969:24 87:381:16 85:1772:5 76:1531:13 40:11lots61:486:12 87:277:370:1 76:14love77:14makes20:11matters17:15meant64:12low6:15,17,2332:5 76:1720:15 78:7measure24:2
loss 37:8 33:16 51:17 15:1,19 38:1 lost 62:20 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 massachusetts 52:1 53:17 18:25 20:12 32:13,17 35:16 20:9 55:15 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 70:1 76:14 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
lost 62:20 make 5:7 12:2 marshall 1:10 49:11,12 50:6 lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 massachusetts 52:1 53:17 18:25 20:12 32:13,17 35:16 20:9 55:15 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 70:1 76:14 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
lot 14:14 15:24 12:24 23:23 massachusetts 52:1 53:17 18:25 20:12 32:13,17 35:16 20:9 55:15 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
18:25 20:12 32:13,17 35:16 20:9 55:15 23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
23:25 28:23 44:25 55:7 material 76:16 meaningful 83:17 36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
36:1 43:15 59:23 61:6 materials 26:2 83:17 54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
54:20 57:18 67:6,7 78:24 matter 11:3 means 14:19 69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
69:24 87:3 81:16 85:17 72:5 76:15 31:13 40:11 lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
lots 61:4 86:12 87:2 77:3 70:1 76:14 love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
love 77:14 makes 20:11 matters 17:15 meant 64:12 low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
low 6:15,17,23 32:5 76:17 20:15 78:7 measure 24:2
6:25 17:20 making 5:23 mayor 13:8 mechanically
23:5 65:3 9:11 20:16 22:5,15,20 14:24
lower 14:8 15:2 21:8 32:8 24:5 43:11,23 mechanism
16:5 35:7,8 42:19 46:14 48:10,11,14,15 60:25
36:23 51:15 71:6 49:13,16,18,20 mechanisms
lying 81:25 74:18 49:23 50:1,5,5 57:9
malfeasance 50:16,17,24 media 35:20
61:23 51:17 55:17 most 22:18
ma'am 80:7 man 76:23 57:16 64:17 meeting 5:4
71:19 7:16 8:2,7

87:23 88:23,25	midst 6:14	mission 5:6	moment 65:4
89:5	mike 68:23	24:19	71:2,3 87:21
	73:23	mitaglario 75:4	momentum
meetings 8:3			21:18
42:21 43:14,14	military 71:24	mitagliaro 3:25	
melanated 80:6	72:11,16	73:21,24,25	money 49:2
member 2:6,8	million 10:13	74:5	69:24
2:10,14,16,18	17:10 19:11,22	mocs 20:21	monopoly 13:6
2:20 3:3,5,7,9	20:14 25:19	42:19,24,24	month 75:9,9
5:20	26:15,16,17,21	43:21 46:14,17	months 12:7
members 7:20	26:22 28:16,18	47:5,13,15,19	44:9 69:13
8:24 13:21	44:6 56:6,8	48:1,20 49:3	77:23
24:14 25:9	65:7 67:24	49:11,12,19	moore 91:2,15
33:20 42:3,4	71:21 73:9	50:2,3,13,17,18	morano 3:11
84:22 85:13	millions 6:15	50:22,25 51:8	8:21,22 9:1
membership	6:17 79:18	51:11,18 52:2	13:16
41:9	mind 53:24	52:3,7,10	mother 77:4
memorial 75:8	54:21 76:13	55:13 56:25	mother's 75:9
mendel 3:22	minneapolis	57:18,24 58:7	motion 87:22
41:18 63:19	10:10 12:13	58:12	88:22,24 89:6
66:12,14,19,20	minor 11:24	model 62:2,8	89:9
68:17	minority 40:7	62:10	move 15:7 24:8
mention 18:19	83:20	models 45:21	80:9 81:3 83:2
78:5	minute 88:23	61:4	85:18
mentioned 8:25	minutes 7:21	moderated 1:5	moved 28:2
32:4 35:2 38:7	78:1 87:22	modern 45:17	69:25 70:3
38:23 67:16	88:22 89:7	modest 39:25	movement
mentorship	misconception	modeste 3:20	39:15 54:5
88:10	76:17	29:19 41:16	59:25 79:15,15
merely 45:11	misconceptio	44:14,16 46:11	moving 15:22
merit 13:7	76:15	53:9 54:13,16	16:7 25:4
method 10:5	misconduct	58:16,24 59:12	28:23 30:21
michelle 3:19	87:13	60:15,22 61:25	31:7 54:7
29:18 41:16,20	mispronounce	62:12,17 63:5	moynihan 4:4
54:18	16:13	63:15	73:23 75:7

77:19,20	nearly 10:8,12	14:20 16:21	non 12:14
multi 29:25	72:6	17:3,10,18	14:16 23:14
multiple 81:20	necessarily	18:10,22 19:24	24:18 29:25
89:8	15:16,19 53:17	20:19 21:5,11	31:14 32:20
municipal 9:22	53:18 58:22	21:14,23 22:4	34:13 37:24
_		24:1,17,19,20	38:1,12,24
	necessary 27:10,20 32:11	24:1,17,19,20	40:25 54:7
n	33:16 85:24	27:15 28:2	60:10 61:21
n 2:1 3:1 4:1			
5:1	necessity 32:4	29:22 30:2,19	63:11 65:8,14
naacp 44:17	need 13:2 17:24	33:3 34:13	84:21
52:25 54:6	21:6 67:6,8,12	36:18 40:5	nonpartisan
83:18	67:13 70:16	42:1 44:19,25	9:7,14,23 10:4
name 5:4 9:1	75:17 81:16,18	45:1,2,22 46:2	10:9,14,17
13:22 16:13	81:22	52:5,14 53:11	11:1,16 12:23
24:15 33:1	needed 43:21	61:9 62:13	19:16 22:7
38:10 39:7	negative 84:25	65:8 68:10	33:4,9,15,17
44:15 66:17,19	negatives 32:17	69:5,25 70:3,5	34:3,9,17 38:8
68:24 71:11	neglected 16:9	71:1,19 72:3,6	75:1 82:23
74:1 76:1	negotiate 56:21	73:7,14 74:9	84:10,16
79:19 85:9	neighborhood	75:2 79:5 80:5	nonprofit 7:2
name's 29:20	70:18	81:8 85:11,18	41:24 42:6,14
41:20	neither 37:9	87:9,12 88:2,3	42:16 43:20
nation's 44:22	76:21 90:10	88:4 90:21	56:10
national 36:9	91:7	newcomer 28:3	nonprofits 42:1
nations 75:21	never 70:2 73:4		56:5
native 69:5	75:20	87:25 88:14	norm 10:18
natural 37:7	new 1:1 2:4,6,8	newspaper	86:15
54:9	2:10,12,14,16	87:24	notary 90:20
naturally 40:16	2:18,20,22,24	newspapers	note 15:18 32:1
nature 53:1	3:3,5,7,9 5:16	36:19	32:19,19 59:13
navigate 13:11	6:15,18,19 7:3	nieves 3:3 6:6	noted 18:6
navigate 13.11 navy 71:13	8:25 9:1,2,10	nine 18:23	25:25 26:11
114 y / 1.13	9:14,22 12:25	nominate 11:6	40:2
	13:5,8,10		
L	1	l	1

notes 17:10	35:14 39:13	once 18:1,15,20	operational
noticed 58:21	40:9,14	19:3,15 20:6	26:3
notion 59:2	office 20:16	20:11 89:6	operations
november 12:2	24:17 43:19	ones 57:1 79:7	48:13
12:24 26:8,11	48:13 49:17	81:17	opinions 46:7
33:5 68:7	55:25 56:13	online 8:1	82:17
number 19:14	71:19	open 10:25	opportunities
25:5,13 70:7	officer 90:2	11:4,13,15	8:10 88:7,12
80:17 81:3,7	officers 86:1,6	12:19 14:5	opportunity
82:1,4,22	86:8,11,21,24	15:8 17:9 20:7	8:23 16:15
numbered 26:7	87:5	20:13 22:6,10	25:3 27:12
26:9,12,13	offices 17:20	22:14 28:4,10	29:23 33:1
numbers 14:21	29:5,5 69:12	33:2 37:19,20	41:23 43:16
40:6 83:21	officials 5:20	37:24 38:9,10	66:15 71:11
ny 1:12	16:25 23:21	38:24 40:25	88:15
nyc.gov 7:9 8:3	offset 86:15	41:1 44:19,24	oppose 84:5
8:12	ogle 4:6 85:5,6	45:10 48:24	opposed 51:23
0	85:10 87:18	60:6,13 61:4	60:12 84:3
o 5:1 87:14	oh 13:20 68:17	62:19,25 69:4	89:9
oakland 10:10	78:5	70:2 71:3	opposite 84:12
12:12 83:8	okay 5:2 16:10	72:21 73:11	opt 56:23
obama 66:7	21:25 24:8,10	78:1,10 79:15	opting 72:10
obama's 66:2	44:14 65:16	84:3,5,5,15,16	option 79:4
objection 60:14	66:14 75:6	opened 87:24	options 39:1
60:19,24 61:20	76:4 81:7	opening 22:8	order 81:14,18
61:24 62:8	82:11 85:4	60:9 84:24	81:20 89:6
obvious 22:20	old 21:21 36:15	operate 23:8	organization
78:4	76:3 85:12	61:15	16:20 27:22
obviously 31:5	older 35:10	operates 52:19	30:1 37:25
38:9 40:13	oldest 44:22	operating	38:10 44:23
55:22 61:1	omb 43:2 49:2	26:23,24	61:2
odd 25:5,12	57:2 58:3	operation	organization's
26:9,15 30:21	omitted 25:17	61:23	83:1

• 4•	•1 7 4 05 04	45 20 50 0	17 10 00 0
organizations	paid 7:4 25:24	45:20 70:8	17:12 23:3
45:6	47:25 56:11	72:23	28:8 33:6,10
orwellian 11:14	87:14	particular 5:8	33:20 34:5
ought 84:1	pan 36:16	6:10 15:15	45:6,8 46:4,5
outcome 90:15	panacea 15:20	37:12 40:1,15	60:21 61:6,7
91:12	panama 77:8	46:4 54:6 59:3	63:11,12 65:8
outside 52:9	panel 7:25	particularly	65:14 66:25
outweighs 37:8	73:17	7:1 14:2 15:12	67:3,11 68:11
overall 35:6	panelists 7:17	16:19 39:20	71:23 78:23
40:14	68:19 79:23	40:2 60:16	79:10 83:14
overdue 9:23	paper 15:7 40:2	parties 9:20	84:12,17,20
overlap 46:22	40:21	11:5,24 19:17	party's 11:7
oversees 43:7	paralegal 85:20	23:10 38:2	pass 20:3 21:18
oversight 46:25	85:21,22,22	72:22 84:4,13	44:1 88:15
47:3,19 55:22	86:19 87:7,10	90:11,14 91:8	passed 16:23
58:3,4,10	paranoid 45:15	91:11	69:24 87:11
85:19	parking 13:11	partisan 12:14	passes 89:10
overstep 47:19	part 7:19 15:2	14:8 22:24	passing 70:1
overwhelming	32:10,11 42:7	23:14 24:18	passionately
18:11	55:11 56:15	30:1 32:20	65:25
overwhelmin	59:14 67:11	34:11,13 37:24	passport 42:13
45:2 60:17	85:13 89:2	38:1,12 40:25	past 26:15 28:5
oweinama 1:21	partial 56:15	partisanship	42:9 53:12
90:2,19	participate	10:21	56:22
own 11:6 50:16	33:11 67:14,23	partner 53:21	pathways
87:4	68:12 70:8,13	partnered	42:17
p	83:14 84:1,18	50:21	paul 3:14,24
	84:22	partners 7:2	22:1 63:21
p 2:1,1 3:1,1	participating	53:22	68:22 71:9,10
4:1,1 5:1	28:1	partnership	71:12 73:17
p.m. 1:7 8:8	participation	88:2,4	pavement
89:11	12:15 14:6,24	party 9:15	86:11
page 8:2	15:2,24 30:3	10:19 13:6	pay 56:15
	34:3 39:3	14:17 15:15,17	67:22

noving 12:11	69:21 72:6,12	nhiladalnhia	policies 44:4
paying 42:11	80:24 81:1	philadelphia 10:16	67:12
payment 42:6 42:14 56:15			
	percentage	phoenix 22:6	policing 86:14
payments 57:7	39:22	phone 88:15	policy 13:24
57:22	perfect 71:2	phrase 32:13	16:22 17:1
peace 82:12,13	perfectly 62:22	32:13	24:16,21 25:1
82:17 85:3	persists 42:14	pick 27:19,19	30:4,5 38:10
people 7:23	person 7:16	picked 51:5	43:9 46:3 47:1
9:12 14:22	10:19 22:16	piece 56:17	47:12 49:16
15:4 19:19,23	24:8 79:3	pieces 43:25	55:12,23 57:3
22:19 23:2,5	80:22,23,24	pilot 9:25	57:17
23:23 24:9	81:22,22,22	place 16:1	political 11:5
30:14,17,18	86:6	17:22 21:11	14:15 17:12
32:4 34:16	personal 27:1,2	25:24 35:23	19:17 21:18
35:16 44:25	personally 38:6	37:6,11	27:16 30:1
49:2 50:12	61:1 78:20	planning 6:11	31:17 34:18
51:16 53:14,15	88:9	88:1	45:7,9 69:2
54:6,7 59:3	personnel	plate 81:9	71:23 72:10
63:12,25 65:15	28:23	platforms 46:3	politically
65:16,22 67:1	perspective	play 84:7	20:13 21:14,20
67:4,5,8,12	6:12 36:10	please 16:13	politics 67:11
70:7,9,13,15,17	83:10	81:4 82:3	70:10
70:18,24 72:17	perspectives	plus 19:3	poll 12:1 27:4
73:9 74:6,19	83:18	point 23:7 30:8	polls 66:1
77:9 78:5,12	petition 70:20	33:24 51:15	poor 17:3
80:8 81:1	petitioned 28:5	64:18 83:23	popular 23:24
84:10 86:9	petitioners	pointed 47:23	population
people's 27:20	70:23	82:22 83:7	35:9 40:3 45:1
77:10	petitioning	points 22:19	70:15
percent 18:21	70:18	39:23 54:14	populations
18:23,24,24	ph 4:5,6 78:13	65:4	14:22 35:10
39:21 40:6,8	80:10,11,12	polarization	40:7,16 53:3
40:12 45:1	82:11 85:5	34:8	86:3
55:17,20 65:18	87:18		

	1		1
portion 37:1	preferences	33:2,16,17	78:3,4,16
position 25:7	33:18 46:7	34:3,9,13,15,18	79:15 83:15
39:11 58:21	preliminary	37:19,20,24,24	84:3,16,17,24
59:6	7:6 9:5 10:24	38:1,4,9,11	prince 3:20
positive 15:9	16:17 17:1,6	40:25 44:19,24	29:18 41:16
33:24	29:24 30:9,12	45:10 60:7	44:14,15 46:11
possibility 18:9	42:7,22	61:4 65:20	53:9 54:13,16
79:14	prepared 91:3	67:17 68:4	58:24 59:11
possible 20:5	prerequisite	69:5,10 70:2	60:15,22 61:25
69:22 81:16	68:12	72:6,21 73:11	62:12,17 63:5
post 13:22	prescribed	75:1 76:7	63:15
72:12	27:9	77:17 78:1,10	principally
potential 21:9	present 25:3	84:5,5,15	51:23
44:24 62:20	presented	primarily	principle 83:25
poverty 87:1	83:18	44:23 60:9	printing 26:1
power 21:5	president 44:17	primary 11:4,7	prior 26:9
45:7 46:4	66:7	11:13,14,15,16	38:19 71:16
49:12 50:4	presidential	12:19 14:1,6	84:15 90:5
60:11 61:8,13	29:10 37:1	14:23,25 15:7	privacy 76:4
62:11 68:5	39:25 40:11	15:8,9 17:19	privilege 71:18
85:17	pressing 86:10	18:20 20:8	87:24
powers 20:17	pretty 18:15	22:7,9,10,11,14	privileged
50:4	30:14 32:15	22:24,24,25	35:10,22
ppb 42:20	40:4 54:23	23:5,15 25:16	pro 23:11,11,12
46:16 47:6,18	prevent 69:24	26:13,19 27:24	23:12,13,13,15
practice 73:6	previous 85:21	28:3 33:4,9,9	23:16,16,17,18
preceding 17:4	previously	38:25 40:25	probability
precise 12:17	37:17	42:2 45:21	78:24
precondition	primaries 11:1	59:17 60:10,12	probably 14:23
21:19	12:5 14:8,12	60:13,19,21	19:25 37:7
preferable	15:5,23 16:4,7	61:18,19,20,21	78:17
37:22	17:9,12 18:4	61:24 62:3,3,4	problem 6:23
preference	18:13 20:7,13	62:25 63:12	30:19 51:19
14:17 78:9	28:4,10 32:20	64:21 65:2,18	67:15

problematic	progressive	public 5:3,18	quasi 49:16
23:7,8	36:15	5:21 7:7,20	queens 1:10,11
problems 50:10	project 82:18	8:11,13,18	8:4 71:16
proceeding	promise 60:23	9:17 10:23	77:21 80:1
89:12 91:4	promote 30:24	17:1 24:20,21	85:10
proceedings	promoting	25:9 30:5	question 32:3
90:3,4,6,8 91:6	34:23	42:21 43:10,14	35:1 37:13,16
process 7:11	promotional	43:14,16,20	38:16 46:13,21
9:3 18:1,20	26:2	47:20 64:3	47:23 52:24
20:19 33:14	pronouncing	73:1 81:25	53:10 58:2
34:19 38:24	74:1	87:3 90:20	59:11 63:10
41:8 47:4 55:3	pronunciation	published 25:4	77:14 79:23
57:6,6,7 58:2	63:22	puerto 88:19	82:2
58:11 64:21	proposal 11:1	pure 76:12,20	questions 7:23
71:3 83:24	25:7 33:5	76:21	7:25 16:9
84:22 85:1	44:19 45:10	purpose 60:25	20:24 21:1
processes 49:8	74:25	purposes 8:19	24:5 27:13
55:7 58:14	proposals	pursue 5:25	28:13 29:13
procure 52:13	61:15	pursuing 5:17	37:15 41:13
procurement	proposed 6:1	71:19	43:24 44:11
20:19,22 42:3	proposition	push 59:1	46:10 49:11
42:6 43:9,12	69:9	put 12:22 19:23	54:20 59:8
47:1,2,11,14	prosecutorial	21:23 26:21	68:18 73:16
49:12,15 50:7	85:20,21 86:20	28:10 31:16	75:4 81:3 82:7
50:15,24 52:1	protect 31:18	53:19 62:9	85:3 87:17,17
55:12,23	72:14	64:18 68:6	quick 46:13
produce 22:22	protected 19:6	78:11 79:8,18	quinton 2:3
product 76:15	protections	putting 31:15	quite 87:25
profile 36:23	31:10,13	puzzle 32:11	quran 75:13
profit 27:21	proudly 71:13	q	r
profound 6:14	proven 73:1	qme 66:21	r 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1
programs 9:25	79:6	qualified 90:7	race 17:17 37:9
22:22 67:13	provide 7:3	•	78:21
	42:5		

[races - related] Page 28

26.21.22	4 1 10 10	• 4 500	11 5.05
races 36:21,22	rational 18:10	receipt 56:9	regardless 5:25
37:10,10 45:14	rcb 20:6	receive 57:1	6:1 33:10
racial 14:10	rcv 18:2,16,20	receives 47:4	60:20
racially 38:17	79:19	recent 26:23	regions 40:3
radical 10:6	reaches 80:24	40:10 43:23	register 48:24
rainbows 50:15	read 16:18 30:8	48:4	65:23
raised 71:16	81:12 87:24,25	recently 7:5	registered
85:10	ready 24:11	20:9 27:21	15:16 33:6
raising 59:21	41:17	recognize 45:4	34:4 45:2
ran 22:14	real 12:22	recognized	60:10,17 61:6
ranch 11:2	85:17,19	45:5	61:7 64:11
range 26:15	realize 32:4	recommendat	66:8,23 70:21
34:1,10	really 6:12 7:3	5:23 44:10	70:22
rank 13:8	13:21 17:15	record 9:17	registering
80:20	18:9 24:7	89:4 90:9 91:5	28:7
ranked 9:8,15	31:23 32:7,9	recorded 8:18	registration
9:24 10:4,9	32:12 42:5,10	90:6	54:8 60:20
12:4,13,23	43:8,10,17	recording 90:8	regulate 39:12
13:12 18:4,8	47:1,5,11 49:7	91:4	regulated
18:11 19:13	50:4 57:22	recourse 86:19	75:23
22:7 26:4	68:4,9 69:16	reduce 10:20	regulating
30:10 34:14	74:15 75:20	34:11	75:23
37:18 58:18,25	82:24 85:4	reduced 90:6	regulations
59:4,4 79:16	87:2,18 88:3	reducing 14:24	76:5
80:14,18 81:14	reason 70:17	15:20	rehash 77:24
ranking 80:19	reasonable	reduction 34:7	reinvent 16:20
raquel 3:12	70:4	reflect 33:18	17:21
13:19,22	reasonably	reflective 34:20	reiterate 78:9
rarely 17:18	39:18	reflects 7:10	reiterated 79:7
rate 47:25 81:2	reasons 33:15	73:8	rejected 56:5
rates 14:17	59:24 70:16	reform 9:4 42:3	56:10
rather 33:19	rebellious	42:18 50:15	related 16:4
53:10	64:10	69:2 79:15	26:3,5,14 29:4
		84:10	37:17 90:11
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>

[related - roll] Page 29

91:7	representation	residents 10:13	revolutionary
relates 28:21	31:4	resourceful	84:25
39:2	representative	86:23	richard 1:5
relation 86:25	9:20 30:24	respected 72:4	2:12 3:17,25
relations 64:3	33:13 34:16,23	response 38:15	6:4 24:12
relative 90:13	35:25 44:21	responsibilities	29:16 33:1
91:10	72:20	42:24 46:16,18	73:24
relatively 27:7	representatives	47:14,18 72:2	richardson 2:8
release 81:25	84:6,8	responsibility	6:7 58:15
released 7:5	represented	5:10 27:23	rico 88:19
religion 75:10	11:10	46:25 50:5	ridge 68:25
77:3	represents	72:3	right 21:19
remark 87:1	34:21	responsible	24:13 28:8
remarkably	republican	47:5	35:7,8 36:13
43:3 49:7	22:17,24 60:13	responsive 5:8	36:15,24 39:16
remarks 86:13	61:19 62:3,6	84:14	41:4,9 47:24
remotely 16:16	78:18,25 79:18	restore 10:21	49:17 53:12
renewals 48:25	republicans	restrictive	54:6 55:16,24
rentals 27:6	11:21 12:2	79:20	59:12 63:17
renters 31:2	83:22 84:18	result 9:18 15:9	68:1,10 73:14
35:4 38:18	request 25:10	23:6	75:11,22 76:2
40:1	53:10	retire 88:1	78:15 82:25
repeat 60:1	require 50:10	retired 27:21	83:1,12 84:1
report 7:6,9,9	57:14	64:2 66:20	rights 23:13,18
9:5 10:24	required 42:20	85:14	44:22 59:20
16:17 17:2,6	59:19	return 71:6	84:11
17:10 20:18	research 13:25	review 5:4,10	rise 13:7
25:4 28:19,25	14:15 16:3	36:17 85:16,17	robust 20:17
29:2,24 30:9	17:12 31:2	revision 1:2 2:5	20:21
30:12 42:7	35:2 39:6,11	2:6,9,10,12,14	role 47:7,19
48:5 65:11	40:19	2:16,18,20,23	55:22 58:4,4
reported 1:21	researcher 39:9	2:25 3:4,5,7,9	86:20
represent	resident 33:2	9:2,9 24:15	roll 45:11
33:12 41:25		64:16	

11 01 0 15	10.10.14	1 10 6	
ronald 91:2,15	san 10:10,14	second 12:6	senator 75:25
rooms 51:2	12:12 18:18	17:25 23:17	send 39:8 54:24
rot 75:22	19:14 82:20	33:24 55:11	57:2
roughly 44:25	83:8	62:24 88:25	sends 21:13
round 12:6	sat 64:15	89:7	sense 20:12
18:2 30:10	satisfying	secondly 31:6	22:23 37:21
37:18 62:5	47:21	seconds 77:14	55:16 58:1
80:25 81:15	sauce 62:21	secretary 2:24	64:10 71:23
rounded 33:21	save 19:20,21	6:5	sent 56:10
route 38:8	saving 19:23	sector 41:24	separate 55:4
rubenstein	savings 25:19	42:16 43:20	seriously 20:19
64:4	28:17,20 30:22	44:7	servant 85:22
rule 61:12	savino 3:7 6:7	sectors 47:24	servants 73:1
rules 43:12	saw 47:20	see 11:12 15:2	serve 5:5 45:22
47:20 59:17	78:12 80:5	20:21 40:4,16	73:8
81:13	88:14	42:6 43:4	served 71:13
run 8:8 22:9,10	saying 43:22	46:23 53:8	72:14
22:14,16,23	55:3 61:17	54:4 72:1	service 9:18
25:22 84:13	63:11 76:1	73:15 76:9	71:24 73:18
running 23:14	88:16	80:16 84:8	services 7:3
29:4 68:5	scary 20:5	86:8,14 87:11	20:17 41:21,24
runoff 11:16	schedule 13:12	seeing 48:7	41:25 42:1,5
runoffs 12:6	scheduled 8:8	55:16 74:14	43:19 44:8
S	scholar 13:23	88:14	47:10 48:11,12
s 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	school 39:9,12	seems 64:19	48:15 51:12
sacrificed	39:15	seen 23:14	52:6,9,14
72:15	schools 6:19	31:17 56:22	55:25 56:13
sad 50:8	science 13:23	59:2 64:15	set 12:25,25
satu 50.8 safety 87:3	14:15	seize 86:4	13:1 47:12
salaries 87:13	scientists 17:13	select 8:4	sets 86:5
salt 10:10	scope 37:12	selecting 33:11	settle 12:5
samuels 3:5 6:7	scraps 27:18	selection 34:5	settlements
	screwed 20:19	semi 20:7,13	87:13
		41:1 84:16	

seventy 18:23	sic 68:23 73:23	slavery 80:5	spare 88:23
several 50:9	side 13:11	sliwa 78:18	speak 5:14 8:7
77:23	32:19 47:15	slow 67:10	35:4 36:10
severely 6:18	57:12	small 48:12	50:20 61:14
shame 37:11	sign 2:3 70:20	smart 32:15	63:24 64:1,1
shams 2:18 6:6	70:20	smirk 86:12	65:5 66:10
shane 4:4 73:22	signal 21:13	smirks 86:17	77:5,5,5
75:7	signature 90:18	smith 68:22	speaker 28:14
shape 24:24	91:14	73:21 75:6	52:20 54:17
67:12	significant 86:1	social 22:22	57:4 64:5
share 27:5	87:5	socialists 62:7	speakers 89:8
39:20,22,24	significantly	society 13:23	speaking 44:16
40:17 71:11	25:22	45:18 54:10	57:10,11 61:2
shared 46:7,25	similar 43:2	solely 33:19	64:25 65:2
sharing 24:4	49:1	somewhat	74:7,23 75:10
87:19	similarly 76:12	36:23	77:6
sharon 2:22 6:5	simple 57:6,6	son 64:4	speaks 28:25
shift 27:11	simply 35:11	sorry 38:14	special 9:15,25
79:17	35:22 53:19	62:21 66:3	13:9 25:17
shifted 25:13	62:3,13	67:10 82:5	45:13 56:24
shifting 28:17	simpson 50:18	85:18 86:15	73:13
shine 35:17	51:17	sort 16:3 36:23	specials 13:1
shirt 76:10,11	single 9:9 18:2	41:7 43:11	specific 38:20
76:11,13	18:3 19:4,11	51:15 54:9	42:23 43:15
shocked 70:24	20:6 37:18,22	55:4,6 60:1	50:21 56:4
short 53:14	60:12,13,19	74:7	specify 38:3
showed 72:19	site 27:6 81:12	sorts 61:22	spectrum 5:16
showing 35:2	81:13	soul 76:12,20	spending 52:5
shows 19:1	size 52:2	76:21	spends 28:16
44:5 57:5	skewed 23:7	soviet 75:19	spent 26:22
shut 28:2 72:9	skills 90:10	space 45:17	spill 14:25
shuts 11:24	91:6	spanish 75:10	spirit 75:10
73:8	sky 12:14	77:5,6	77:3

spiritual 75:18	31:12,25 32:5	streamlining	successful 24:2
76:25	42:1,4 53:22	48:21	suffer 6:25
split 35:15	59:19 69:15,16	strength 45:25	suggest 5:11
splitting 11:20	71:7 84:23	strictly 29:2	15:6 33:3 59:3
18:17	90:21	strong 20:21	suggested 21:3
spoiler 33:22	states 11:8,9	21:13 51:1,3	83:6
spoke 36:4 39:7	14:5 18:7 24:1	78:24	suggesting
62:23 77:22,22	73:5 75:12	strongly 20:16	58:17
83:5	76:2 80:18	structural	suggestion
spoken 17:25	83:23	51:24 52:1,8	54:25
spread 35:8	statewide 21:17	structures	suggests 17:13
stability 34:12	36:9	42:13	28:19 60:2
staff 2:4 7:5	stating 69:17	structuring	summarizing
16:17,22 17:1	statistic 65:17	47:3	7:6
27:6 52:3,3	statistical 54:5	struggle 6:16	summary 16:3
stage 83:15	statistics 38:21	stuart 3:15	sunday 69:12
stake 83:1,12	39:2 64:24	24:10,14,16	sunshine 50:14
stakeholders	stats 65:5,11,13	28:13,15 29:2	support 20:16
25:8	stay 6:21	29:8,12,15	21:4,15 32:9
standard 10:6	step 34:21	studied 75:13	33:17 41:5
26:23,24 44:3	steven 64:4	studies 71:20	53:7 78:14
standardize	stirring 72:23	study 36:17	supported 17:8
20:22	stood 65:25	studying 32:20	36:14
standardized	stop 10:2 12:18	stuff 16:18	supporting
56:1	stopped 27:25	submit 8:10,14	28:4 66:25
standpoint	story 56:8	29:24 44:10	69:2
31:7 32:3	strategic 48:14	47:9 49:2 56:7	supports 6:1
stark 65:9,17	82:17	submitted 30:9	67:22
start 5:3 75:16	stream 57:25	subway 13:12	suppose 83:9
76:8	streamline 55:3	succeeded 70:1	supreme 19:7
state 16:23	55:6,6,24	84:20	77:3
20:3,3 21:6,7,9	58:13	success 20:4	sure 32:8,13,17
21:10 22:3	streamlines	34:14 51:10	35:16 36:12
25:13 27:9,10	58:1		52:1 54:13,23

[sure - thank] Page 33

55.7 50.22	tookling 86.6	tends 64:22	59:13 63:18
55:7 59:23 81:16 88:6	tackling 86:6	term 11:13	68:20 73:20
	tagliaro 68:23		
surpass 81:17	take 6:13 25:3	38:25	79:23,24 80:10
survey 14:3	25:6 31:23	terms 27:3	82:10 85:4,5
suspicion 45:10	45:17 58:21	47:14 55:22	87:16,19
svoboda 3:16	62:14 87:23	58:11 65:23	texas 11:8
24:11 27:14	taken 67:21	terrible 63:21	thank 8:22,23
28:13	76:18,19 90:3	testified 9:6	13:13,15,16,17
swat 48:22	90:12 91:9	30:14 44:5	16:8,11,14
sway 19:8,8	takes 81:10	48:1	20:25 21:2,24
switch 12:20	talk 12:4 13:21	testifier 8:20	21:25 22:3
28:19 36:15	13:24 23:21	87:20	23:24 24:3,6
switching	35:7 72:21	testify 5:21	24:13 27:11
39:16	talked 30:18	7:20 8:1,24	28:11,12,14
sworn 90:5	37:20	27:12 33:1	29:7,14,15,20
symbolic 85:18	talking 72:22	41:23 66:15	32:22,23,25
system 10:1	72:22,24 84:2	80:8 82:20	34:24,25 37:14
11:18 13:3,5	85:9	85:15	37:15 38:12,13
14:23 18:21	tapped 31:23	testifying 33:3	38:14 40:18,22
33:9 48:20	taxes 67:21,22	42:8 46:13	40:23 41:10,11
50:15 72:10	taxpayers	58:16 90:5	41:12,14,15,21
73:7 78:4,10	87:12	testimonials	44:11,13 46:7
78:14 79:4,11	team 48:22	24:9	46:9,12,20
80:4 82:24	52:4	testimony 7:10	49:9 54:3,15
83:3,6 84:24	tear 79:6	7:12,16,22	54:16,18 58:15
systemic 86:21	tell 47:8 64:14	8:10,14,20	59:7,12,12
systems 19:3	77:10	13:18 16:12	61:10 63:7,16
42:12 50:12	telling 83:16	21:1,3 28:15	63:17,22,23
t	tells 49:2	29:14,24 30:10	66:9,11 68:12
tab 8:3	temporary 9:25	36:6 38:14,19	68:14,15,17,18
table 73:12	ten 19:10,15	40:19 41:12,14	68:19 71:3,8
tabulation	74:9	42:18 43:22	71:10 73:15,16
81:14	tend 11:9 14:16	47:23 54:4,18	73:17,20 74:1
01.17	15:13 36:22	54:23 58:17	74:3,7 75:2,3,4

76:19,20 77:18	38:8,9,11 39:6	thrilled 42:6	71:11 74:6,19
77:20,21 79:20	41:7 46:21,24	throw 86:9	74:23 78:8
79:22,23 80:8	48:2 49:5,6,24	till 58:12	85:15
82:9,13,14,19	50:11,13 51:6	time 7:4,23	today's 7:12
85:2 87:18	51:7 52:15,22	13:14 16:2	together 6:21
88:17,17,17,17	53:6,11 54:21	24:6,10 31:24	20:23 50:19
88:18 89:1,3	55:1,5,11,24	35:17,18 42:9	told 79:9
thanks 16:15	57:9 58:23	44:12 47:25	tones 86:13
20:23 66:15	59:19,22,22,25	48:8 53:14	tongue 77:4
89:1,1	60:5 61:12	56:6 58:11,12	tonight 44:16
thing 11:17	62:24,25 64:17	58:19 64:20	80:16
18:18 21:22	64:18 65:5,6	66:3,16 68:15	top 11:13,16,18
23:14 31:19	68:1,7 70:5,25	69:10,10 71:1	12:20 14:5
35:11 46:24	71:1 72:19	74:6,8,10	15:8,8 22:7
52:12 59:13	78:2,3 79:13	79:21 80:15,17	69:10 78:14
70:4 79:25	81:8 82:15	81:23 82:6	79:4,12 82:21
82:24	83:9 84:7,12	84:7 85:3	82:23 83:2,3,4
things 18:10	84:19,23	86:14 87:3,16	83:6 84:3,7
20:2 23:9,18	thinking 10:7	88:13,23	topic 7:12 25:4
30:13,16,22	32:12 79:12	timely 25:2	total 26:14
31:18 37:19	third 34:2 79:3	times 36:18	totally 20:4
44:4,5,6 47:24	79:4	73:19 88:17	67:15
48:4 49:4 55:7	thomas 75:13	timing 25:17	touch 77:2
55:24 57:3,12	thoroughly	27:8 31:7	toward 54:7
58:6 59:14	30:14	39:10	towards 19:23
60:4,5 64:15	thought 35:15	tired 77:15	34:21 79:13
think 10:24	69:22 85:8	tirelessly 45:7	town 64:22
16:4 20:4,6,11	thoughtful 7:10	today 7:19 8:7	toxic 10:21
21:22 22:4,13	thousands 69:6	8:24 13:4,21	track 39:17
23:25 27:17	69:7	13:24 16:15	trackable
30:14 31:16,19	three 7:21,22	17:21 28:6	39:18
31:22 35:6	80:14 82:4	29:23 46:7	trainer 59:1
36:2,5,13 37:3	85:12 86:5	48:1,20 49:12	transcriber
37:11,21 38:6		61:19 70:11	91:1

transcript 91:3	35:8,8,24 40:7	ultimately 14:7	unilaterally
91:5	40:11,14 65:3	33:20 45:12	21:5
transcriptionist	70:11	umbrella 31:16	unintended
90:7	turns 78:6	unaffiliated	82:23
transparent	twenty 19:10	17:11 20:14	union 25:10
5:7 16:21 25:2	twice 9:7 18:16	65:8,14	36:13 75:20
transportation	79:5	under 15:25	united 18:7
27:7	two 11:13,16	31:16 48:10,11	73:5 75:11
travesty 83:7	11:18,21 12:1	48:12,13 49:13	76:2
tremendous	12:1,20 14:6	49:16 50:16	universities
69:23	15:8 17:4,6,13	51:17 59:19	77:12
tricky 32:6	17:16,22 19:9	65:15 72:7	unpaid 44:7
tried 51:5,7	19:21 22:7	75:20 77:13	unrelated
56:23 79:6,6	23:9 24:9	understand	20:15
trouble 85:7	26:19 42:19	45:18 53:15	upside 20:12
true 11:1 56:7	46:18 47:18	59:5 61:3,17	urge 17:21 28:9
72:11 80:25	69:6,6,10	61:20,24 62:8	32:12 73:11
90:9 91:5	71:16 78:14,20	62:17 63:10	urgent 28:6
trust 10:23	78:25 79:12	86:16,18	44:8 68:8,8
13:8,9 53:16	81:3,7 82:1,21	understanding	use 11:12 14:3
try 51:20 52:12	82:23 83:2,6	24:20 30:4	79:11
69:24 77:24	84:3,7,25 86:6	54:22 59:4	used 20:8 62:24
trying 16:2	86:7	74:17	63:1 79:5
59:15	two's 83:4	unfold 7:14	useful 39:11
turn 23:5 66:6	type 80:5	unfolds 7:11	uses 10:8,9,14
78:19	types 22:9	unfortunately	18:19
turning 7:16	typewriting	39:7 74:11	using 9:15
15:4 18:14,15	90:7	unidentified	12:13,19 18:4
turnout 6:23	typically 17:20	28:14 52:20	48:4
7:1 14:9 15:10	u	54:17 57:4	usual 30:15
15:21 16:5	u.s. 10:8	64:5	usurp 58:8
17:3,14,20	ultimate 60:23	unified 43:1	
18:21,23 23:5	00.23	uniform 57:3	
30:19 33:13			

[valerie - wait] Page 36

V	vital 7:3	70:10,12,16,17	35:22 39:20
valerie 3:9 6:8	voice 20:15	70:25 73:14	40:12 45:2,23
validated 14:4	31:2,4 35:4	74:10,10,11,24	46:1,2 58:17
values 5:25	71:11 78:2	74:25 79:9	60:13,16 61:5
34:20 72:19	voiced 78:13	80:14 81:21	61:7 62:13,14
variable 25:18	voices 11:25	83:16	65:1,8,18,20
various 53:3	34:19 70:10	voted 72:18	66:6 67:25
various 33.3 vehicle 43:10	72:25	voter 6:23 11:6	69:13,19 71:13
venturing	volumes 26:4	12:15 14:4	72:7,8 74:9,17
53:11	volunteer	17:3 18:21	81:11,11 83:13
versa 11:22	27:20 33:2	23:1 31:20	83:19,20,20,21
versus 14:5,5	71:12	32:7 33:13	83:21 84:14,17
18:24 38:18	volunteered	34:3,6,22	votes 59:18
vested 46:3	69:8	45:19,19 65:3	voting 9:8,15
veterans 71:12	volunteering	65:11 66:23	9:24 10:5,9
71:23 72:12,15	30:7	69:14 70:11	12:5,13 13:3
73:1 74:8	vote 11:7,20	71:21 74:12	13:13 18:4,8
vibrant 6:25	12:8 13:6 15:5	82:18 84:11	18:12 19:18
vice 2:22 6:4	15:15 17:12	voter's 5:11	22:7,16 23:1
11:22	18:1,17,20	voters 5:12,24	26:4 27:17
videoconfere	19:3,13,15,24	9:20 10:19	28:3 30:11
2:21,23,25 3:4	20:6,6,7,11	11:23 12:10,20	34:15 37:19
3:6,8,11,12,13	27:24 28:9	13:2 14:2,10	45:25 58:18
3:14	31:8 33:22	14:11,14,16,17	59:1,19 60:11
view 22:19 23:7	35:11 38:2	14:18 15:10,12	61:13 62:5,11
84:6,10	40:17 44:24	15:13 16:6	65:16 72:1,9
viewpoint	53:25 59:18	17:11 18:14,14	74:20 75:1
58:23	60:20,24 61:8	19:17 20:14	79:16 80:18
virtual 7:16	61:21 62:5,6,7	21:14,17 28:7	vulnerable
virtually 8:1	62:7,8,16,18,20	28:11 29:21	86:3
vision 24:23	63:12 64:21	30:2 31:1,10	W
visit 8:12	65:23 66:6,7	31:21,23 32:14	wait 56:16
.1510 0.12	66:23 67:19	32:15 33:6,10	Wait 50.10
	68:1,10 69:21	34:1,4,4,10,19	

waiting 71:2	watched 87:8	64:25	worked 28:4
walking 74:14	water 13:1	widely 63:1	50:18 58:25
wang 3:18	way 15:18,23	wider 34:10	64:3,4,7 66:21
24:12 29:17,20	39:17 40:13,13	wiesbrod 21:24	67:20 85:8
29:21 35:1,6	48:16,22,24,25	wife 76:23	workers 27:4
36:12 38:14,14	50:13,21,23	wilde 88:3	47:10
39:5 40:20	51:19 52:15,18	win 78:16	working 10:1
41:3,6	55:5,9 56:25	80:23	67:5 72:10
want 11:23	66:9 69:14	winner 67:18	78:17 83:5
15:18 16:6	ways 5:7 49:4	winning 33:17	works 11:8
23:10 29:22	60:7	wins 80:22	13:4 27:22
32:1,16 42:18	we've 16:3	wise 71:6	30:4 53:23
53:8 56:1	31:17 35:19	wish 8:1 53:12	world 61:18
59:13,22 60:4	58:16 70:11	wishes 5:21 8:7	75:18 76:16
60:8 61:11,13	weaken 45:11	witness 90:4	worn 86:22
61:14 63:2	weakening	woman 45:16	worried 62:19
67:2,3,7 73:17	72:22	women 29:21	worse 23:4
73:25 74:15	wednesday 1:6	30:2 80:6	44:6 47:24
76:8 78:7,21	week 78:13	won 69:21,21	worst 48:7
79:8,8,9 80:8	weeks 78:13	wonderful	worth 52:5
80:22,23 87:18	weigh 43:16	47:12	wrap 66:4
87:23 88:8	weisbrod 2:14	wootten 3:21	wrapping 66:5
wanted 30:13	6:8 21:2 49:10	41:17 63:19,23	wreck 19:11
30:16 54:19	50:1 51:14	64:2,7 66:5	writer 69:1
75:16 80:13	63:9	word 51:2,3	written 8:14
wants 56:14	welcome 5:3	wording 32:18	30:10 40:19
war 75:19	7:12 66:18	words 7:13	54:23
77:17	welcoming	11:3	wrong 11:14
washington	72:25	work 6:20 7:4	74:19
20:10	went 36:25	9:12 25:8	wrote 75:14
wasted 33:23	37:1 69:12	27:21 47:12	wylde 2:20 6:8
watch 85:25	white 3:9 6:8	49:4 66:21	59:8,10 88:1
86:3	14:17 35:10	72:16,20 85:9	88:18
	38:13 54:3,15	88:8	

wylde's 88:24	york 1:1 2:4,6,8	65:22 70:23
y	2:10,12,14,16	72:8
	2:18,20,22,24	younger 35:22
yeah 35:6	3:3,5,7,9 9:10	39:24 40:12
36:12 39:5	9:14,22 12:25	54:5,5 65:10
40:10 41:6	14:20 16:21	youth 27:22
46:20 52:20	17:3,11,18	Z
55:10	18:10,22 19:24	
year 9:13 17:7	20:19 21:5,12	zohran 78:16
17:15,23 21:4	21:14,23 22:4	zoom 8:21
21:6,15 25:12	24:1,17,19,20	10:11 80:9
25:19,20,20	25:11 27:15	
26:5,9,12,15,16 26:23 28:17,17	28:2 29:22	
30:11,12 32:22	30:2,19 33:3	
35:2 36:6,24	34:14 36:18	
38:16 40:8	40:5 42:1	
48:8 55:18	44:20,25 45:1	
67:22 70:18	45:2,23 52:5	
74:24	52:14 61:9	
years 10:2	62:13 65:8	
12:14 25:5,13	69:25 70:3,5	
25:22,24 26:6	71:1,19 72:3,6	
26:7,14,17,20	74:9 75:2 81:9	
26:21,23 28:1	85:11,18 87:12	
30:21 31:16,23	88:2,3,4 90:21	
35:15 39:13,21	yorker 69:5	
39:25 40:9,14	yorkers 5:16	
56:22 64:9,9,9	6:16,18,19 7:3	
64:19 66:21	8:25 13:5,8,11	
67:21 69:3	24:23 46:2	
71:14 74:9	68:10 71:21	
75:13 76:3	73:7,14 87:10	
82:19 85:12	young 14:22	
	30:25 65:1,15	