	Tieming
	Page 1
1	Charter Review Commission Public Hearing
2	
3	
4	Moderated by Richard Buery
5	Wednesday, April 23, 2025
6	5:21 p.m.
7	
8	
9	New York Law School
10	185 West Broadway
11	New York, NY 10013
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	Reported By: Paul Grasso
18	JOB NO.: 7215034
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES
2	List of Attendees:
3	Richard Buery, Chair
4	Anita Laremont
5	Carl Weisbrod
6	Dr. Lisette Nieves
7	Julie Samuels
8	Grace Bonilla
9	Shams DaBaron
10	Leila Bozorg, Secretary
11	Anthony Richardson
12	Sharon Greenberger, Vice Chair
13	Valerie White
14	Kathryn Wylde
15	Diane Savino
16	Dena Tasse-Winter
17	Susan Nial
18	Nick
19	Mark Weller
20	Christie Peale
21	Celeste Royo
22	Alex Maza
23	Albin Henneberger
2 4	Lo van der Valk
25	Ken A.

	Page 3
1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	Benjy Ross
3	Ilan Rabinovitch
4	Frampton Tolbert
5	Karl-Henry Cesar
6	Moses Gates
7	Tania Arias
8	Annemarie Gray
9	Gabriel Turzo
10	DeRay Mckesson
11	Cassandra Ippaso
12	Abdul Nasser Rad
13	Hassan Naveed
14	Britny McKenzie
15	Simeon Bankoff
16	Roberta Gratz
17	Howard Slatkin
18	Brendan Cheney
19	Felix Stetsenko
20	Jessica Katz
21	Keri Butler
22	Sara Penenberg
23	Maria Danzilo
24	Benjamin Kallos
25	Melanie Wesslock

	Page 4
1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)
2	Alexa Aviles
3	Jerrod Delaine
4	Michelle de la Uz
5	Annie Levers
6	Kimberly Cruz
7	Tara Duvivier
8	Michael Lewyn
9	Gale Brewer
10	Selvena Brooks-Powers
11	Amanda Farias
12	
13	
1 4	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
2 0	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
2 5	

MR. BUERY: Can you all hear me? All right. Great. Welcome to the public hearing of the Charter Revision Commission. My name is Richard Buery. I have the honor of serving as our chair. We are here as New York celebrates our 400th anniversary to take a fresh look at the city's governing charter.

Our goal is to ensure that New York
City remains a cradle of opportunity as it was for my
parents when they immigrated from Panama to New York
City some 60 years ago and to explore how we can
make -- how we can revise the charter to make it a
more effective tool for building the inclusive and
affordable city that New Yorkers deserve.

We have the responsibility to review the entire charter and suggest changes for the voter's consideration. Only if the voters agree to those changes at an election would 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 the broadest spectrum of New Yorkers and to pursuing the best ideas we can find.

This is just one of many public hearings across every borough to hear ideas from experts, from community leaders, from elected

	Troming .
	Page 6
1	officials, and indeed, from any member of the public
2	who wishes to testify. And very importantly, this is
3	an independent commission. So in making our
4	recommendations to the city voters, we are bound only
5	by our judgment and our values. We will pursue ideas
6	regardless of who propose them and regardless of who
7	supports them.
8	Joining me in this task are 12 other
9	commissioners, some of whom are attending virtually,
10	our vice chair, Sharon Greenberger; our secretary,
11	Leila Bozorg; Grace Bonilla; Shams DaBaron; Anita
12	Laremont; Dr. Lisette Nieves; Anthony Richardson;
13	Julie Samuels; Senator Diane Savino; Carl Weisbrod;
14	Valerie White; and Kathryn Wylde.
15	Although, as I said, we will be
16	considering the entire charter, the commission is
17	looking in particular at the charter's approach to
18	housing and planning. From my perspective, there is
19	no more urgent challenge for this body and everyone
20	here understands and knows the city is in the midst of
21	a profound affordability crisis.
22	For millions of low-income New Yorkers,
23	housing costs are the essential struggle of their
24	lives. For millions more, especially low-income New

Yorkers, our housing crisis limits where New Yorkers

	Page 7
1	can live and, therefore, limits what schools they can
2	attend, where they can work, the quality of the air
3	they breathe, whether their families can stay
4	together.
5	These challenges will remain will be
6	the focus of this hearing. But, of course, testimony
7	on any topic related to the charter is always welcome.
8	So before we dive in, let me say a few words about how
9	this hearing will unfold.
10	We'll begin by hearing from members of
11	the public who have signed up and then from those who
12	are attending virtually. We will keep you to a strict
13	three minutes. We ask you to try to time yourself. I
14	will also be relatively aggressive, but hopefully not
15	rude in keeping you to that three minutes.
16	We'll call two or three people at a
17	time to the panel. We'll hear from all three of you.
18	And then once we've heard from the panel, we'll open
19	it up to questions for the entire panel from the
20	commission. And I'll ask my fellow commissioners to
21	hold any testimony until the entire hold any
22	question until the entire panel has finished their
23	testimony.
24	If you are not here in person but wish
25	to testify virtually, there is a form online. You can

find it at the meeting page for this meeting at the website -- at our website, which is found at nyc.gov/charter. You click on the meetings tab, then select this hearing, select the Manhattan hearing, and we will also drop a link to the sign-up form in the chat if you're already online.

And the last thing I'll say is that we will do our best to hear from everyone, but the schedule -- this meeting is scheduled to end until 8 p.m. In the event that we do not get to your testimony this evening, just know there are many ways to submit testimony.

You can submit it on the website we just described, nyc.gov/charter. You can also find out about other commission hearings there. And you can also submit listing -- written testimony via email at any time to chartertestimony@citycharter.nyc.gov.

That's chartertestimony@citycharter.nyc.gov.

All the hearings are live streamed, and, of course, all of our hearings are public. And you can also watch any prior hearing online. They're all archived online. So before we begin, I would like to ask for a motion from my fellow commissioners to approve the minutes from both our March 4th meeting and our April 9th meeting.

	Page 9
1	Is there a second?
2	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 1: Second.
3	MR. BUERY: Any discussion on the
4	motion? All in favor?
5	MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
6	MR. BUERY: Any opposed? Any
7	abstentions? All right. The minutes are adopted.
8	And with that, we'll move on to our testimony. We're
9	going to start with minority leader I'm sorry.
10	Does the word "glasses" help? We're going to start
11	with Majority Leader Farias.
12	Please come and testify. Thank you.
13	I have distance classes and reading
14	glasses. I only have my distance glasses with me.
15	MS. FARIAS: That's okay. I know I'm
16	in the majority. We good?
17	MR. BUERY: Yes, please. Thank you so
18	much.
19	MS. FARIAS: Great. Good evening,
20	Commissioners. My name is Amanda Farias. And I
21	proudly serve as the majority leader of the New York
22	City Council, and I get to represent District 18 in
23	the Bronx. Thank you for the opportunity to testify
24	today on the critical topic of housing and land use.
25	New York City is facing a housing

crisis that demands bold, smart solutions. As we consider changes to the charter, we must protect and strengthen the tools that allow communities to meaningfully shape their futures. Chief among them is the city council's role in the ULURP process.

The charter gave the council land use authority to correct a long history of top-down decisions that disenfranchise black and brown communities, concentrated poverty, and deepened racial segregation. While we have made progress, our neighborhoods remain deeply unequal.

Many communities, particularly in the Bronx, still lack access to affordable housing, public transit, and critical infrastructure. That is why local leadership must remain central to any conversation about land use. As councilmembers, we are the closest level of government to the people.

We don't just represent our neighborhoods, we live in them. We see firsthand the challenges our constituents face, and we are the best position to balance the needs of developers, tenants, homeowners, and businesses alike. That is what makes our role in the ULURP process so valuable.

We help mediate divergent interests and forge compromises that make development possible while

ensuring that our communities are not left behind.
The results speak for themselves. Since 2022, this
council has approved land use applications that will
produce over 120,000 homes, including nearly 29,000
from private applications, more than half of which are
affordable.

That level of affordability would not have happened without council advocacy. Beyond housing, the council has secured billions with a "B" of dollars in public and private investments from major neighborhood re-zonings to community benefits like childcare centers, job training, and cultural spaces.

An excellent example of the leverage that ULURP provides to local communities was the Bronx Metro-North area neighborhood plan that passed in the city council last summer. The project is slated to bring four new train stations to the East Bronx, including the Parkchester/Van Nest station in my own community.

Alongside a brand-new train station, this project will bring housing, jobs, and other amenities. My office worked closely with council planning and land use to create multiple community engagement sessions where we had meaningful

conversations	with	0117	neighbors
CONVETSUCTORS	M T CII	Our	HETUIDOLS.

Through the community engagement in the ULURP process, we received what council would bring to the negotiating table, which enabled me to secure nearly 195 million for District 18 alone in a nearly \$500 million deal with the city, critical investments to address longstanding infrastructure issues with upgrades --

Can I have additional time?

MR. BUERY: Yeah.

MS. FARIAS: Thank you. Critical investments to address longstanding infrastructure issues with upgrades for water management and flood-prone areas, millions of dollars in renovations to our local playgrounds, upgrades to schools in the area, and in a full study of the surrounding area for safer streets, and 2,000 units of new housing that includes open plaza concepts, community spaces, and capital upgrades for the existing Parkchester condominiums.

Despite claims to the contrary, ULURP is not the bottleneck. The real delays happen in the pre-certification phase where applications can sit for years in environmental review, a process over which the council has no control over. And even after

ULURP,	many	approved	projects	wait	years	for	HPD
financi	ing.						

If we want to speed up housing, we need to focus on fixing those parts of the pipeline, not gutting council oversight. Some argue that taking the council out of ULURP would de-politicize venues, but politics does not appear when you centralize power. It becomes less accountable.

The mayor, borough presidents, and agency heads are all political actors too. Removing councilmembers from this process would reduce transparency, silence local voices, and concentrate powers in ways that risk further marginalizing working class communities. We have already seen this happen.

For example, in 2022 there were 111 recommendations in the mayor's 2022 Get Stuff Built report, which was a result in the building and land use approval streamlining task force. The council has not had an update from the mayor on those recommendations since 2023, including more than 20 improvements to the CEQR process, which is a notoriously cumbersome part of the pre-certification process.

The administration could heed its own advice and recommendations in 2022 and make several

meaningful changes to improve the building and land use approval process without significant changes to the charter. If we want to move this system, let's focus on real solutions.

We should increase community education around land use, streamline the pre-ULURP process to create a more inclusive opportunities for housing and secure residents to participate in public review. We should also recognize that the loudest voices in these processes are not always the most representative and find ways to elevate those most in need of affordable housing.

Charter reform should not -- should be about empowering communities, not disempowering them. It should reflect our shared values, equity, transparency, and meaningful engagement. The city council's role in land use is essential to advancing those goals, and I urge you to preserve it.

Lastly, I'd like to briefly speak to you about the importance of our communities and the continuity of their success in development, budgetary allocations, capital investments, and civic engagement. I know you've heard from one councilmember already on this, but extending New York City Council term limits to allow for a third term is

necessary	and	timely	change	e to	the	city	chart	er,
especially	, for	the c	urrent	legi	slat	tive	body.	

As the city faces increasingly complex challenges from housing and climate resiliency to economic recovery and public safety, it's more important than ever to ensure continuity in leadership and governance. A third term would allow councilmembers to see long-term projects and community-driven initiatives through to completion, providing much needed consistency and stability for constituency.

When I entered the council, I had far too many stalled projects in schools, senior centers, and local infrastructure, all with budget gaps that could not continue being implemented due to not being fully funded.

Moreover, a longer legislative horizon strengthens the council's ability to serve as an effective check on the mayoral administration, offering a more balanced distribution of power and avoiding the destabilizing effect of concurrent mass turnover across branches of government.

This is about good governance, accountability and ensuring that progress isn't lost to term limits that work against the city's long-term

	Page 16
1	interests. This is about the stabilization of our
2	institution.
3	I appreciate your time listening to my
4	testimony and the extended time allotted to me. Thank
5	you.
6	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much, Leader.
7	Any questions from the panel?
8	Kathryn?
9	MS. WYLDE : All right, Councilmember.
10	When citywide interests conflict with local interests
11	and this we're not really talking about a situation
12	in your district, but we're talking about a situation
13	where protectionist interests in a district conflict
L 4	with something that the city desperately needs, like
15	affordable housing. How would you suggest that we try
16	and deal with the councilmember deference issue?
17	MS. FARIAS: I think councilmember
18	deference is always an interesting concept that comes
19	up. It is something that really we are unable to
20	mandate in any way as it is amongst relationships
21	among members.
22	I do think what's what we've been
23	driving in the city right now is the, you know, fair
24	chance for housing, right, making sure that every
2 5	district is doing their own allotment of building of

Pac	re	17

developmen	t, of	affordab]	le housing,	of cooperati	lve
housing, j	ust of	housing	opportunity	throughout	the
city.					

I think if we continue to move in that direction where we're looking at who's building and at what rate and at what amounts, where we -- we can be able to redistribute and have those, you know, more important conversations in different districts with who needs to be able to take on some of the development.

I do think that a part of the dialogue always needs to have and always needs to happen around what neighborhoods can take what capacity and what type of development. I think that's a real conversation that we consistently have every single time a ULURP application comes in front of us.

We're always consistently trying to look at what does the fabric of that community look like? Can a six-story building go there, or can we push for a ten, or is it better to be a four-story?

I mean, we're consistently having that dialogue, and I think that is a huge driver in even amongst the body itself in supporting the member deference concept in that way because the dialogue amongst members is what's really driving how folks can

push further or even help communicate outward to communities.

But without the education piece going into community boards, CECs, the precinct councils, people understanding land use themselves and what it means to build and what our equal responsibility we have across the city to add to the housing stock and to answer for the housing crisis, we really -- that's really the starting point that we need to push within communities and within the council.

MR. BUERY: If I could follow up on that question. And I definitely appreciate the sentiment. But in some ways, the question is also about how you manage it in your district. But as we've said how it's managed citywide. And we've heard compelling testimony from some developers. They will not even propose projects in certain districts because they've anticipated opposition from local council leadership.

We've heard from developers of -smaller developers that the process -- not only the
pre-certification process but the ULURP process itself
is so onerous that they have no ability to -- they
have very limited ability to pursue projects because
they don't have the capital or time, particularly for

				C
smaller	projects	to	move	iorward.

And so even -- and I'm sorry if the question's repetitive. But I guess I would ask, even understanding the value of having local leadership who understand the community both drive what develop happen in the district but also use that power to deliver things like affordable housing and other their needs.

In some ways, I'm trying to understand what you would recommend to drive different action in other districts where council leaders might not be as open to those good faith negotiations that we need to have affordable housing, not just in some districts. Because in the other testimony, we've seen very starkly of that, that housing development you described is not happening citywide. It's happening in the portion of the city.

MS. FARIAS: Yeah. I mean, the first thing that comes to mind is a recent example from one of my colleagues, Councilmember Narcisse, who negotiated a deal in her community with a developer that has now turned that affordable housing project into a shelter.

So I think there are a lot of gaps within the system, like the agency policy itself,

where we can put some stoppages to make sure that the
housing that we are actually putting people through in
terms of a ULURP process is actually coming out in
implementation.

I think to couple with that and to support that, the -- looking at different ways where the city can either expand bonding capacity, to expand the amount of closings we have every year, I think we do have to be a little bit more innovative on how many closings HPD can do, for example.

Even looking at their term sheets and redeveloping them, which I know is something that we are consistently communicating with HPD on. There's a multitude of facets that we have in front of us that just quite aren't working right now, and no one is taking a deep look into on how to preliminarily say the system can be better.

I gave some solutions here, and I'll make sure to put this testimony in the record too and written, but we have agencies that aren't quite functioning at their best. And it's not for a lack of trying, and it's not for the lack of the efforts being made out of those leaders.

But there is capacity issues. There is closing issues. There is bonding issues that I think

Tioming
Page 21
the city can take time to look into more deeply other
than this one component of removing community's voice
and council's decision-making process, which is
coupled with the community's voice and the land use
decision making.
MR. BUERY: Thank you. I do want to
encourage you if you could just submit those specific
recommendations to the commission, we'd appreciate it.
MS. SAVINO: Good evening,
Councilwoman. So I think in a couple of the hearings,
we've heard people talk about the issue of member
deference. Now, we honestly know that we couldn't
legislate away member deference. We couldn't include
it in the charter or exclude it in the charter because
it's the way the legislative body works.
It's whether it's the New York City
Council, the state legislature or congress, you know,
having the respect of your colleagues and being able
to support each other on these things makes the, you
know, the world turn.
But what do we do? It's been said that
if every council district created 5,000 units of
housing, we could solve the housing crisis that New

district -- for some councilmembers, the creation of

York City faces. But we know that not every

500 units of housing is catastrophic to them, where others are doing 20,000 units.

How do we break that so that we can find a way to actually achieve the stated goals of creating the amount of affordable housing that we need and protecting, you know, the relationship that local elected officials have with the people who sent them to make those decisions for them.

So you mentioned a few things in your testimony about making some potential changes to the certification process and to the approval process.

Why not move that forward through the legislative process and not just wait for us to do something in the Charter Revision Commission and work together on that?

Because you're right, when you mentioned the Metro North train station project, that project -- that discussion started 12 years ago.

Twelve years ago. It should not take 12 years to get to the point where you finally approved it as the representative from your district.

So how do we break those log jams?

It's not just the ULURP process, which shouldn't be a one size fits all. You shouldn't need a ULURP for a five-story building and a sixty-story building, right.

We car	n probably	y agree or	n that,	but what	steps o	do you
think	could be	taken at	the leg	gislative	level	that
would	help supp	port whate	ever ef	forts we':	re doing	g here?

MS. FARIAS: Well, I'd love to keep the conversation going on the legislative items, and I'm happy to take these specific recommendations to the legislative division to see what the council can draft up. And I'm happy to prime on those bills and work with you folks on it.

The initial thought that came to mind on finding the spaces or the communities that can take on whether it's 5,500 or 5,000 -- you know, we also have a bunch of housing stock that isn't necessarily housing stock, right. We have transitional housing. We have the stabilization housing. We have folks that are in shelters.

I think some of that burden and the conversation that comes with whether or not ULURPs come up and where we place different housing spaces, also looks at -- also deals with looking at which communities are taking the burden of some of these larger shelters or transitional housing hubs that are not getting housing opportunities for their local members too.

So I think, I mean, there's a whole

Page	2	4
------	---	---

host of things we could be working at as a city on how to stabilize New Yorkers and offer real housing opportunities for them. I think looking at DHS and the contracts we have and maybe even the properties that the city owns, our own assets, and what can be, you know, transitioned or changed into housing.

I know we're -- approved that and going through all of that notion as well. There's a lot of areas to that are not getting housing opportunities despite other areas that could even build a small shelter where those areas are not getting anything. And so I think we really need to talk about balancing of the scales and looking at what communities can take on what responsibility for all of New York, not just who can build the housing. It's all of it together.

MS. BOZORG: Thank you, Majority

Leader. And first, I just want to say you have

personally been an amazing housing leader for the

city. The speaker's been an amazing housing leader

for the city, but it takes amazing housing leaders and

the council to get housing built because of our

current system.

MS. SAVINO: Thank you.

And I think one of the questions I have, acknowledging too, that I think it's been

something like 16 years since we've gotten a project through ULURP without the local member support. You have been great at leveraging your, you know, leveraging the ULURP process to get more resources, to make sure the project meets your community's needs.

But there have been a lot of other members who have just used that leverage to ensure no projects are happening. And so I think the question I have -- because we're not looking at this as a binary of should there be a ULURP or not.

The question is are there adjustments we can make to, kind of, correct for the fact that it does end up being a binary? Some people use ULURP to make projects better and fight for their community, and some use that power to truly block it. And so we have uneven development across the city.

So I think my question is, would you support changes that at least try to correct for that imbalance, knowing that you still want to preserve, kind of, community input and a member's ability to change the project in the ways that are best for the project and for the community but have some mechanism to, kind of, correct for the citywide imbalance we have?

Because even the Fair Share framework,

which I think the Fair Housing Framework is amazing, but there's no teeth to it. We know that. We can analyze and say what would be fair for different districts to produce, but we have no mechanism for enforcing that. It just becomes a nice report and a, kind of, thought process.

So curious to hear your thoughts on how to, kind of, correct for that imbalance when the question isn't should we have ULURP or not. It's really, how do you balance community input with these, kind of, citywide reality of what we've been dealing with with member deference?

MS. FARIAS: Yeah. I appreciate this question. I think the operational side of it -- I mean Diane Savino brought up a great point. Twelve years for Metro North to happen, and it ended up in my lap.

And that entire process, the state's involvement for the first five, six, seven years were more so telling people that it was coming but not actually going into the community and talking about what's coming and how could they benefit, let alone the housing components that was -- that were attached to this application.

None of that dialogue happened until I

really asked DCP and this council's land use division to help reengage the community in a real way. And like, I'm, you know, super grateful for all the folks that worked with me on that.

I mean, we had development teams that had their architects actually build models and show people Plan A, Plan B, Plan C of what the development could look like to help realize for people and contextualize, like, the difference between 15 stories, 18 stories, 23 stories.

And that supported my efforts in encouraging the community and really empowering them to own this project as their own again and to feel good about building buildings that were for the community, that were going to create units for their families and their extended families, or their kids and moms not to still be in their place with them.

So I really think looking at DCP's process or the outreach part of this, creating more community engagement where it's in person getting ideas. I mean, we had activities from people that were basically like forcing them to look at tradeoffs.

If you want a community center or you want a school, what does that mean in development of

this housing? And does that mean we have to go taller or wider? Does that mean we get less three bedrooms and more one bedrooms?

Things like that that helped people in the moment become more educated on the process and what opportunities were in front of them or what options they had but also allowing them to help be decision makers. And I think that was the most empowering part of the process for people, that we re-engaged them in the decision-making process.

And for me, I think when looking at -and I fully understand -- looking at every single
project and having a fully engaged process can feel
cumbersome and feel like our agencies don't have
capacity to do that. But it was the reason why I had
not a single protest, and I had only cheers when we
passed Metro North in my district.

Why I still have people excited for it to come, and I have people excited for taller buildings that come with the school and come with the community center and come with open space and come with a commercial space at the bottom. That all happens because they were part of a super engaged process that actually contextualized the project for them.

Page	2	9
------	---	---

So I think if we can look at the steps
it takes to come to a project in the community before
even it goes to a community board vote, I think even
beginning at how do we engage the land use committees
and our community boards or how do we engage the
community board in that process, more times than not,
I feel like it does a piece of paper goes in front
of people or an a PDF gets, you know, swapped
through on a meeting that is really supposed to be an
hour but ends up being three hours because of it.
You're not as engaged in that process.
Looking at the outreach and education component prior
to that pre-certification phase I think is really,
really important in having communities buy in or at
least feel looped into the process of what's going to
come in their community.
MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Really
appreciate your testimony.
MS. FARIAS: Thank you so much,
everybody.
MR. BUERY: Thank you. We're going to
go I think we're going to go slightly out of order.
We're going to go to Zoom where we have Councilmember
Selvena Brooks-Powers.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: I don't think

	Page 30
1	she's here. Oh, she's on the she's on mute.
2	MS. BROOKS-POWERS: Hi. Can you hear
3	me?
4	MR. BUERY: Yes, we can. Thank you so
5	much.
6	MS. BROOKS-POWERS: Hi. Good evening.
7	I am New York City Council Majority Whip Selvena
8	Brooks-Powers, proudly representing the 31st Council
9	District in Southeast Queens. I thank you for the
10	opportunity to testify today.
11	Let me be clear, removing or limiting
12	the city council's role in the land use process with
13	disenfranchised countless voices, particularly for
14	working class communities of color that have too often
15	been left out of decisions that shape our
16	neighborhoods.
17	Councilmembers are the closest
18	connection many New Yorkers have to city government as
19	my colleague had shared earlier. And we listen to our
20	communities, not only when a development application
21	comes up but every day in between. We are intimately
22	familiar with every block of our district.
23	More importantly, we know the people
24	that make up these blocks and these communities. That
25	provimity allows us to broker real solutions that

reflect both	citywide needs and neighborhood
priorities.	A perfect example of that is the Ocean
Crest re-zoni	ing and Far Rockaway.

This proposal had stiff opposition at first from neighbors due to the density proposed.

Working with my colleagues and community partners, we transformed what could have been a typical rental development into the first 100 percent affordable home ownership project in the Rockaways in more than a decade.

Eighty-nine families, many of them longtime residents, will now have an opportunity to own a home in a city that has made home ownership increasingly inaccessible, especially for black New Yorkers. That's equity in action. That's generational wealth. And that kind of result simply would not have happened without local leadership guiding the ULURP process.

Beyond this project, I've approved four other housing projects in my district for a total of over 2,300 units, 2,000 of which are affordable. For all of these projects, I was able to broker compromises that alleviated community concerns while also improving the proposals.

It's been said that the ULURP process

delays housing production, but the delays don't happen during the council's review. We have a short 50-day window to act. They happen long before certification and long after approval during environmental review and when projects sit in line for HPD financing.

Let's address those bottlenecks rather than dismantling one of the few avenues where communities still have a seat at the table. The council's involvement has made projects better, whether that's securing home ownership opportunities, supporting local hiring, or protecting open space.

Our roles should be strengthened, not sidelined. I do not agree with those that view the ULURP process and the negotiations as obstacles. The ULURP process is a cornerstone of our democracy, allowing everyday residents to have a role in shaping their community.

I urge the commission to focus on reforms that expand inclusion, builds trust in the process, and accelerate housing in ways that don't sacrifice community input or equity. Once again, thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much,
Councilmember. Are there any questions for the
councilmember?

MR. DABARON: I got a question. So
wanted to know, in your testimony, whether you
submitted, like are you do you have ways,
especially from this council's standpoint, of being
able to, sort of like, find suggestions to how to
speed up that process?

It definitely -- it's not a situation where the council is, sort of like, creating the delays. But are there ways to speed up that process? Just because I think the objective is really to find ways to get more housing done quicker in the city and in communities throughout the city and not necessarily to eliminate community input, council input, et cetera.

MS. BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you for the question. Like I said before, many of my colleagues, including myself, feel that our 50-day review period is not nearly enough to have some of the comprehensive conversations that a ULURP process really requires when you're talking about transforming parts of your community.

But in order to speed up the process when you're looking at it holistically, a part of it also is how do we move these projects through the HPD pipeline sooner? There are projects that I have

P	a	a	e	3	4

approved in my first term. I'm now entering
preparing to enter my fourth term, four years later.
And those projects have still not been put on the list
to go to closing.

And so we need to understand what that bottleneck is to be able to move these projects along because developers come to us, they have an idea of where their financing is coming from and what they need. What this also does is it increases the cost of the development as well because, as we know, every day the price of construction goes up.

And so sometimes it makes it that much less unattainable to see it through because of now you have a gap that has been presented and then the developer has to go and find other funding sources as a result.

MR. DABARON: Yeah. Well, look you -so I -- sometimes I think that perhaps there may be
capacity issues at HPD and -- but I think probably -and I want to know from you -- do you think that it's
also a question of the budget that they're working
with and perhaps we need to put significant funding
behind HPD --

MS. BROOKS-POWERS: And again, thank you for that. We have had this conversation with HPD

trying to drill down to understand what the
bottlenecks are that exists. I know that it's a mixed
bag. It there's an element of needing to staff up
the agency because, again, when I first got elected,
it was, you know, in the midst of the pandemic.

So there was staffing challenges there, but then also having to prioritize all of the housing across the city. Everyone can't go at the same time. And so to your point, the funding is always going to be important, and this council has prioritized that, whether it be in the budget or different negotiations to try and support the work of HPD as well.

But we can definitely work with the land use team to provide some additional recommendations if the commission is open to receiving that. But to your point, this is an area that really needs some focus and attention, which could help to move along a lot of these housing projects much sooner.

Because right now I can count at least four projects off the top of my head in my district that have been approved for several years since I've been a councilmember that have not been sent to closing yet.

MS. BOZORG: Hi, Councilmember. Thanks

for your testimony. I think I want to ask a similar question that I just asked the majority leader.

Because I think part of the challenge -- you're highlighting how you have used the ULURP process to negotiate for your community and you've gotten to "yes" and used that power to make sure that projects are meeting the needs of your local community.

And the HPD -- you know, the affordable housing side of the world where it's absolutely the case that we have a resource need to get through a lot of the backlog of projects. But I think part of what we've been focused on and hearing a lot about is that -- is not the challenge of -- with members who are willing to get to "yes," but members who have used the, kind of, practice of member deference to not even let projects get started in the first place.

And so what's happened is this unfair situation where most of the development has been happening in low-income communities. Communities of color, and typically whiter, wealthier communities have been able to just block projects from starting off the ground from the start.

So I'm curious to hear your thoughts about just the fairness of that reality and if you'd be in favor of some kind of mechanism that still gives

you power and input to shape projects and get to "yes'
in a way that works for you and your community, but
really solves for this other problem that there are
other colleagues that have been able to use the
process to ensure nothing is happening, and not just
HPD projects, but no development whatsoever, even of
modest size.

MS. BROOKS-POWERS: So I can appreciate that question. And what I will say is I don't look at it necessarily as members trying to not get to a "yes." I think many members have often come in with good intentions, but they're not engaged early enough for sometimes the size of the projects.

But I also think that this council takes seriously the need to create housing. And when we see that there is a greater citywide need or impact, the council takes that very seriously. But I do believe wholeheartedly that as a councilmember, we have a unique lens on our community and what our needs are and what some of the challenges are.

So there may be a type of development that's being proposed in our district that may work in one part of New York City and not necessarily in another. Give my district, for example, where we have crumbling infrastructure, where we are largely a

coastal community, and already have great density	coastal	community,	and	already	have	great	density
---	---------	------------	-----	---------	------	-------	---------

So when myself or members that have districts that are very similar, it may come off like we are NIMBY or that we don't want to see development when that's not the case. It's about being nuanced, understanding that we have vulnerable communities. Certain districts lack the basic infrastructure and members may need to address those challenges before they can accommodate additional density.

So I think while we look to address the housing crisis, we can't do it in a vacuum in the sense that we're not taking into account other elements in that community on the ground because what then happens, will be that we'll then make a community even more vulnerable.

So like, as you see, NASA put out a report about a year or so ago talking about New York City sinking. When you look at some of those community districts that are included, a lot of it is in my district, right. So when I approach ULURP, I have to take that into account and not solely just building housing.

And so in the council, again, I think we have that unique lens that the agencies may not have. They have the lens of the housing crisis

	Page 39
1	globally and a goal of creating X amount of housing.
2	We have a responsibility to our community to make sure
3	that we do create housing because every district has a
4	housing crisis and is impacted by that. But we also
5	have to be nuanced in how we approach it.
6	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much,
7	Councilmember. Thank you so much for your testimony.
8	I appreciate it.
9	MS. BROOKS-POWERS: Thank you.
10	MR. BUERY: I'm going to call
11	Councilmember Alexa Aviles.
12	MS. AVILES: Hello. Okay. Hello,
13	everyone. How are we doing?
14	MR. BUERY: Great, Councilmember.
15	MS. AVILES: Great. Thank you so much.
16	So I've lived in Sunset Park for over 20 years. I'm a
17	Brooklynite, actually raised in East New York,
18	Brooklyn. So I have seen many, many changes.
19	MR. BUERY: Give me if I could
20	say one second.
21	MS. AVILES: Yes.
22	MR. BUERY: Shout out to East New York.
23	MS. AVILES: That's especially for you.
24	I have seen many, many changes in our incredible
25	borough of Brooklyn, and among them is has been

certainly over the recent history of commiserating
with so many fellow neighbors about how our
neighborhoods were growing on a more and more
unaffordable, watching families being dispersed,
having to move out of state, losing the cohesion of
knowing everyone on the block, which really meant a
lot for communities.

That's how we survived very difficult conditions. And yet here we are. We're still with new, raising costs, and we continue to watch neighborhoods like Sunset Park and Red Hook and working class black and brown neighbors get pushed aside again and again through our city's political process.

Of course, anger is rising when we see the interests of wealthy, well-resourced communities being protected while other communities are completely being disregarded. And so, in every way, these neighborhoods are our homes, and we want to take care and nurture it.

And that's why when I was elected first as a public servant, to fight alongside my neighbors, to see our neighborhoods that were overlooked, to know intimately that the struggles we face as a home of immigrant and working-class New Yorkers. And this is

Page	41

among	one	of	the	many	reas	sons	why	city	cou	ıncil	shoul	.d
be	thei	ir a	geno	cy sho	ould	be	prote	ected	in	this	land	
use pi	roces	ss.										

And in some ways expanded, and I can get into that a little more later. Our housing issues through long-term sustainable solutions to affordability is where we really need to get. When we talk about the ULURP process and zoning changes, we're talking about changing people's homes, our lives, our histories, and we are trying to build a better future.

And so city council has a say in that process because we are able to speak to, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, the really deeply rooted concerns and idiosyncrasies of all of our neighborhoods in many -- in very intimate ways.

And frankly, when the administration, any mayoral administration, has a variety of interests, it too is a political body that is driven by politics in the same way that individuals, and certainly these tools that we have at our disposal, while very imperfect, and ways to improve them, do have an important protection mechanism among them.

And so rather than taking a sledgehammer to this instrument, I think it's important to be surgical here because there is a lot

of nuance. And I'll -- I just completely disregarded my comments.

Lastly, I'll just say the city council's participation here is an intimate and a short one. And there are certainly significant problems with the overall process, as you've heard my colleagues mention, years and years of delays for projects which are outside of our scope.

But if we are trying to solve a problem among some of those solutions would certainly be a more strategic intervention and looking very closely at all of it. And in particular, putting in guardrails to protect both from the political winds of a mayoral administration who may not be considering the nuances of a neighborhood and members who may not be interested in bringing more housing when we have a crisis in our city.

So not throwing out the baby with the bath water, but really looking at this finely with a fine-tooth comb and allowing the members to continue to represent their communities in a 50-day period. That is what we have as community representatives, which is really important.

And we should think about strengthening those tools rather than diminishing them because

C C
Page 43
removing council authority and process from this
larger process would truly be a detriment to our
communities and our interests.
And by and large, you see
councilmembers negotiating significant community
benefits that would have never been there had it not
been for their participation and their commitment to
protecting the interests of their community members.
I'll stop there.
MR. BUERY: Any questions?
MR. WEISBROD: Thank you. Thank you,
Councilmember. I was struck by what you said at the
outset, which is how and I can appreciate how you
and other communities and councilmembers feel about
your communities getting a lot of housing while, as
you said, other communities are protected.
We heard a lot of testimony from
developers saying that one of the first things they do
is look and see which councilmembers are at all
receptive to housing and which ones aren't. And those
that aren't, they just won't proceed at all. They
won't go forward.
They won't propose projects because

they'd have to invest a lot of money, and it would be,

at the end of the day, a waste of time. And in fact,

	Page 44
1	the communities that you referenced that are protected
2	have been protected for a long time by councilmember
3	after councilmember resisting housing in those, in
4	those districts.
5	How would you address that issue given
6	the existing willingness of councilmembers to defer to
7	each individual councilmember as to the desires of his
8	or her district?
9	MS. AVILES: Well, thank you for the
10	question. I would first make an amendment here. This
11	is not a process that solely depends on a
12	councilmember and a developer. There is an
13	administration. There is with DCP. There is the
14	whole process. There is the borough president. There
15	are actually many political bodies that determine,
16	kind of, the life cycle of these projects.
17	MR. WEISBROD: I don't want to
18	interrupt you, but in fact, it does depend on,
19	usually, on a developer who is prepared to put up some
20	money upfront
21	MS. AVILES: Sure.
22	MR. WEISBROD: in order to
23	potentially see a project completed at the end of the
24	day. And if that developer or any developer is
25	unprepared to do that, irrespective of what the city

can	do,	there's	really	not	going	to	be	development	in
that	t dis	strict.							

MS. AVILES: Well, I think, again, here, there are many voices that determine, kind of, whether our project comes to fruition or not. If developers are not interested in engaging in the work that it will require to responsibly develop in our city, then I think that that's their choice.

I think lacking a comprehensive plan for a city, which I think is a really fundamental problem for our city, that we do not comprehensively plan where we can make sure that we are not only building to achieve certain level of goals to make sure that our city runs appropriately and has fair distribution of whatever, you know, public mechanisms that it requires, right, to run effectively.

I think you have to -- it is not just the developer's whims here. You have -- it's carrots and sticks and guardrails and responsible development. So I don't think it's just a developer -- if we want to incentivize the appropriate development as a city, our administration should be doing that, our councilmembers should be doing that.

And we should be doing it in a way where there's appropriate guardrails and appropriate

considerations because there are different nuances.
In fact, our community had an enormous we haven't
had a ton of development, but we have had an enormous
amount of siting of shelters.

We've had a building of all these hotels in a community where there was no tourist attraction. They were being built because the city was incentivizing shelter as a good business model. And so there was no one watching for interest there, right, so but the development was moving towards the money.

So I think, you know, there's no easy answer here. And I can't solve the problem of the developers who are chasing their profit, but I can say on behalf of the public interest of this city, that we not only need to comprehensively plan, but we have to place guardrails on all facets here, right, because if you are chasing the dollar, you're certainly not chasing the public interest. Maybe those two can converge, and many times they do, and it's a good thing.

Nevertheless, what we see is development that is not quite hitting the interest and the need within our city. And this is where the council's intervention is able to help move that in

	Page 47
1	the place closer to the needs of the residents. I'm
2	not sure I fully answered your question.
3	MR. WEISBROD: It may not be a fully
4	answerable answer.
5	MS. SAVINO: It's I'm just going to
6	follow up on that. So first of all, thank you for
7	coming tonight, Councilwoman. Assuming we had a
8	comprehensive plan I'm not sure exactly how we
9	would define that because state zoning law requires us
10	to have a comprehensive plan for zoning purposes.
11	But let's assume we created a plan that
12	said we have 51 council districts in the city of
13	New York. I don't know how many neighborhoods there
14	are. I'm sure Gail Brewer knows the answer to that
15	question.
16	But this that plan that New York
17	City would create, alongside the council and city
18	planning, is to have X number of new housing units
19	across all 5 boroughs, all 51 council districts, every
20	community, to meet the need.
21	We still come up against the fact that
22	there are certain districts and certain
23	councilmembers and I know a few of them who lived
24	to live pretty close to me who have vehemently
25	opposed to any development. So how do we square that

	Page 48
1	circle? How do we solve that problem?
2	So even if we had this comprehensive
3	plan which identified, you know, how we build and
4	where we build and how many stories, we still have
5	because of the local, you know, representation and
6	I agree. Councilmember is the closest person to the
7	community. I absolutely agree with you on that.
8	Voters sent you there to make decisions, but we do run
9	up against this.
10	MS. AVILES: Sure.
11	MS. SAVINO: There are people who for
12	whom the idea of building any units of housing in
13	their district, they are vehemently opposed to.
14	MS. AVILES: Yeah. Yeah. I mean, we
15	run up against it almost in every facet. We run up
16	against it with polluting facilities, of which my
17	community has a disproportionate amount. We run up
18	against it with shelters, of which my community has a
19	disproportionate amount.
20	So this is not a unique problem to the
21	housing space. It is certainly a unique problem to a
22	very diverse city that has a lot of competing needs
23	and often protects powerful interests.
24	MS. SAVINO: Yes.
25	MS. AVILES: So I think there are many

interventions here. I don't think one intervention will solve this problem. I think we, as a city, need to -- like we have a Fair Share housing policy. There is a Fair Share shelter siting policy. No one follows it. There's no enforcement.

And what does the agency do? It says we believe in this Fair Share policy, however, here's your number 18 shelter facility while your two neighbors have zero shelter facilities. How do we solve that problem? We need an administration who's committed to proper siting.

We need to have some enforcement mechanisms there. We probably need to change the siting process to say, "No. Actually you cannot build, you know, over a certain threshold in a community." So I think there are many mechanisms here.

I think what we want to be -- while there are a few members who maybe stop the development of housing in their districts, I don't think the answer is removing the power of the councilmembers still to be able to advance projects in their communities that bring benefit. It feels too blunt of a response.

I think we're trying to tackle what is,

	Tremm's
	Page 50
1	thankfully, not a giant problem. It is a problem
2	without question, but I think we've seen more benefit.
3	We have to tackle it, I think, in a number of
4	different ways.
5	MS. SAVINO: Thank you.
6	MS. AVILES: Yeah.
7	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for your
8	testimony. Deeply appreciate it.
9	MS. AVILES: Thank you.
10	MR. BUERY: Next we hear from
11	Councilmember Gale Brewer.
12	MS. SAVINO: Oh good.
13	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
14	MS. SAVINO: I like that.
15	MR. BUERY: Thank you.
16	MS. SAVINO: Oh
17	MS. BREWER: According to the New York
18	Times, there are 350 neighborhoods in New York City.
19	And according
20	MS. SAVINO: I knew you would get me
21	the answer.
22	MS. BREWER: according to the
23	Department of City Planning, there are 339. So take
24	your choice. So I'm Gale Brewer. I'm city
25	councilmember for District 6, Upper West Side, the 50s

to the 90s, and Central Park. And I chair council Committee on Oversight and Investigation.

So I'm not going to -- just to in time,
I list the fact that Tish James, when she was on the
council and I had our -- we passed a law -- I think
Weisbrod knows about it -- that passed -- we had a
commission that was, I think, more representative than
this one or anybody else's.

And then we go through the time that de Blasio -- soon as the council had a commission, he had a commission. And now the same thing is happening.

Just to give a little history of the charter issues.

Number 2, I'm going to just list some of the concerns I have. ULURP is just really small on my list, but I can talk more if you want. I've done 250 ULURPs in my life.

In terms of land use, I just want to talk about the Franchise and Concession Review

Committee, FCRC. As you know, those outcomes are weighted in the mayor's favor. The charter also states that when an application relates to more than one borough, the borough president share a single vote.

I did pitch in the past that FCRC in 2010, along with Christine Quinn, that we should have

a different system. The reforms were not considered, and the Adams administration is poised to award the expiring contract for operation, for instance, on the Wollman Rink in Central Park, perhaps to the Trump organization or another private outfit.

The reason I mention this, this would be an example where, I think, the city council, when it's a major concession -- and I list this in my testimony -- should be the ones considering that kind of a decision. I feel very strongly about it, and that is something that I'd like to have considered as part of your deliberations.

In terms of ULURP, I agree a lot with my colleagues. I do want to say that one aspect that has been in -- the way it's been done, but not mandated, and I do think, to answer your question, Carl, how you could speed up the process.

Mandate that the Department of City
Planning brief community boards on any ULURP
application before the process begins. A lot of these
community boards are turning over with that stupid
eight-year thing that you came up with in the previous
charters, so they only have eight years. And that
means they never really learn land use.

And so therefore, they need

pre-briefing, and then they need to have much more
support in terms of the fund for the city of New York
having the wonderfully Alden Alvin Bonea [ph]
trained Urban Fellows to help them with their process.
That is how you're going to speed it up.

Some of the neighborhoods, how do you end up having ULURP that is helpful to developing housing? You have to listen and maybe not make them, you know, 30 stories tall. Quickly. I want to establish a New York City land bank. It could be done legislatively but can also be done by the charter.

I want to protect landmark buildings.

As you know, we have one now that the developer wants to turn down -- tore down. It is landmarked, and I think individually designated landmarks, if they're to be torn down, the decision should be made by the same organization that landmarked them, called the city council.

I want to say we had a discussion today about the issue of how you deal with outdoor cafes on the roadside and battery swapping cabinets. One of the ways that these get delayed is they need a revocable consent. Get rid of it, and do a permit.

Makes much more sense.

Budget independence, oversight

Page	54
------	----

agencies, you'll see my list. These agencies, some of
them have the ability to be tagged and to the
agency that they deal with. IBO is an example with
OMB. But guess what? Department of Investigation
does not have that. Board of Correction does not have
that. Special Commission for Investigation of the
School District does not have that.

Really tiny budgets compared to what they have to do. They need to be tied to an agency. Enhanced units of appropriation. Oh my goodness. You'll have -- police department has in one unit of appropriation, boroughwide offices, detective division, forensic investigation, narcotics division, and the SRG, Strategic Response Group operations. How the hell you supposed to know what's in that?

Revenue estimates. The city council and the mayor's office should somehow come to some kind of an agreement. I believe in advice and consent. We did it as a result of my commission, and it should be for all the other agencies. I know that wasn't loved by the mayor's office. I feel strongly about it. And then if a local law is passed, it should be implemented.

Mayoral control of some of the commissions should be less mayoral control. And I

	Page 55
1	talked about the DOI, and then I do believe, as the
2	Citizens Union does, that we should have election
3	cycles that are all one so that people would actually
4	not have to vote so many times during the year. Thank
5	you very much.
6	MR. BUERY: Thank you very much,
7	Councilmember.
8	MS. BREWER: You're welcome, sir.
9	MR. BUERY: Any questions?
10	MS. SAVINO: I have a question. So
11	thank first of all, thank you. You know, I knew
12	you would know the answer to any and all questions.
13	On the one of the recommendations you have about
14	the community boards and I don't necessarily
15	disagree with you.
16	Eight years is not enough time to
17	learn it's not enough time to learn land use in a
18	community board level or eight years is not enough
19	time to learn how to become a councilmember
20	MS. BREWER: Correct.
21	MS. SAVINO: but that being said,
22	community boards are oftentimes more opposed to
23	development than anybody. So how do you how do we
24	resolve that? So again, I actually know some
25	councilmembers and other elected officials who say

	Page 56
1	they would never, ever take a position in opposition
2	to what their community board recommended, even though
3	it's a non-binding vote.
4	So if we were to go through this to
5	reform this process and inform the community board,
6	and they said "No," how does that councilmember then
7	move forward?
8	MS. BREWER: Well, the councilmember
9	needs to have a little guts, first of all. But
10	MS. SAVINO: Well, guts is in short
11	supply these days, Gale.
12	MS. BREWER: No, I don't understand
13	that, and I have a lot of guts. So but the issue
14	is the lack of understanding of land use at the
15	community board level is intense. There's I'm I
16	was borough president. I had to appoint people. We
17	did trainings constantly, and it still isn't enough.
18	So I would say also, if you are in
19	an area I don't know anything besides Manhattan. I
20	know there are five boroughs, but I never go to the
21	other ones. And so I am not familiar with, you know,
22	suburban Queens or suburban Staten Island. I know
23	they're beautiful, but I don't go there.
24	MS. SAVINO: We're going to bring you
25	out there.

Page 57 1 MS. BREWER: So I know, but you pointed out in your area in Staten Island that people are 2 So the issue, for me, would be like what 3 opposed. 4 Community Board 4 did in Manhattan. 5 They went to every single lot in that 6 community, and they have actually superb land use 7 experts on the board. And they have a report -- you should read it -- and it lists every single way that 8 affordable housing could be built on every single lot 10 the way they want to do it. And they're building it. 11 So that's -- you know, you have -- if somebody doesn't want, you know, a 30-story building 12 13 in an area that has, I don't know, 10-story buildings -- I don't even know what a 10-story 14 15 building looks like in Manhattan, then go with a 16 low-rise, affordable, maybe home ownership. 17 That's what they -- instead of spending 18 years fighting this stuff, for god's sake, go with 19 something that is acceptable and compromise in that 20 area. That's what I would do. 21 MS. SAVINO: Thank you. 22 MS. BREWER: You know what? I would 23 make it happen. 24 MS. SAVINO: All right --25 MS. BREWER: How many is this for you?

	Page 58
1	MR. WEISBROD: Excuse me. I hesitate
2	to ask you a question, but I will.
3	MS. BREWER: How many commissions is
4	this for you? That's what I want know.
5	MR. WEISBROD: Only two.
6	MS. BREWER: Only two?
7	MR. WEISBROD: Only two.
8	MS. BREWER: I don't believe it.
9	MR. WEISBROD: Actually, I have a I
10	do have a question for you Councilmember. Which is,
11	you've been both a borough president and
12	MS. BREWER: Yeah.
13	MR. WEISBROD: and a councilmember.
14	And I just do you think that the balance of the
15	roles of the borough president and the councilmember
16	with respect to ULURP and the land use process is
17	about right? Or do you think it should be modified in
18	some way?
19	MS. BREWER: It's a good question. The
20	way on the controversial projects it's easy on
21	the ones that are not. But on the controversial
22	projects, the community goes to the community board
23	and then the borough president, which has a land use
24	staff, right, that helps.
25	The controversial project they make

changes. The council makes -- I mean, the borough president makes changes. The community board makes changes. So by the time it gets to the city council, hopefully, there's enough cover because when it's really controversial, it's rough to have to say "yes" to a very tall building or a very -- in a area that people don't want housing, or they don't like poor people, or whatever the hell it is.

Then as -- so I do think that the city councilmember gets some cover from the borough president, to answer your question, because there is -- the borough president doesn't have to vote. They just have to recommend. Now, you could all -- the borough president -- when you're there, you feel kind of powerless, like why the hell does a city council get to vote on this?

But if it's controversial, you might be pleased. It's a political process. But I do think the relationship -- if the borough president has a good land use staff -- and the city council has one too, but it's not just focused on that councilmember. So the borough president, you lean heavily on what they have to say, and they lean on the community board.

Along the way, to be honest with you,

	Page 60
1	no matter how good staff is, there's not a lot of it.
2	And it's, you know, probably could all use some more
3	intelligent thinking about what really is needed.
4	That's you know, we're really lacking in thoughtful
5	consideration of what really could be built.
6	I'm struggling right now. I'm trying
7	to figure out A, B, C, Extell, Gary Barnett. You
8	know, that's a big challenging situation, and we're
9	trying on every level to think outside the box. It's
10	hard. There aren't a lot of people who really know
11	land use in the city of New York, to be honest with
12	you.
13	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Well, thank you
14	so much. Appreciate it.
15	MS. BREWER: Thank you very much.
16	MS. SAVINO: Thank you, Gale.
17	MR. BUERY: Thank you.
18	MS. BREWER: Now you know how many
19	neighborhoods there are in New York.
20	MR. BUERY: Somewhere between 339 and
21	350. Next, we'll have a panel. I'm going to invite
22	up Jessica Katz and Howard Slatkin. I'll ask the
23	commissioners to hold their questions until both have
24	testified.
25	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: All right.

	Page 61
1	MR. BUERY: Jessica, would you like to
2	begin?
3	MS. KATZ: Sure. Thank you. Hi. And
4	thank you for inviting me to testify here today. My
5	name's Jessica Katz. I'm a lifelong houser and a
6	former government official. Thank you for your
7	service to this commission.
8	After more than 20 years in the housing
9	industry, both inside and outside government, I
10	strongly believe it's time to change the rules of the
11	road for how housing gets built. You might not hear
12	this a lot during this process, but I'm actually a
13	huge fan of ULURP.
14	For more than a decade, it was my job,
15	my honor and privilege really, to go before community
16	boards and make the pitch for supportive housing
17	projects for chronically homeless New Yorkers. I've
18	stood in school auditoriums and senior center
19	cafeterias in every borough, a couple times pregnant
20	and in heels, answering questions and hearing
21	community concerns, sorting out fact from fiction.
22	I've been called every name in the book.
23	I've been shouted at in every
24	neighborhood in this city. And I truly appreciated
25	those moments where things got heated in those

meetings because it gave me the opportunity to set the record straight about the challenges faced by

New Yorkers experiencing homelessness, to build some empathy and understanding in the hopes that when the building opened, the community would welcome their new neighbors.

For every project that had a small but vocal army of opponents, it was my job to help build a base of support. And I knew that if the opponents would just meet some supportive housing tenants, they would see that their fears were unfounded.

But I always had my misgivings about this strategy. It was effective, but it was a lot to ask of formerly homeless New Yorkers who had just achieved a measure of stability. I'd be asking them to appear publicly before an angry crowd to tell their traumatic stories and how they overcame the worst times in their lives in an effort to win a little grace for the next homeless New Yorker who desperately needed a place to live.

In those moments, it felt like the rules of the game were rigged in favor of stably-housed New Yorkers. "Housing is a human right" is a really lovely phrase, but how do you make it more than a bumper sticker?

First of all, you need to build some housing for housing to be a human right. And also, legally, a human right is something that's even more important than democracy. We elevate certain rights, and we put them on a higher plane because those rights are so fundamental that they're not subject to the whims of public opinion.

So "Housing is a human right" means we shouldn't be asking for a show of hands to determine whether our homeless neighbors live stable lives or die in the street.

Another change that has had a huge impact on housing development has been term limits. When the current ULURP process was designed, we were typically working with local elected officials who'd been office a long time and who would continue to hold their seats long after the controversy about any particular project had died down.

So the players in the project would be around to see a project go from idea to implementation, from an angry community board meeting to a round of applause at a ribbon cutting. Today, term limits means that councilmembers who are skeptical of new housing have little reason to take into account their future constituents who may need

housing,	and	even	the	most p	ro-l	hous	ing	council	Lmembe	ers
will like	ely r	not b	e in	office	to	see	a	project	come	to
fruition										

This combination of short term limits and long development timelines is a structural problem that inhibits new housing that was not the case when our current land use rules were first created. So I'm so grateful to this commission for finding new ways to build more housing.

This is necessary because the affordability crisis is worse than ever before because it's not fair to ask our homeless neighbors to fight for their lives in a ULURP process that is stacked against them and because term limits has fundamentally changed the rules of the road. Thank you.

MR. SLATKIN: Good evening, Chair Buery and commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Howard Slatkin, Executive Director of Citizens Housing and Planning Council.

And I would like to use the opportunity this evening to build on testimony that I presented to the -- this commission back in February and highlight some of the specifics of the proposals we published in our report, Key Charter Reforms for Housing and Land Use.

I'll also describe one additional proposal not included in that report that I think is responsive to the issues that the commission is considering here. In highlighting these elements of this proposal -- of these proposals, I want to emphasize, you know, as part of tonight's discussion, that I don't think the question is whether the city council should have a role in the process of land use review, but what the effect of, and how to incorporate the city council's review within the land use process.

The proposal that we've outlined in this report wouldn't remove the council from ULURP but would lean into the council's role as a citywide body that also, like other participants, the process is responsible for integrating local and citywide concerns and not acting in a strictly local capacity.

The -- a key element of these proposals would be to create a check, a procedural check, on member deference that would, in event -- in the event that it would compromise the broader public interest, by allowing -- by super majority vote at the city planning commission and override or modification of the council vote on a land use action.

In addition, the proposals include giving the council speaker the 13th appointment to the

City Planning Commission in order to provide opportunities for coordinated and cooperative review, rather than the sequential and rival risk review that occurs through the process in most circumstances today.

And finally, to make council's review of land use actions optional rather than mandatory, which could, in the event that there is a -- an outcome that could be achieved at the commission with that composition of the commission would take nearly two months off of the process. I'll also highlight one additional item -- proposal, which would be in order to address the issue of the challenges facing affordable housing development.

In particularly, in geographies where there has been an insufficient supply of affordable housing, providing the Board of Standards and Appeals with the ability to provide project-specific zoning relief for affordable housing developments in areas where there has been an insufficient supply of housing, the BSA would have the authority to waive zoning provisions based on findings of programmatic necessity and neighborhood character.

And the emphasis here is that this is project specific relief for a proposal. It's not a

	Page 67
1	zoning change. The underlining zoning would not
2	change through that process. I can answer any
3	questions about those proposals.
4	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
5	Appreciate it.
6	Any questions for this panel?
7	MR. WEISBROD: Just a second. The
8	proposal to allow the BSA to for certain kinds of
9	projects, to in effect modify the zoning for that
10	project, how would would that be after the ULURP
11	process? Would that be instead of the ULURP process?
12	How would that work?
13	MR. SLATKIN: Right. The idea is it
L 4	would be instead of the ULURP process and strictly for
15	a category of affordable housing projects, essentially
16	projects that are going to be subject to a regulatory
17	agreement owned by an HDFC and can be targeted toward
18	geographies where there has been an insufficient
19	number of affordable housing units provided in order
20	to counterbalance that.
21	MR. WEISBROD: Thank you.
22	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 4: That's the
23	trigger then that would allow that
24	MR. SLATKIN: Sure. The threshold
25	and this is building on things like the Fair Housing

Page 68
Framework that the city council has laid out. The
idea is that there are clearly geographies that fall
below a threshold. But you can that threshold can
be set.
But there are clearly geographies that
fall below that threshold, in which there has been
insufficient production of affordable housing, and
this, sort of, streamlined process would be available
in those places.
MS. SAVINO: a question. Thank you.
I have a question for Jessica. First of all, it's
good to see you. And so here in the testimony, we
heard from the majority leader, Amanda Farias, Alexa
Aviles, and Gale Brewer about some of the challenges
of the long process.
So it's based on your experience in
the past, like what could we do to improve the process
before we ever get to the ULURP because, as the
councilmembers said, they only got 50 days to approve
a project. But some of these projects go on for
years.
T man T abill maglack an Cons

I mean, I still reflect on Coney
Island. We re-zoned Coney Island in 2009, and some of
those buildings are -- they're just getting to the
ribbon cutting now. That is -- 16 years -- I lost

track	16	years	later.
-------	----	-------	--------

So what can we do in the pre-certification process, the HPD process? How do we, you know, expand the ability to finance some of them or to come to closing sooner? How do we do that? And you must have some thoughts based on your longterm experience working in this field.

MS. KATZ: Yeah. I mean, certainly, there are, certainly, resources, staffing and procedural improvements, like the "Get Stuff Done" report, are all very important to achieve in order to push forward the pipeline that already exists.

The pre-certification period, I think, is really just a reflection of the way that member deference works in the actual ULURP process that makes ULURP, in a way, sort of, perfunctory where you do -- you know, you can negotiate with someone for years or even decades, and you would never enter into a formal ULURP without having some confidence of the actual outcome.

So I think those two things are related. So if you felt like you had a better -- if you had a broader constituency to appeal to, then you wouldn't have this very long tail before the ULURP process started.

Pa	a	e	7	0

MS. SAVINO: I don't think enough has been said also about the requirements that the state places on local governments with respect to development -- today is -- I think today is the one year anniversary of Albany last year finally giving New York City the tools it needs to, you know, get the old 421-a projects in the pipeline and create a new -- a replacement 485-x.

I don't know when, you know, or how long it's going to take for anybody to actually utilize any of those new tools, but the reality is the state does require the city, not just New York City, but all localities to adhere to a certain set of principles, particularly around environmental review. And some of those things take an extraordinary amount of time.

Now, certainly we don't want to build housing on brownfields, and we want to make sure that we're building appropriately and safe housing. But is there some way for us, independent of what we do with the Charter Revision Commission, to change that dynamic so that the state takes its foot off the neck of, say, local government?

MS. KATZ: Sure. And I think the SEQR process in particular is designed to measure the

	Page 71
1	impact of doing a thing and assumes that the impact of
2	doing nothing is nothing. And with housing, that's
3	just not the case.
4	The impact of building no housing is
5	very significant, but we don't measure that if we're
6	not doing it in the first place. So that's something
7	that the SEQR process doesn't well it doesn't
8	embody that well.
9	MR. BUERY: Thank you.
10	MS. SAVINO: Thank you.
11	MR. BUERY: any other question?
12	MR. DABARON: Oh, I had Howard.
13	But Jessica, I think you might've said
14	something, but I was going to ask, is there something
15	that the charter can do to help address the housing
16	crisis? And I think you were speaking to that just
17	now.
18	MS. KATZ: Yeah. I mean, I think
19	homelessness in particular, that's the, kind of,
20	narrow lens that I've taken here. It's just not a
21	hyper-local issue. And we have many, many ways in the
22	existing land use process to address those hyper-local
23	issues and not a lot of other ways to address a
24	citywide immediate crisis.
25	So, you know, when Hurricane Sandy hit,

we shelter	ed tens	s of th	ousa	nds of p	peopl	e who	are	
homeless.	Like,	it was	our	number	one	priori	ty,	and
it was our	job.							

Meanwhile, we've been living with tens of thousands of homeless people and not truly treated it like it was much of an emergency prior to that. If you are strictly looking at a human rights perspective, you would never do a show of hands and a public opinion poll about whether or not we should have a roof over people's heads.

Failing that kind of radical change, there's plenty of ways that have been suggested by some of the experts on these panels and by this body in terms of looking at a broader citywide approach that is not necessarily treating every single project individually and, kind of, treating the housing crisis with the urgency that it's going to require.

MR. DABARON: For Howard -Thank you. Thank you.

And for Howard, so when I'm listening to your statement -- and I heard you mention this in a previous testimony. You were talking -- it sounded like towards the issue of member deference, and you was associating it with where there is a need and with the planning and I just -- Fair Share.

	Page 73
1	So I wanted to, like, kind of like,
2	find out from you if what you were speaking to
3	because it sounds to me a little like eminent domain.
4	Is it that, or is it something else?
5	MR. SLATKIN: The I'm sorry. The
6	which part of it? The sounds like not the
7	MR. DABARON: You were saying that the
8	super majority yeah.
9	MR. SLATKIN: Yes. Okay. Yeah. And
10	I it has I think I hope it doesn't, and it's
11	not intended to. So let me see if I can clarify that.
12	It is just a matter of providing a procedural
13	rebalancing of the way that decisions are arrived at
L 4	through the process that we already have for ULURP.
15	The same types of land use decisions
16	would be made through that process. But in the
17	event one of the things that we highlighted in
18	the our report, the elephant in the room, is that
19	land use and zoning is the only arena in which the
20	city council effectively votes on things that are
21	strictly local in nature.
22	Everything else local laws are
23	general in nature. They affect the city. The
24	policies may affect different parts of the city in

different ways, and of course, there's a lot of

texture	to	th	at.	But	there's	no	such	thing	as	member
deferenc	e i	ln	the	other	arenas	of	the	council	L's	
authorit	у.									

The issue here is to try to create a process by which the other actors in the ULURP process, the other officials, officials at the boroughwide or the citywide level, have an opportunity to articulate, "Actually, there's a broader interest at stake here, and this decision needs to be considered in that light."

It's a -- as other speakers have said tonight, there's not a way to say, "You're -- thou shalt not have member deference." It's inherent in the nature of a deliberative body where, you know, members elected from a district allow each member to look after the issues that are specific to their district.

The idea is to introduce an -- a level on which that then gets reintroduced to the citywide or boroughwide level. The original ULURP process in 1975 -- you know, the idea was give voice to community concerns as the first step of the process.

Begin the process with hearing what the local community has to say. Then you gradually proceed to higher levels of geography. And at the

Page 1	/	5
--------	---	---

citywide level, then it was	the aptly derided Board of			
Estimate. But the idea was	that the decision happened			
at some broader level where	all those perspectives			
could be integrated.				

The effective member deference in the 1989 charter revisions was to short circuit that and, basically, take the city council, which is a citywide body, and turn it into, effectively, a local body on local actions, which returns you to the first part of the process. And that was, I would say, a bug and not a feature.

It does not mean that the council and that local perspectives are not important to bring into the process of the council. It just means that the last vote in the process shouldn't be local in nature.

MR. BUERY: One last question?

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes. Thank you both for your testimony, first of all.

I have a question for Ms. Katz. Given your specific experience, I want to get your thoughts about something, and I want to connect, kind of, two points that have been made. So I think you've heard the suggestion that there could be tweaks to ULURP or carve-outs for certain things.

And you, you know, talked about this idea of elevating certain rights, and some of that speaks to the idea that there could be a consensus, that there could be certain things such as all affordable proposals that have a level of significance or are critical enough that we could all agree that they could be in this carve-out.

At the same time, we've heard testimony that says that, well, there are bottlenecks in the system that have to do with the scarcity of funding or bonding capacity and the like. So I want to hear from you, do the idea of carve-outs, in light of the other constraints, exacerbate the problem? Or could you -- what do you think about that?

MS. KATZ: I mean, I think we have to work on both tracks. I think, in housing, we're not going to find that one single solution that's going to solve the problem.

I do think, in terms of some of the negotiations that go around on ULURP, I think the way that that functions right now actually exacerbates some of the equity concerns across the city, right, like a well-heeled neighborhood does not need to beg for parks funding or education funding or a daycare center in exchange for blocking a ULURP.

P	age	• 7	7

They just block the ULURP, whereas it's
those neighborhoods that do need to, kind of, beg for
those resources because they lack them that engage in
that kind of negotiation. Whereas, the ones that
already have the resources just say "No" in the first
place.

So I do think that the equity issues are exacerbated by the fact that we have this member deference and so much inequality across the city, and I think that a more citywide or a boroughwide approach would actually improve some of those equity issues.

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

MR. WEISBROD: Excuse me. I'm sorry.

I do have -- we heard from Councilmember Aviles and, I think, others about Fair Share. And the -- I think what we would all recognize is that Fair Share, as envisioned by the 1989 charter, has not lived up to its expectations, to put it mildly.

Do either of you have suggestions on how Fair Share can be improved and to what extent it can be applicable, not only to the kinds of uses that neighborhoods don't want to see, but the kinds of uses that we would want to see, including more housing?

And I'm not necessarily asking for you to respond now,

	Page 78
1	but if you can think about it then and and let us
2	know.
3	MR. SLATKIN: Yeah. I would I will
4	do that, but I would just add that as some of the
5	other speakers have alluded to, there's not a simple
6	objective way to construe what Fair Share means. You
7	know, what is the ability of a neighborhood to support
8	one thing or the other?
9	And with certain types of facilities, I
10	don't think that it's even easy to say whether a
11	facility is desirable or not in an objective sense. I
12	think that there's a lot of texture to that. So I
13	think for that reason, I think it's important. And I
14	will consider the question in more detail as well.
15	But I think it's important to look at
16	the goal decision-making process and the procedures
17	for decision making in which all of those issues are
18	going to be considered and balanced, rather than to
19	look for formulas that are going to substitute for the
20	judgment of the people acting in that process.
21	MS. KATZ: Yeah. I would add that Fair
22	Share, as it's currently written, is primarily a
23	reporting process and a disclosure process, rather
24	than a, kind of, decision making "yes" or "no" tool.
25	I think it should probably remain that

- 49 - 7 - 3	P	a	те	7	9
---------------------	---	---	----	---	---

way, particularly if when viewed through the lens of, say, a supportive housing or a social services kind of service where you're dealing primarily with people who are disabled, who have a mental health issue, who have a substance abuse issue.

And these are all protected classes, and you really can't -- or we shouldn't and we can't create a system that says, "No, there are too many of those kind of people here," the same way we would not do that for other kind of protected classes.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.

Appreciate it. Our next panel will be Britny McKenzie and Keri Butler. While you are coming, I'll just notify the next panel already. They'll be followed by Sara Penenberg and Annie Levers. Whoever would like to start first.

MS. MCKENZIE: Sure. I'll go ahead.

Thank you, commissioners, for the opportunity to submit our testimony and contribute to this important discussion. The Fair Housing Justice Center, FHJC, is a nonprofit civil rights organization committed to eliminating housing discrimination, promoting inclusive and accessible communities, strengthening the enforcement of fair housing laws throughout New York City and its seven surrounding counties.

For over two decades, FHJC has played a leading role in advancing housing equity and access across our region. We have assisted thousands of individuals and organizations in challenging discriminatory practices, filing complaints, and asserting their legal rights under local, state and federal fair housing laws.

Our organization operates a full service fair housing program including proactive investigations, systemic testing, litigation support, policy advocacy, education and technical assistance. Through our investigative work, FHJC has uncovered widespread discriminatory practices among both housing providers and public agencies.

Our legal actions, more than 160 in total, have resulted in increased compliance, open access to over 80,000 units, and secured 55 million in damages and penalties. Yet despite these victories, discrimination remains a persistent force shaping housing opportunity in and access in New York City.

We submit this testimony today to urge the Charter Commission to take bold necessary steps to embed a stronger fair housing mandate within the city's planning governance and planning and accountability structures. As a member of the

Thriving Communities Coalition, the FHJC supports	the
Our Neighborhood, Our Plans initiative, which call	S
for a fair and comprehensive planning approach.	

While we support the range of recommendations of the Thriving Communities Coalition, given our service area and expertise, we want to highlight and provide recommendations related to fair housing and fair housing enforcement.

Specifically, one, strengthening the
Fair Housing plan in the charter pursuant to the
Thriving Communities Coalition comprehensive plan.
The Thriving Communities Coalition comprehensive plan
is attached to my written testimony, which you'll see.

Secondly, require fair housing planning documents, including those required by the city charter to evaluate how city laws, zoning codes, infrastructure, investment, and program administration effort affects -- excuse me -- residential segregation, the relative success of fair housing enforcement efforts, and the location availability and accessibility of housing.

For example, CHR should be required to release data on discrimination complaints received and to make preliminary determinations on whether discrimination exists regardless of whether it

1 proceeds with enforcement.

Third, any update to the city charter as it relates to residential units must enforce stricter requirements and robust oversight around the design and construction. May I have more time?

MR. BUERY: Just a few --

MS. MCKENZIE: Yeah. Just one more point. I'll start from the top. Any update to the city charter as it relates to residential units must enforce stricter requirements and robust oversight around the design and construction standards to ensure that all new developments and renovations are fully accessible to people with disabilities.

My last point, expand on access to home ownership opportunities and implement reforms that ensure fairness and inclusivity in housing markets. The commission's recommendations should include advocating with the mayor and the city council to pass the co-op disclosure bill, 407, currently pending before the city council.

Just to conclude, addressing these structural issues requires more than acknowledgement. It requires sustained coordinated action and the political will to make bold and often uncomfortable changes.

P	aq	e	8	3

New York City has often been described
as "a tale of two cities," one where privilege is
preserved through restrictive zoning and planning
policies and another where communities of color and
low-income residents are left to shoulder the burden
of limited affordable housing options and government
disinvestment.
If we're serious about equity, we must
stop mistaking performative planning for progress, and
the time to review is now. The time is the time
for action is now.
MR. BUERY: Thank you.
MS. MCKENZIE: Thank you for your time.
MS. BUTLER: Hi. My name is Keri
Butler. I am the interim president of the Municipal
Arts Society, and MAS did does support the Thriving
Communities Coalition's text draft text for
comprehensive planning. We are a member of that
comprehensive planning. We are a member of that coalition.
coalition.

I think there were a lot of important

for smaller and nonprofit developers, and it can be

opaque and confusing for community members.

topics that were touched on today, including community
members having a lack of resources and knowledge about
land use process, how complicated it can be. MAS does
try to do some of that work with our Livable
Neighborhoods program, but it is complicated.

And I also have heard -- and I'm going a little off script here, sorry -- but I also have heard from many people that it is the time before ULURP that can be most risky because it's so unknown, and it has a lot of to do with personal, I guess, opinions and things, you know, in the process.

And I think there's also an importance to note that there's city plannings process when they want to re-zone and do a neighborhood plan where they have been, I think, doing a really good job of going into the community for an extended period of time.

But then you have private developers.

So there's different types of processes here. So there have been a lot of proposals shared, and I'm just going to go through some of the things that MAS supports as quickly as I can. We support increasing efficiency and improving transparency and reducing the timeline, if possible.

Perhaps that would be establishing -- as I said about the pre-process -- establishing a

formalized pre-certification phase to reduce uncertainty. Having, perhaps, community boards and borough presidents conduct concurrent reviews.

You, perhaps, could change the order of reviews, so shifting city council to before the borough president or having them happen concurrently. Establishing an appeals panel, perhaps it would be members of different representatives, city planning, community board, borough president, and the council. Evaluating the scope of actions that require ULURP.

There are 12 categories, some of which are often bypassed because of due -- due to city planning's rulemaking authority. I think we should establish a transparent process for regular city planning evaluation of these actions subject to ULURP, to both remove those that are outdated, but also, perhaps, incorporating new categories as environments change.

Allowing CPC final decision making authority on a selection of smaller scale or CPC-determined low impact products -- projects. Okay. Can I just real quickly say which we don't? We are strongly opposed to incentivizing the disposition of city-owned property to expedite short-term development.

P	a	a	e	8	6

This will compromise the city's long-
term flexibility and control and weaken the ability to
leverage those assets to achieve broader housing
climate goals in our future. We oppose fast-tracking
for specific uses because it could lead to inadequate
community input, incomplete impact assessments, and
diminishing project quality.

And we do not propose adding time limits to application or pre-certification processes, as those have shown poor results in other cities. And we strongly oppose consolidating ULURP decision making within major city -- mayor -- excuse me -- within the mayor or city council.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.

MS. BUTLER: Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Appreciate it.

Any questions for the panel?

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you both for your testimony. And given your work at the Fair Housing Justice Center, I think there was other testimony talking about the extent to which the scarcity of housing drives the discriminatory practices. I'd be interested to hear if you found that -- concur with that statement or --

MS. MCKENZIE: So housing

Page 87 1 discrimination is very prevalent and is happening whether communities have a lot of housing or a little 2 3 bit of housing. And that's what we see in our 4 investigative efforts. So I would say it's not 5 restricted to just communities that don't have enough 6 units, but it's really happening throughout the city. 7 MR. BUERY: All right. Thank you so 8 much. Thank you for your testimony. 9 MS. BUTLER: Thank you. 10 MR. BUERY: Next, I'll invite Sara 11 Penenberg and Annie Levers, that they're prepared. They'll be followed by DeRay Mckesson and Cassandra 12 13 Ippaso. 14 MS. PENENBERG: Hi. Good evening, you 15 My name is Sara Penenberg, and I'm here on 16 behalf of SEIU Local 32BJ. 32BJ is the largest union 17 of property service workers in the country, 18 representing over 175,000 members across 13 states, 19 including tens of thousands of commercial property 20 service workers, security guards, airport workers, and 21 residential building staff in New York. 32BJ believes that the city's ULURP 22 23 process is a vital democratic process through which 24 community members, groups, including labor unions,

have the opportunity to engage developers, the

1	projects	that	shape	New	York	City.
---	----------	------	-------	-----	------	-------

Through decades of involvement in city land use review process, our union has been able to defend hard won industry standard, wages, benefits, and to educate the real estate industry and legislators about the importance of creating good jobs in the property service sector.

At the same time, our union understands the urgency of New York City's housing crisis, and we recognize that confronting the crisis and the demand and working with our policy makers to advance solutions to facilitate the production of hundreds of thousands of new units of housings as soon as possible.

We are hopeful that to the extent that this Charter Review Commission considers amendments to ULURP, the commission's proposals will balance the pressing need to build more housing with the importance of preserving representation, democracy in the review process. Thank you, guys.

MS. LEVERS: Good evening, everyone.

And thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Annie Levers, and I am testifying this evening on behalf of Brad Lander, New York City Comptroller and mayoral candidate. I'd like to thank Chair Buery, the

commissioners, and the commission staff for convening this hearing.

Over the last several years, Brad

Lander has proposed a robust set of charter revision

proposals, ranging from strengthening the city's Fair

Share rules to modernizing its fiscal framework.

Given the commission's emphasis tonight on land use

reforms, my testimony in this evening will focus

exclusively on proposals for tackling the city's

housing crisis.

To boost New York City's housing supply, build political consensus for growth, and ensure that expansion is backed by critical investments in infrastructure, Brad's housing plan proposed revisions that would allow the city to immediately expedite re-zonings for increased density while laying the groundwork for a long-term comprehensive plan, a best practice that Brad has championed for decades, but that the city has failed to implement.

These recommendations are aligned with proposals from ANHD, the Thriving Communities

Coalition, and Open New York to make the city's Fair Housing Framework enforceable. The charter should be amended to empower the mayor to declare a temporary

housing emergency, alongside mechanisms to streamline and fast-track new development.

Under this framework, the mayor would convene a Citizens' Assembly to address the housing crisis, the affordability and homelessness crisis no less than 100 days after the declaration of the emergency. The Citizens' Assembly would be a group of randomly selected diverse New Yorkers who are unencumbered by the entrenched interests and political dynamics that too often stall out growth.

The assembly would be required to develop and adopt plans for increased density and transit-oriented growth that fulfill the targets and mandates of the city's Fair Housing Framework. These plans would provide New Yorkers with more detailed land use and infrastructure visions for their neighborhoods.

The Citizens' Assembly plan would be sent to the community boards, borough presidents, and the New York City Council, requiring a two-thirds council vote to reject the plan altogether. For re-zoning actions that the City Planning Commission determines comply with the Citizens' Assembly plans, the charter would establish an alternative streamlined 90-day ULURP review and public comment period.

Page :	9	1
--------	---	---

That would bring the ULURP clock from
roughly seven months to 90 days. Re-zoning actions
that comply with the Citizens' Assembly plan would not
be subject to council review or approval. To supplant
the emergency process, the charter should then be
amended to require the development of a comprehensive
plan no less than two years since the start of the
housing emergency.

The adopted comprehensive plan in place, the charter would be amended to make permanent that 90-day streamlined ULURP process. Additionally, I strongly encourage the commission to put the original City of Yes proposal on the ballot to New Yorkers to deliver the additional 20,000 units that were lost after negotiations.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify this evening. I have attached more details to my written testimony, which you'll all receive, and I would be happy to meet with each of you and the staff to discuss these in more detail. Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. I want to applaud each of you for testifying with -- are there any questions from the panel?

DR. NIEVES: I actually have one. Can you cite an example where -- you -- whenever I hear a

Page 92 1 Citizens' Assembly --MS. LEVERS: Indeed. 2 Yeah. 3 DR. NIEVES: Some could view that as 4 adding another layer and want to reject it outright. 5 Can you give me an example where that has been one 6 where it's actually encouraged greater buy-in versus 7 created more tension? Well, I'll start 8 MS. LEVERS: Sure. 9 first by just making clear that the point of the 10 comprehensive plan itself and the way it's used in 11 other cities has always been to develop buy-in and 12 build political consensus citywide on these individual 13 neighborhood-level issues. 14 So that's why it works in other 15 jurisdictions. You bring the plan to the council and 16 the council has to agree to address the crisis, right, citywide. Each councilmember is forced to take a 17 18 little bit. They've already taken leadership in this 19 area by passing the Fair Housing Framework. 20 So there's clearly some buy-in to this 21 concept that there is a need to deliver citywide 22 housing in every neighborhood. A comprehensive plan 23 does exactly that. I think a big critique of 24 comprehensive planning has been that it takes too 25 long, and it sits on a shelf and never gets

implemen	te	≥d	
----------	----	----	--

And what this proposal is designed to do is address those two critiques. We would create a Citizens' Assembly, which has been used -- I mean, my favorite example is it's actually used in legislative areas. So it was used in Ireland to dramatically expand abortion rights in a country that would not otherwise actually be inclined to do so.

Through this, sort of, diverse body of people that were randomly selected jury-duty style to actually just learn about the issue and vote on what they really saw was the right thing to do. So that's an example of where it's been used previously.

But the idea is that it would take the Fair Housing Framework, it would get information from city agencies and independent experts, many of whom are in this room, on sort of where the crisis is, you know, hitting hardest in communities and build a land use plan for each district so that councilmembers have a somewhat clearer sense of where in their district growth is going to go and that that could help build some consensus. They would then adopt that plan, and then they would forgo their review from there.

MR. DABARON: Does this -- sort of like -- is that similar to the process with community

Hearing

	Page 94
1	boards and stuff like that? Or is this different?
2	DR. NIEVES: Outside of that.
3	MR. DABARON: Outside of
4	MS. LEVERS: So this would it it
5	would exist outside of it. It would be a temporary
6	body. It would be convened within, you know, a
7	hundred days of the mayor declaring the emergency.
8	And within six months of being
9	convened, it would deliver these plans. The plans
10	would then go to community boards, which are obviously
11	critical and have a lot of input and context, for
12	comment. And it would the whole plan would go to
13	the council for a vote, but it would exist outside of
14	community boards.
15	MS. LAREMONT: Could I just ask you
16	regarding that, how would you account for the dynamic
17	nature of the city and the diversity of the city in
18	terms of having a plan that was done and then would
19	need to be redone again? What is your thought about
20	how often this would have to be done? Because that's
21	one of the challenges that we have in the city is it's
22	dynamic nature.
23	MS. LEVERS: Yeah. So the Citizens'
24	Assembly plan, we are hoping, would only need to
25	happen once. I think we all agree that we're in a

Page 95 1 housing emergency right now. What that would do would lay the 2 3 groundwork for a real ten-year comprehensive planning 4 cycle where, you know, best practices show that you 5 should create a whole new plan every ten years that, 6 you know, in context of what's gone on over the last 7 ten years, what you predict to happen in the future ten years, with opportunities for amendments about 8 9 five years in. 10 MS. BOZORG: I'm curious to understand. 11 So the council would still have to vote on the plan? MS. LEVERS: That's the idea. 12 13 MS. BOZORG: Okay. So in an emergency, 14 to develop a plan that the council still votes on. 15 And then projects go through, assuming the council's 16 voted on the plan and agrees with it. 17 MS. LEVERS: Indeed. And creating that 18 higher threshold for them to just outright reject the 19 plan, I think can help build the consensus. 20 MS. BOZORG: Okay. 21 MR. BUERY: Can I ask --22 Hold on. MS. BOZORG: I just want to 23 I'm curious -- because you both mentioned the 24 importance of democracy and democratic processes, also 25 acknowledging housing emergency is something that

maybe well-housed people shouldn't be voting on, you know, the types of projects or the need for certain types of projects.

How would you -- I mean, how do you think about this balance of what is a necessary democratic process versus acknowledging it's an emergency that needs quick, fast action?

MS. PENENBERG: Yeah.

MS. LEVERS: Do you want --

MS. PENENBERG: No. Go ahead.

MS. LEVERS: Okay. I think what this does is actually strengthen our forms of democracy by creating a new process, basically, that still allows for consensus to be built with opportunities for input along the way. And I -- you know, I think that there are lots of things that will come out through that emergency process that could be addressed through a longer term comprehensive plan.

But this would create, sort of, an immediate relief mechanism to make sure that the targets that are put in the city's Fair Housing Framework, which I think everyone agrees is, like, a critical framework for actually addressing the crisis, can actually be implemented. Because otherwise, it's just another plan that's going to sit on a shelf.

Page 97
MS. PENENBERG: Just to add to that, I
think a big part of the democratic process that us as
a union sees is the ability for our membership to have
a voice in a process that they wouldn't be aware of or
a part of, right, and so we're that governing body for
them.
So I think the democratic process for
us is really shown in those relationships that we
build in making sure that the good job you know,
the good job parameters are seen and that advocacy is
done through our voice as representing that larger
membership base, which is around 90,000, and in all
vast communities in all different boroughs of the
city.
MR. BUERY: When you describe a
comprehensive plan, how comprehensive is
comprehensive? Do that include schools, sanitation
needs, transportation?
MS. LEVERS: Yes.
MR. BUERY: Okay.
MS. LEVERS: Yes, it would. I mean,

of our city's planning for that kind of infrastructure

the proposal that we -- that I think makes sense for

city's ten-year capital strategy, which outlines all

the city to pursue is one that actually integrates the

And what that requires is the city to first and foremost do an assessment of the state of good repair of our infrastructure, which we are not currently doing a great job at.

So it would start there and look at where we need to make repairs, first and foremost prioritize the areas that need those investments, and then match that with a land use plan that actually makes sure that the areas experiencing significant growth are being matched with the infrastructure they need to support it.

MR. BUERY: And what would you say to those who might say that the mere complexity of that plan, not only the, sort of, the surface complexity but the need to engage with the MTA, other bodies, or not even necessarily city bodies risk creating something that is so complex and difficult that, in fact, the process gets buried under the weight of the plan itself?

MS. LEVERS: I think that's why you need clear timeframes. Like I agree that it is not a good idea to let the planning process go on forever, in part, because I think it will just bog down community conversations and actually erode public

	Page 99
1	trust in government and just give everyone planning
2	fatigue.
3	So I think what makes sense is to have
4	a timeline for actually developing the plan that
5	creates room for building true consensus among
6	community members and making, you know, making sure
7	that people have an opportunity to weigh in without
8	letting it go on forever.
9	MR. BUERY: Thank you very much.
10	Really appreciate your testimony. Thank you.
11	Next up we have DeRay Mckesson and
12	Cassandra Ippaso. And just so that they know,
13	following them will be Abdul Rad and Hassan Naveed.
14	Thank you so much. Okay. Please whoever wants to go
15	first.
16	MR. MCKESSON: Hello. I'm DeRay
17	Mckesson, the executive director of Campaign Zero, an
18	organization that works to end police violence and
19	mass incarceration across the country. But my first
20	job and the honor of my life was being a sixth grade
21	math teacher in Starrett City in East New York. Sixth
22	grade is still the best
23	MR. BUERY: Once again, I have to
24	interrupt. Shout out, East New York.
25	MR. MCKESSON: I want those seconds

Page 100 1 back. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 5: That's also in 2 3 Brooklyn, Chair. I just want to make --4 MR. MCKESSON: Sixth grade is still the 5 best grade of middle school to teach. I'm not here to 6 talk about housing directly, but I am here to talk 7 about public safety. And we think about public safety as the only issue that touches all of the other issues that people think about safety a lot, both in this 10 city and around the country. 11 And there's no way to talk about safety 12 without talking about the police. We also think that 13 the issue of accountability is key to talking about the issue of safety, if we talk about it at all. 14 CCRB, as you know, exists, and the power to discipline 15 16 any police officer in New York City is rested in the 17 charter. 18 And the charter is clear that the 19 police chief is the only person that has the power to 20 discipline an officer. So the CCRB right now 21 functions as a review and advisory body. They make a 22 lot of recommendations, some of which are ignored and 23 some of which are heeded by. 24 But I'll tell you, when we look at the

data over time, we have seen that commissioners have

D		4	\sim	4
Pag	е	1	υ	Т

jus	st wl	holesa	le dis	smiss	ed mar	ny of	the	recon	nmer	ndatio	ons
of	the	CCRB.	And	the	questi	ion be	come	es is	it	reall	Ly
ove	ersi	ght if	they	can	write	recom	mend	latior	ns,	they	can
do	inve	estiga	tions	, and	they	actua	ally	lead	to	nothi	ing?

When I think about what I told my students, what I tell people as organizers is that we should make structures that work independent of whether the people who hold the roles are people we like, people we don't like.

And right now, we have a structure that actually doesn't work, that it is beholden to who the mayor is and who the police chief is, and there are some concrete ways that we can actually change this.

We can give the CCRB the power to actually discipline officers.

It'd have to be in accordance with the discipline matrix, which is robust here in the city. When I think about the work that we've done, we've reviewed more police union contracts and discipline systems across the country. So we've done an analysis of 3,000 discipline systems across the country of the police, and there's a real opportunity here.

And the last thing that I'll say is that if we are able to give the CCRB the power to discipline, this would not be an outlier in some of

	Page 102
1	the major cities. There are cities across the
2	country, major police departments, where the police
3	chief is either not the only person who can discipline
4	a police officer or there's some places, like L.A.,
5	where the police chief actually cannot fire a police
6	officer at all on his own. He has to go through
7	another process.
8	So I say this to say that I think it's
9	possible. The only people who are not in favor of
10	this largely are the police, and what people say is
11	that if this happens, police will quit, things like
12	that.
13	There's a 2020 study by Grunwald that
14	says that police officers who choose to leave are not
15	leaving because of the protest or accountability.
16	They're leaving for a host of other reasons. So I'll
17	stop there with ten seconds to spare.
18	MR. BUERY: thank you so much.
19	MS. IPPASO: Good evening. My name is
20	Cassandra Ippaso. I'm a proud New York City resident
21	and also the policy director at Campaign Zero, an
22	organization committed to ending police violence and
23	cause for violence through data-informed policy

First, I want to thank you for

solutions.

24

providing me the opportunity to speak before you today. I am here to speak in support of critical reforms to the New York City charter that would strengthen the Civilian Complaint Review Board as DeRay mentioned, the CCRB, and restore public trust in our systems of policy oversight.

The CCRB is intended to provide independent, transparent, and impartial civilian oversight of the NYPD by allowing the public to file complaints against officers and have those complaints investigated outside of the police department itself. Right now, the CCRB is failing to carry out this mandate.

While its mission is to ensure accountability, it lacks the authority to enforce its decisions. Its work is often obstructed by limited access to NYPD records, long investigation delays, and a system where the police commissioner can ignore or overturn its disciplinary recommendations.

And in 70 percent of cases, it does.

This gross dereliction renders the CCRB powerless and leaves New York City without real accountability.

Simply put, the CCRB cannot fulfill its intent mission in its current form.

Let's be clear, New Yorkers deserve a

police accountability system that is independent, transparent, and effective. That's why we need reforms in the hands of voters through ballot measures. These changes are essential to realign oversight with public expectations, not political convenience.

Our first recommendation is make the CCRB independent. Today, the mayor controls 9 of 15 board appointments, creating a lopsided structure that undermines the board's independence. We propose expanding this board to 21 members and reforming the appointment process to limit political influence and ensure broader representation of New Yorkers.

We also recommend a 60-day time limit for interim chairs. Why? Because open-ended interim appointments sidestep accountability and weaken the city council's role in governance. Currently, all board member vacancies must be filled within 60 days, and we are asking that the same is applied to the chair position, the most important of all.

Second, the CCRB must have direct access to NYPD misconduct databases. Currently, the NYPD controls the flow of misconduct records, meaning they determine what information is shared. No accountability system would allow these subjects to

review the control of information, and, in this case, it forces the CCRB to rely on subpoenas that are frequently delayed or ignored.

A 2020 ProPublica investigation found that NYPD routinely fails to provide the CCRB with essential records and body-worn cam footage, particularly in the most severe of cases. This information sharing obstructs investigations and delays justice. We propose direct access to the NYPD misconduct database, so that oversight is timely, complete, and independent.

Third, and most importantly, the CCRB'S disciplinary decisions must be final. Even when the CCRB substantiates misconduct and recommends discipline -- almost finished, I promise -- the police commissioner can, and most often does, overrule them 70 percent of the time.

This gross failure renders the board's work as merely symbolic rather than substantive. And the public's faith in oversight evaporates. We must give the CCRB binding disciplinary authority, so accountability is not just a recommendation but a guarantee. Thank you so much.

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

MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you both for
your testimony. You alluded to some other models for
enforcement, I think, and if you know, it's fine. But
you could submit it, subsequently. I'd be interested
to know in those models, is there evidence that they
either decrease complaints and/or repeated instances
of misconduct

MR. MCKESSON: Yeah. So there are other models. We don't love those either, but they do exist. So in Wisconsin, there's a ancient law in Wisconsin that allows a police and fire commission to terminate any officer, including the police chief. The problem with that model is that all of the people in those commissions are appointed by the mayor. So you know, questionable whether it is used, but does it exist? Yes.

In L.A., after -- it, sort of, came after Rodney King. There's a Board of Rights. So the police chief can recommend termination, and the Board of Rights has to say "yes" or "no." The problem with the Board of Rights is that it -- up until a couple of years ago, it was all police on the Board of Rights.

That is -- wouldn't choose that.

And then the other option is all civilians, but they are all lawyers, and the data

shows that you -- police officers are more likely to get disciplined if they choose the police panel and not the civilian panel because the civilians aren't what, I think, people intended when they did the civilian model.

Chicago also has a very complicated model where if there's disagreement amongst the oversight agencies, it goes to another group and da da da. So none of the ones that exist we love structurally, but there -- but there is no CCRB that exists as robust as the New York City model.

So a lot of the oversight agencies that exist are, like, either paltry, or they, sort of, don't have staff, or they don't have -- people don't make complaints. And this one is robust. They have real investigations. They make real recommendations, but they have no power. That is, sort of like, the rub here.

DR. NIEVES: My question is about expanding it to 21. So are you saying that you also want to make sure that the mayor only gets to a 0.9? Is that what -- part of that? So even if you could -- or send that in, but you don't -- I'm curious to hear just a little bit more on that. You don't even have to answer, but it'd be great to have that fleshed out

Page 108 1 in a -- submitted. 2 MR. MCKESSON: So we actually -- we 3 have the edits to the charter that we would love to I think we only made six copies because it's a 4 long document, so we can send that to you. So Cassie 5 will answer the details, but what we're trying to do 6 is have no one political member a point, a majority. 8 So we are adding people to the process. 9 DR. NIEVES: Totally get that. 10 other than expanding it, are there -- particularly in 11 the 21 -- representation that is not there now that 12 you have recommendations you'd like to see? 13 MS. IPPASO: Yeah. Our proposal is 14 that -- so currently there is one appointment per 15 borough by the city council. We recommend increasing 16 that to two appointments per borough by the city council. We believe that that would be a broader 17 18 representation of New Yorkers at large. 19 And similarly, we actually recommend 20 that we add an appointment by the city comptroller. 21 We believe that this is kind of an additional voice 22 that would work -- help with additional 23 representation. 24 DR. NIEVES: Thank you. 25 And we added the MR. MCKESSON:

Page	1	0	a
PAGE		U)	7

comptroller -- as you know, there's -- New York City has a record number of settlements that the comptroller's office manages with regard to police misconduct. So when we included the comptroller, we didn't do it, sort of, out of left field.

It was like we actually think that the comptroller's office has a different lens on police accountability. And we've actually been trying to work with that office under a previous comptroller to see if we can actually identify streets and, like, neighborhoods where police misconduct is centralized from misconduct database. But that's how we added the comptroller.

DR. NIEVES: Thank you.

MR. BUERY: A few other follow up questions. One, following up on Commissioner Nieves's question. If -- given that the CCRB, as you say, is robust, is making recommendations, can you say a little bit more about what is the problem with the current makeup? If it's making recommendation, then the problem is these commissioners override the power?

MR. MCKESSON: You see, the fundamental power that -- problem that we see with the makeup now is that the board doesn't operate independently if they can -- if the majority of the members can change

when the mayor changes. So that is generally our take on this, is that the board should be one that is not subject to the whims of who the mayor is or who the police chief is.

The police get three appointees. We're fine with that. That makes sense to us. But trying to make sure that the mayor's office doesn't have an outsized role in the CCRB running, I think it makes sense. And the way the interim appointment of the chair works is that the mayor can just appoint an interim that, sort of, lasts forever, bypassing the other processes to make sure that there is a real appointment process.

So what we would do and what we propose in the backup that we've given to some of you, but that we will send, is that if the mayor does not appoint a real chair after the time limit, then the appointment power goes to another political leader so that we can make sure that there's actually a chair of the CCRB and that no one political leader can hamstring the CCRB from functioning, which is what happens now. So we look at the data. You look at 2018.

Commissioner O'Neill sided 83 percent with the CCRB, and then today, it's, sort of, the

2
Page 111
exact opposite. It's like, you know, the commissioner
is only agreeing to about 30 percent of them, not
actually giving over the materials.
And we've learned a lot in the past
decade. You know, I think ten years ago people were
asking for subpoena power. They were like, let the
oversight agency subpoena. Nobody anticipated that
subpoenas would be denied. And then all of a sudden,
they just didn't get anything, right.
So the question what we've learned
is, like, there should actually be direct access so
that you don't have to go through the legal process or
have the agency fight, get the subpoena denied, create
precedent, and then you're, sort of, hamstrung in the
accountability process.
MR. BUERY: On information access, are
there any privacy concerns around giving CCRB
investigators direct access to body cam footage or
other kinds of data?
MS. IPPASO: Yeah. That's a good
question. So Seattle and Chicago are two examples
that have and Washington, D.C that have this
direct access that we're proposing. In

MR. BUERY: Chicago and Seattle, you

said?

Hearing

	Page 112
1	MS. IPPASO: Chicago, Seattle, and
2	Washington, D.C. Unfettered access to police records
3	does not mean full public disclosure. Chicago's COPA,
4	for example, states very clearly that their
5	investigatory files and reports, while relying on
6	access to relevant police records, will not be
7	diverged to any personal agency.
8	So, you know, that both the CCRB and
9	NYPD are both part of the city and that does not mean,
10	like, that these records are going to be public. It's
11	just that that CCRB is able to do their job with due
12	diligence within the timeframe that they need to do
13	it.
14	MR. BUERY: I'm sorry. I have one
15	final question. Is there anything in state law and
16	I'm sorry.
17	People in the room, the room acoustics
18	here are very loud. So if you even whisper, I can
19	hear. So if you can try to step outside, if you need
20	to have a conversation.
21	Is there anything in state law, like
22	a of a bargaining agreement that impacts the police
23	commissioner's final authority?
24	MR. MCKESSON: So not the bargaining
25	agreement. So we have the only database of police

union contracts in the country. Most places do bargain discipline. New York City, the NYPD, cannot bargain discipline because the charter precludes it.

With the charter saying that the police chief is the only person that can discipline, that removes this as a bargainable topic. So in that case, no, not subject to bargaining. We do have language that we would like for you to use that doesn't open us up to bargaining later because I think it is a good thing that we don't bargain discipline in the city.

There is no state law that precludes the CCRB from having the power to discipline. When this topic comes up, there is a lot of emotional arguments about why this is necessarily a bad thing. It is not an illegal thing.

MS. IPPASO: Yeah. And the only thing I'll add to that is New York City -- so you might have heard of the Rochester case in 2023, where the oversight board -- it was ruled that they did not have final disciplinary decision power.

What's different about New York City is that Rochester relinquished that control in 1985.

New York City has never relinquished that control. So Taylor's law does not apply in the case of New York City. And so because of that, because this New York

Hearing

	Page 114
1	City charter dictates, you know, who has final
2	disciplinary decision power, state law isn't relevant
3	in this in New York City specifically.
4	MR. MCKESSON: And what Cassie means by
5	"relinquish control," there was a period in Rochester
6	where they did negotiate and bargain discipline. That
7	is not the case in New York City. It has always been
8	very clear that the police chief is the sole arbiter
9	of discipline.
10	MS. IPPASO: Because of the New York
11	City charter.
12	MR. MCKESSON: Because of the charter.
13	MR. BUERY: Any further questions? All
14	right. Thank you so much.
15	MS. IPPASO: Thank you.
16	MR. BUERY: Next step is Abdul Rad and
17	Hassan Naveed. They'll be followed by Ben Kallos and
18	Brendan Cheney.
19	MR. RAD: Good evening, Commissioners.
20	How's everyone holding up?
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 6: Well.
22	MR. RAD: A lot of that. Okay. Well,
23	thank you for the opportunity to an issue that's
24	been important to me as both a lifelong New Yorker and
25	as someone who's devoted their career to working on

My name is Abdul Nasser Rad, and I serve as the managing director for research and data at Campaign Zero. Publicly available data makes one thing unmistakably clear. The CCRB is currently structured -- the way the CCRB is currently structured cannot hold the NYPD accountable.

Before I discuss the data underscoring the issues crippling the CCRB, I want to provide some information on my background and experiences I've had as an applied public safety researcher in both government and nonprofit sectors.

In government, I worked at the New York
City Mayor's Office of Criminal Justice up until 2021,
where I managed several research portfolios, including
the New York City Office of Neighborhood Safety and
the beginning of the police reinvention and
implementation task force.

In the nonprofit sector, I was the public safety researcher at the Vera Institute, where I advised law enforcement agencies across the U.S. through Department of Justice grants on comprehensive efforts to improve safety.

And relevant to this conversation is my doctoral research at the University of Oxford focused

on police violence and accountability. My colleagues spoke a little bit about the policy recommendations.

I'm here to talk a little bit more about the why and the data behind it.

So from 2000 to 2020, despite investigating over 180,000 complaints, fewer than 2 percent result in any NYPD discipline. In 2021, the NYPD enacted changes that would ensure -- "ensure greater transparency around the disciplinary process. Most notably, the strengthening of the disciplinary matrix and making this disciplinary matrix public."

The theory being that transparency in the commissioner's decision complying or not complying with the matrix would improve accountability. Despite the changes, the 2024 CCRB data renders a disturbing image that proves reforms were meaningless. 2024 CCRB data showed that NYPD administered discipline in fewer than 2 percent of cases. No real difference from 2000 to 2020.

Without granting power to CCRB to both fully investigate and make disciplinary recommendations final, there will be no real accountability or transparency. In 2024, CCRB substantiated 1,057 cases of misconduct. The NYPD declined to act, as my colleague mentioned, in 890 of

Hearing

	110111115
	Page 117
1	them, often citing timing issues tied to the statutes
2	of limitations.
3	These outcomes are not the result of a
4	lack of misconduct. The CCRB received 12,698
5	complaints alleging police misconduct in 2024, the
6	highest volume since 2012. Yet systemic barriers
7	contain to prevent meaningful accountability. They
8	reflect structural deficiencies that inhibit
9	independent oversight.
10	I would request just maybe 15 to 30
11	more seconds if that's all right. Thank you,
12	Commissioners.
13	Delayed access to critical evidence, a
14	lack of final disciplinary authority and governance
15	structures that expose the CCRB to political influence
16	all contribute to a system where accountability is the
17	exception rather than the rule. These persistent
18	failures highlight why targeted reforms are urgently
19	needed.
20	Expanding the size of CCRB, limiting
21	the interim chair's term, and providing direct access,
22	as my colleague mentioned, are all critical. The
23	broader data environment continues to reinforce the

same theory. Oversight without real power is

oversight in name only.

24

D	4	4	0
Page	Т	1	ŏ

	Today the	Charter	Review C	Commission	has
an opportunity	to strengt	then acco	untabili	ty and en	sure
that the CCRB b	ecomes an	institut	ion capa	able of	
delivering the	accountab	ility New	Yorkers	deserve.	
Thank you.					

MR. NAVEED: Good evening. My name is Hassan Naveed. I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify tonight. I'm here to urge the commission to amend the city charter to give CCRB final authority to impose disciplining cases where misconduct by NYPD officers has been substantiated.

Over the past decade, I've worked across New York City government and public service and police oversight. As director and special investigator at the Office of the Inspector General for the NYPD at the city's Department of Investigation, I was part of multiple investigations into NYPD practices, including a landmark report on bias police that helped establish the CCRB's bias policing unit.

I later served as the deputy -- first deputy executive director and then the executive director of the New York City Mayor's Office for the Prevention of Hate Crimes where I led the citywide efforts to prevent hate violence, launch the first

hate crime curriculum in public schools, expanded
safety programs across all five boroughs and
coordinated rapid responses to emerging threats.

Throughout my career, I've had the opportunity to build new systems, implement policy reform, improve government efficiency, fight corruption, and see firsthand that many benefits of effective accountability and how easily they can evaporate when not enforced or institutionalized.

As someone who has worked closely with NYPD and deeply respects the many officers who serve with integrity and dedication, I've seen firsthand their commitment to public service. But that good work is undermined when the disciplinary system is inconsistent or unenforced.

Let me be clear. What I'm asking for is practical, necessary, and long overdue. I'm not calling for the CCRB to impose harsher punishments. We need the CCRB to have the authority, as it was intended to have, and enforce discipline in cases where police misconduct has been substantiated through a thorough independent investigative process.

Too often, even after thorough investigations that clear findings of misconduct, cases end without consequences. This is particularly

unfortunate given the commitment of so many NYPD officers who serve with integrity every day. It erodes trust, morale, and legitimacy from within.

I commend NYPD Commissioner Jessica

Tisch for her efforts to modernize the department and strengthen accountability tools showing that internal reform is possible with strong leadership. Still, lasting public trust requires more than leadership alone. Commissioners change, but policies must endure.

We need systems that are consistent, transparent, and accountable no matter who is at the helm. The CCRB was created to provide meaningful civilian oversight, not to make recommendation that can be dismissed without consequence. Granting the board final disciplinary authority would send a clear message. Oversight is essential, and accountability shouldn't depend on who's in charge.

Just ten more seconds, if you don't mind.

When misconduct is substantiated through a full CCRB investigation, discipline should follow. This isn't about harsher penalties. It's about closing the loop of accountability. New Yorkers deserve a system they can trust, and officers deserve

6
Page 121
one that is fair and consistent. This reform would
restore integrity to a broken process and move us from
symbolic oversight to real accountability. Thank you
for your time.
MR. BUERY: Questions?
MR. WEISBROD: Yes. I was struck by
the testimony before you that under Commissioner
O'Neill 80 percent of the CCRB disciplinary
recommendations were upheld and now 30 percent are
upheld. Is that dramatic change simply due to the
views of the commissioner, or are there other factors
at play?
MR. RAD: I mean, I won't be able to
speak to what the commissioner is thinking on those
things. As we stated, the issue is around the
structures and, as Hassan mentioned, who's at the
helm. And we're trying to advocate for a system where
who's at the helm does not dictate accountability.
MR. NAVEED: And this speaks at a time
when we're looking at complaints at a record high.
We've seen, just in the last year itself, 12,000
complaints this is the highest since 2012 that
have been filed against officers that have been, I
guess, alleged misconduct.

MR. WEISBROD: I'm just not sure you're

answering my question or maybe you're not capable of answering my question. But is it the dramatic change simply do to the views of the commissioner at the time, or are there other factors at play? For example, the different nature of cases that are determined by the CCRB now versus ten years ago, eight years ago with Commissioner O'Neill?

MR. RAD: Let me try to respond to that, Commissioner. So as I started, the data that from 2000 to 2020 still showed that NYPD administered and still fewer than 20 -- than 2 percent of cases. So that is the data for two decades.

Now, Commissioner O'Neill being having a different administration of -- or a compliance, whatever you'd like to call it, that -- can't say what the case is for that year, but on average, is what we're talking about. So again, on average, this is an issue.

MR. NAVEED: Yeah. And again, discipline resides within the discretion of the police commissioner, and how the police commissioner's carrying it out really leads it to that decision-making process.

I can't speak to what goes into the commissioner's mind themselves in that decision-making

process, but what we can say is that there is a situation where we're saying -- the disciplinary recommendations have only, in this particular case, 30 percent of the time compared to previous commissioners.

I'd also add that CCRB did testify not too long ago on the matter of it being granted -- of it itself, advocating for disciplinary powers to be given to the agency itself. Sort of recognizing the fact that this is a matter of concern when we have this inconsistency, when we have this lack of balance, I guess, un-enforcement, that is.

MR. BUERY: -- ask this some -- I'm trying to ask a slightly different way to see it. Is there any other independent factors that you can think of that could lead to -- that have led to that change? Were there other policy changes? Changes in the nature of complaint? Are there any other data that you might be able to point to?

MR. RAD: Yeah. I mean, I would need to look at the specifics, and I'm happy to follow up in detail with the commission afterwards. We know that from year to year there are changes.

So specifically, I would need to know what year that was of Commissioner O'Neill's tenure

	Page 124
1	because there was, as we all know, the COVID pandemic
2	and a bunch of other things. So the nature of those
3	offenses and those things do change. So I would need
4	to look at specifically what the year and then slice
5	the data to understand
6	MR. BUERY: Fair enough.
7	MR. RAD: if there were certain
8	differences. But again, 20 years of data and over
9	180,000 complaints show you that discipline was only
10	administered in fewer than 2 percent of cases.
11	DR. NIEVES: When you submit that data,
12	could you separate the data, pre-body cam usage and
13	post-body cam usage?
14	MR. RAD: Let's see what we could do.
15	DR. NIEVES: Thank you.
16	MR. BUERY: I have one other question.
17	Again, just sort of reflecting on the process. I
18	mean, I think we're we think about disciplinary
19	processes. It's comfortable thinking about there
20	being an appeal.
21	And so when we say that the CCRB
22	recommendation would be final, that mean there would
23	be no appeal from that recommendation even if it
24	was not to the PC? There would be no appeal to that
25	whatsoever?

Hearing

	Page 125
1	MR. RAD: You're saying if an officer
2	appeals the decision?
3	MR. BUERY: Yeah. Would there be any
4	opportunity for an officer to appeal under this
5	regime? To anyone?
6	MR. RAD: So I mean, they're it
7	depends on whether, you know, again, with the
8	bargaining contract, whether there's a, you know,
9	binding arbitration agreement in there in New York. I
10	would have to double check that in detail. But so
11	we'll follow up with the commission up to that.
12	MR. BUERY: Any other all right.
13	Thank you so much for your testimony. Deeply
14	appreciate it. Thank you.
15	Next up, we have Benjamin Kallos and
16	Brendan Cheney. Thank you.
17	Councilman, you want to begin? Thank
18	you so much.
19	MR. KALLOS: Distinguished members of
20	the Charter Vision Commission, thank you for your
21	individual service to the people of this great city,
22	for your partnership that I had with many of you when
23	I served in the council, and for your service on this
24	Charter Revision Commission.
25	Through charter revision welve been

able to empower voters to adopt big, bold changes that could not have been accomplished any other way.

Following one charter revision where I testified, the voters adopted the eight to one public matching that paved the way for the full public matching system I authored that allows anyone to run on small dollars.

I prepared a three-minute summary of detailed testimony, which I welcome an opportunity to discuss further with commissioners and staff. I'm proposing eighteen amendments to the charter, along six main themes.

The first theme is, let's increase housing supply. Let's get a vacancy tax. There's 200 -- sorry -- 20,000 apartments previously used for short-term rental back -- that are not back on the market. Let's expand the law I already authored to cover every multifamily housing unit and then tax the vacant units.

Number 2, let's renovate and repair rent-regulated apartments. Let's get 90,000 rent-regulated apartments back on the market by overhauling, unlocking doors. Let's increase it from 25,000 a unit to a hundred thousand a unit. Let's use market rate housing to house the homeless.

It costs the city \$8,000 a month to

shelter a family. I proposed with Fred Shack that we use this money to buy market rate apartments for homeless families in every community, including the Upper East Side. This would be less expensive, even on the upper East Side, and it would be permanently affordable housing.

While we're at it, Number 4, stop predatory equity from buying houses for families. These are all things that you can do. You can change the charter. It's like being councilmember. It's awesome. The second theme is delivery -- deliver affordable housing for more New Yorkers.

Let's set the median income for affordable housing to the census block instead of the area median income. The median household income in East Harlem neighborhood tabulation area, which I represented was \$39,490. While the area median income is \$179,355. I think we should just use the local number.

I don't think people making \$180,000 should be getting that affordable housing. We can replace rent-regulated, affordable housing, torn down to make way for new mixed income. Buildings, in my district, we would regularly see four brownstones with 80 rent-regulated units replaced by a brand-new luxury

	Page 128
1	building that had a fraction of the units and very
2	little, if any, affordable housing.
3	I'd also love to count the number of
4	people getting affordable housing instead of units.
5	This would reorient the city from studios and one
6	bedrooms to two, three, and four bedrooms families
7	actually need.
8	Similarly, where the market has failed
9	to actually build two, three, and four family units,
10	we need to require it as part of every new
11	development. Third theme, building more housing.
12	I don't know how much more time I may
13	be granted, but I'll just wrap up and
14	MR. BUERY: Yeah. Thank you.
15	MR. KALLOS: just say there's a lot
16	that we can do. We could also empower communities in
17	the re-zoning process. Please take a gander at the
18	testimony. I know there's also been a lot of
19	conversation around member deference. I read
20	editorials about myself and member deference all the
21	time.
22	I'd just like to note that in my
23	district we had more housing starts than anywhere else
24	in the city while I was a councilmember. The former
25	planning chair can correct me on that. We had a

thousand units of affordable housing, including on Roosevelt Island where one of you lives.

We welcome new housing shelters and services for the homeless. And so I would really be interested to learn more about some of the questions about member deference because I'm not sure where there's districts where there's no housing happening.

MR. CHENEY: Good evening. Good evening. My name is Brendan Cheney. I'm the director of policy and operations at the New York Housing Conference. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. New York Housing Conference is a nonprofit affordable housing policy and advocacy organization.

As a broad based coalition, our mission is to advance city, state, and federal policies and funding to support the development and preservation of decent affordable housing for all New Yorkers. You've got my full testimony, but I'm going to try and summarize it so I can fit it all in the time I have.

When I testified in the Bronx, I shared information and data about the extent of the housing crisis and shared data that you guys have already heard, just showing how affordable housing is not distributed equally across the city. We have our New York City housing tracker that shows that data.

We're updating that data probably next week with the latest information, and it's going to show the same thing that we've been seeing in the past. Nothing's changing. It's the same unequal distribution across the city.

And so unless we make changes, next year's housing tracker's going to show the same thing as this year's housing tracker as last year's housing tracker, that we have really unequal distribution across the city. So when we, you know, thought about how to -- what to recommend to you all, we focused on three main issues, right.

How can we create an easier approval process for affordable housing? How can we create a faster process for housing development? And how can we make housing and zoning decisions with more of a boroughwide and citywide approach? With that focus, we came up with several recommendations which I will summarize.

First of all, two recommendations that we think would make an easier approval process for affordable housing. First, you've already heard Howard talk about it, but this sort of fast-track for affordable housing through the board of standards and appeals, waiving the re-zoning for that project.

And then secondly, allowing for
affordable housing on city-owned land should not have
to go through ULURP if it meets the underlying zoning
So sort of exempt that. Affordable housing,
city-owned land should not have to go through ULURP.

Specifically, for ULURP and housing development, we recommend building on the city's Fair Housing Framework by shortening ULURP process so that in districts that are not meeting their Fair Housing Framework goals, the housing -- the ULURP process would end at the City Planning Commission.

And then finally, just a few short proposals. Let's see, shortening the ULURP. We support merging the borough president and community board review into one review that's shorter and that would be under the focus of the borough president. We think you could have a shorter timeline, but also one that has better, less toxic review process.

And then small and minor projects, we support going through the borough, stopping of the borough president. A lot of small projects don't go through ULURP because it's too expensive. And then finally, smaller changes that we think should not have to go through ULURP, like special permits, revocable consents, concessions, things like that.

MS. WHITE: Yes. Thank you both for your testimony. Former city council person, good to see you. And thank you for mentioning the AMI versus census block. It's been a thing of mine for, like, close to 30 years that I've been in the business, so thank you for that.

I had a question in relation to the 20,000 short-term units that you referenced that should go back in -- on market in every single type of multifamily structure. Do you mean every single type of multifamily structure, and precisely what type of short-term units are you talking about? Were they the Airbnb or whatever? Yeah.

MR. KALLOS: Thank you. A publication called SCIF did a steep dive onto the law I wrote on short-term regulation and found that the 20,000 short-term rentals had not been put back on the market. Local Law 64, which I wrote, governs affordable housing subsidized by the city and requires all of those affordable housing units to register.

In my more detailed testimony, I suggest expanding Local Law 64, so it would be multifamily housing with ten or more units, as well as if one person owned ten or more units across multiple buildings.

So we're trying to target some of the
larger landlords and then making sure that, as part of
that registration, we're putting in a vacancy tax so
that if they try to leave their markets off leave
their units off the market in order to, kind of, drive
up prices, it would actually mean that they couldn't
do it.
There's buildings in my district with
400 vacant units, and that just shouldn't be when
we're trying to increase housing supply.
MS. WHITE: Right. Because my the
MS. WHITE: Right. Because my the reason I was questioning, I was thinking of the family
reason I was questioning, I was thinking of the family
reason I was questioning, I was thinking of the family that, you know, four-family house that might have a
reason I was questioning, I was thinking of the family that, you know, four-family house that might have a vacant unit and was that who you were talking about?
reason I was questioning, I was thinking of the family that, you know, four-family house that might have a vacant unit and was that who you were talking about? MR. KALLOS: No. We exempted that from
reason I was questioning, I was thinking of the family that, you know, four-family house that might have a vacant unit and was that who you were talking about? MR. KALLOS: No. We exempted that from Local Law 64 as well.
reason I was questioning, I was thinking of the family that, you know, four-family house that might have a vacant unit and was that who you were talking about? MR. KALLOS: No. We exempted that from Local Law 64 as well. MS. WHITE: Okay. So but I wasn't

MS. BOZORG: Yeah. Thanks for your testimony. Brendan, first, thanks so much for New York Housing Conference's great advocacy all across the city for housing. The report you guys do on the distribution of development, I think, has been a really helpful tool for folks to really understand

the distribution of where housing's getting built and where it's not.

Former Councilmember, I'm curious to hear a little bit more about your perspective on how -- what the city can be doing. It sounds like you have all these great housing ideas. We can't bring all of them to voters, which is what the charter revision process requires. And some of them could be put in a housing plan.

But for these districts that build little to no housing, partly because there's really no way to compel, and there's a process that really does put the final vote in a local councilmember's hands and acknowledging that, you know, over 16 -- it's been 16 years since we've had housing project go through without the local councilmembers vote.

Curious what you think the city should do to create more housing and neighborhoods that have not done very much. According to the housing conferences report too, I think, in your district, I think only 488 units got built in -- between 2014 and 2023.

So I'm not sure where the thousand is you're coming from, but I -- but just curious to get your ideas on what we can do in neighborhoods and

Page	135
Lage	100

districts	where	little	to	no	housing	has	been	getting
built.								

MR. KALLOS: Sure. So I might might ask some of my colleagues who served at city planning. So what's detailed in my testimony is a issue, which is in order to put up new housing in a city that is largely built, they have to tear down buildings.

And so in my district, there's four-, five-, and six-story buildings that are old, and therefore, often rent-regulated. So you're losing 80 rent-regulated apartments where the rents are anywhere between \$80 a month -- I have tenants who are rent-controlled who are paying \$80 a month to live in this great city, which is amazing.

And people paying a thousand, and then they -- those -- they get moved out. They get pushed out. They get bought out. And then we get a 20-story building or a 30-story building with luxury developments starting at a million dollars a unit. Sometimes they have affordable housing in them.

So we might get -- if it's got

40 units, 20 percent will get eight units of

affordable housing. The city will pay several hundred
thousand or a million dollars per unit of subsidized

affordable housing. And so the number issue that

you're talking about is between that and the fact that there aren't enough two, three, or four bedrooms in my district between the loss of the regulated housing and people combining units.

That's why you have that number of 400 when we had more housing starts than anywhere else. But in terms of how to help people get more units of affordable housing in their districts, later in my testimony, I suggest doing real honest to goodness community planning.

In Melissa Mark-Viverito's district who represented more of East Harlem than I did, she funded a group to -- a community-based group to do honest to goodness community planning. And they put forward a community-based up-zoning. That up-zoning, I think that the speaker at the time felt that city planning did not listen to that, and they came back with their own plan.

MS. BOZORG: But that plan -- but that's a neighborhood that's produced a lot of housing. I'm asking about neighborhoods where very little housing has gotten built.

MR. KALLOS: So I think what I -- where I'm going with this is, if for districts that don't have a speaker who can fund a community group to do

it -- and in my district, I actually raised money to do my own re-zoning, which the city planning did accept.

So I think one of the solutions I'm proposing is for you to create a fund to support communities that want to have organizations that work with community members to do a community-led up-zoning and then pair them with urban planners and the land use professionals to actually put forward community plans.

Because right now, residents can say let's do an up-zoning, the community board can pass a resolution, but it's up to city planning whether or not they do anything with it. And so I would really push strongly for giving those urban planners to the community board so that they can come back with their plans.

MS. BOZORG: Do you have any ideas for neighborhoods that don't want to do community planning and are saying they don't want new housing? But we're saying we have a citywide crisis, and every neighborhood should be evaluated for where it can be building housing.

MR. KALLOS: I honestly was curious as I heard the commissioners talking about neighborhoods

because I think there might be a conception it was the Upper East Side, but we were fighting to get affordable housing and homeless shelters, and we voted for them. So I'm not sure where those neighborhoods are in the council.

We were all trying to push for more affordability. And I'll be honest, there's a memo I gave to the de Blasio administration with, I think, several sites to up-zone to build homeless beds. I asked the mayor if we could please just up-zone a block so that a church could put a homeless home -- beds for homeless, either permanent housing or shelter beds above the church.

And they came back and said, "We don't have the money. Your district's too expensive. And two, we're -- we don't want to go through the ULURP process, even if you're on board, Senator Krueger's on board, and your borough president, Gale Brewer's on board." So my --

MS. BOZORG: Okay. Well, I would point you to housing conferences report, if you want to know the districts that have not been producing any housing. You said you don't know where they are, and I know you're data driven, so I think you should take a look at their report.

Hearing

	Page 139
1	MR. KALLOS: I'm concerned that that
2	data may not reflect I I'm I was looking at
3	some of the data on my way on as I was drafting the
4	testimony, and I'm concerned that it's not I'm
5	happy to go over the data with you. I'd be
6	interested.
7	MR. CHENEY: Yes, please. The data is
8	from the Park of Housing Preservation Development and
9	the planning.
10	MS. BOZORG: Great.
11	MR. BUERY: the question? No?
12	Okay. Any other questions? No? Okay.
13	Thank you so much for your testimony.
14	MR. KALLOS: Thank you.
15	MR. BUERY: I appreciate it.
16	Next up, we have Moses Gates and Dena
17	Tasse-Winter. I please apologize if I'm
18	misspelling if I mispronounce that. And just so
19	you know, next step will be Annemarie Gray and
20	Michelle de la Uz.
21	MR. GATES: Hello. Hello.
22	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 7: We can hear
23	you.
24	MR. GATES: Thanks so much. First,
25	even though she is not here, I feel compelled to tell

Page 140 1 you all that I've had the rarest of New York experiences, a Brooklyn sighting of Gale Brewer. It 2 3 was, I think, close to 20 years ago, and if I can 4 remember correctly, it was a tenants and neighbors conference. 5 6 MS. BREWER: It happened. 7 Thank you. My name is MR. GATES: 8 Moses Gates. I am from Regional Plan Association, a 9 nonprofit --10 MR. BUERY: Sorry to interrupt you for 11 And we'll -- I'll honor the time. one second. Our American Sign Language translators 12 13 leave at 8 p.m. I just want to make sure that no one who is still planning to testify or in the room needs 14 15 If they do, I will -- we will ask them to 16 stay, but we will relieve them if no one needs them. 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 8: Sign language. 18 MR. BUERY: I'm sorry. American Sign 19 I apologize. Okay. I'm going to take that Language. 20 as a "no," so please continue. And we'll start your 21 time over. 22 MR. GATES: Thank you. I'm glad to 23 know that Gale Brewer story didn't come into my time. 24 My name is Moses Gates. I'm vice president of housing 25 at Regional Plan Association. We do research planning

and advocacy in the greater New York, New Jersey, Connecticut metropolitan region.

I wanted to testify today on more of the overarching goals we believe that the commission should consider with respect to land use and housing. And we have more specifics that we'll submit, kind of, in our written -- in more written testimony. It's evident we have a problem meeting citywide needs.

Right now, that need is housing. That need has not always been housing, and it won't be housing in the future. And we need to think about reforming the land use process in ways where we're able to meet both our current, present, and future needs.

And it should be noted, there is no one land use process. We have ULURP. Some things are subject to ULURP. Many things are not subject to ULURP. And in much of the testimony from city councilmembers and others, we, I feel like, have a thematic consensus.

And the thematic consensus is different levels of government should work together to produce the things that New York City needs. And I think everybody on the commission and everybody we've heard testimony is aligned with that. There are different

ways	to	meet	that.
------	----	------	-------

The school construction authority is not subject to ULURP. And nobody is saying that it should be, and nobody says that the way we build schools in New York City is a crisis of democracy. So there are different ways going about this. We wanted to highlight a few different ways that we think the process should be balanced in terms of local and citywide interests and voices.

So first of all, having -- when it comes to individual land use applications, we, like many others who have testified, believe the process is imbalanced and too deferential to the individual councilmember.

There are many ways to change this.

One of which is to have some kind of appeals process using existing institutions like the Bureau of Standards and Appeals, which is able to overrule land use applications on the basis of the interests of the individual developer but currently not able to overrule that same land use application in terms of the interests of the people of New York City.

So that is something that we think the commission should examine as ways to better rebalance that process and make sure that the process that all

the councilmembers described -- and I want to really commend the three who testified for the projects they did in their district, as well as the council as a whole for doing City of Yes.

I thought these were all excellent things that should not be generational undertakings as they are right now and should be expanded to, as the commission members have pointed out, those districts that have less impetus to go forward. With that, I'll stop.

MS. GREENBERGER: Thank you so much.

MS. TASSE-WINTER: Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Dena Tasse-Winter, and I'm speaking on behalf of Village Preservation, a membership-based nonprofit that documents, celebrates, and preserves the special architectural and cultural heritage of Greenwich Village, the East Village, and NoHo.

I'm here today specifically to speak about housing because, while we firmly believe that we should regularly review and reevaluate our government systems and bureaucracies, as has become apparent, destroying longstanding practices and standards merely for the sake of change will likely do more harm than good.

D	4 4	A
Page	14	4
		_

So would deregulating industries that
need careful oversight and dismantling systems for
ensuring balanced and appropriate review of changes
that will have a profound impact on our lives,
neighborhoods, and city.

Based on public statements made by
Mayor Adams who convened this body, we are concerned
that this is exactly what the commission has been
charged to do. We strongly oppose efforts to
deregulate developments in New York City or to remove
common sense oversight, which ensures that
environmental and other impacts of new development are
adequately considered.

We also strongly urge the commission not to seek to strip away necessary checks and balances on the development process in our city and to ensure that neighborhood character and historic resources continue to be considered as important parts of the evaluation of appropriate new development in our neighborhoods.

Our city is currently aiming to add thousands of units of new housing each year, but by far, most of these new developments are unaffordable to the vast majority of New Yorkers. And in too many cases, they replace older, more affordable, existing

	Page 145
1	housing stock. Both make our city's affordability
2	crisis worse, not better.
3	Instead of encouraging or enabling more
4	unfettered development with less oversight, we urge
5	this administration and this body to look at ways to
6	preserve and make permanent the affordable housing we
7	do have and to ensure that new housing that we create
8	is as affordable as possible. Deregulation and
9	removal of critical elements of oversight, as the
10	mayor has discussed doing, would not accomplish that.
11	Thank you very much.
12	MS. GREENBERGER: Thank you so much.
13	Any commissioner questions for our speakers?
14	Thank you. Thank you for taking the
15	time. Thank you for being here.
16	I think Michelle and Annemarie, you're
17	up next.
18	And while they're coming up, I think
19	next will after them will be Karl-Henry Cesar and
20	Benjy Ross. Thank you so much. Feel free to begin.
21	MS. GRAY: Great. Hello. Good
22	evening. My name is Annemarie Gray. I'm the
23	executive director of Open New York. We are an

independent grassroots pro-housing nonprofit with

hundreds of volunteer members across the state. I

24

also spent nearly a decade in government and city government before this.

Many of them very deep in the ULURP process, especially focused on how to build housing in some of the most exclusive neighborhoods. Also, this is important enough that I'm back here to testify again for a second time on our top priority issue.

So as has been talked about a lot, tonight -- right now, we have a land use decision-making process that prefers the hyper-local, preferences the hyper-local. And the effects of our dire housing shortage are citywide.

And so, as been discussed, in every attempt to build new homes in the last 20-ish years, city council has deferred to the local councilmember giving them near absolute power to block and delay new homes. This drives up costs for all New Yorkers and deepens patterns of segregation and exclusion.

Reminder that new housing is concentrated in so few neighborhoods that in 2024, only 10 community districts added as much new housing as the other 49 combined. So back in February, Open New York released a policy brief called -- titled "A Charter for Housing Equity: Five Reforms for a Fair or More Affordable New York City," which I encourage

	Page 147
1	everyone to read in full.
2	But today I'm just going to focus on
3	our top priority recommendation to address this
4	particular issue of member deference, which is create
5	a fast-
6	track for fair housing. So we need an
7	approval track for proposals that would advance fair
8	housing in our most transit-rich, climate-resilient,
9	and low-growth neighborhoods. They often are also the
10	neighborhoods that are the whitest and the wealthiest.
11	In line with the implementation of
12	the of Speaker Adams's Fair Housing Framework to
13	actually give it real accountability, teeth, and
14	enforcement. In these well-resourced neighborhoods,
15	we must fast-
16	track approvals to remove the ability
17	for local councilmembers to block new homes, which
18	they continually do.
19	For example, new proposals in these
20	neighborhoods could finish the land use review process
21	at the City Planning Commission. There could
22	potentially be a vote be a representative from city
23	council on this you know, on the CPC for this
24	process.
25	What is most crucial there are a lot

of different ways to design this -- what is most crucial is that the councilmembers representing these districts would no longer have the ability to block new proposals. Something that's come up a bit tonight is how to, you know, how you speed up the entire process not just the actual ULURP clock.

And I do want to definitely note that a huge amount of time is spent trying to game out the hyper-local politics in advance because that's the only path. So this would speed up the entire process even before the official clock starts. So these -- a lot of these reforms are really common in other states. They often happen at the statewide level called -- known as "builders remedies."

Albany has not acted, and so New York is very far behind. But a charter commission is a -- an actual way you can really embrace this. And there are a lot of ways to design this really smartly.

We're eager to continue to work with you all on these ideas, and this is a really, really rare chance to really tackle this. And the stakes are really high. Thank you.

MS. DE LA UZ: Wow. Right on time.

Hi, everybody. Thank you for the opportunity to

testify and for your service. I'm Michelle de la Uz,

executive director of the Fifth Avenue Committee, a 47-year-old nonprofit comprehensive community development corporation who's built over 1,500 units of affordable housing.

And we have an affordable housing pipeline of another 2,000 units. I've also had the pleasure of sitting on the City Planning Commission with a number of you, and Fifth Avenue Committee helped organize the community coalition that led to the Gowanus neighborhood re-zoning, one of the most equitable re-zonings in our city's history.

I've also negotiated a number of community benefits agreements with private developers around private land use actions. And I -- Fifth Avenue Committee has a project, which is set for vote tomorrow, where one of two councilmembers is likely to vote "no" on a hundred percent affordable housing project.

So I have some insight into the things that you're considering, and some of the recommendations you've heard before. And I'm happy to answer any questions, but I definitely think that our public processes should facilitate an equitable, inclusive, and sustainable city.

And I, you know, I am -- you know,

Fifth Avenue Committee is part of the Thriving

Communities Coalition at ANHD, and I certainly believe

that a comprehensive plan is something that the city

really should move towards.

I think the Fair Housing Framework has been a step in that direction, and I believe that a comprehensive plan would take and balance the local concerns, the legitimate local concerns, that many communities have with the citywide needs that a comprehensive plan could address.

Absent a comprehensive plan, depending on the political appetite you all have, I think that in council districts that are not meeting the production goals that are outlined in the Fair Housing Framework, that ULURP should end at the City Planning Commission.

I think that could help address a number of the concerns. Shifting the focus specifically to a hundred percent affordable housing, I think that a hundred percent affordable housing on city-owned land that conforms to underlying zoning just -- it does not need to go through ULURP.

I think that the engagement with the local councilmember and the community boards is something that happens par course anyway and is

something that the agencies can mandate. It doesn't need to happen on a clock. I also believe we should be -- consider merging the city -- the community board -- excuse me -- and the borough president hearing and have that sit at the borough president's office.

And I believe that you should seriously consider for city-sponsored neighborhood re-zonings that they're -- that we mandate as part of the city charter a community-controlled oversight task force. It's something that we have as part of the Gowanus neighborhood re-zonings.

I've been involved in government and/or civic life in New York City for 35 years. It is the most productive relationship between government and community that I've ever seen. And one of the things that we really need to work on is building trust between community and government. And part of that happens after decisions are made when communities are part of the implementation process. And happy to answer any questions you have.

MR. DABARON: I got -- I just wanted to know because I've never heard of it, but what is a community oversight task force, and how would that work?

Page 1	5	2
--------	---	---

MS. DE LA UZ: The experience that we
have in Gowanus so as part of the 2021 neighborhood
re-zoning of 82 blocks, that is bringing 8,500 units
of housing, 3,000 of which are deeply and permanently
affordable, it also included the commitments that were
negotiated. It also included \$200 million, 200
repairs at NYCHA locally, and another, you know, 250
million in other things.

So we have a volunteer group of about 30 people that have gone through a process -- you know, basically said -- raised their hands and said, "We would like to be part of ensuring that the points of agreement that the city committed to are adhered to and are" -- the number one point of agreement that the city of New York agreed to in 2021 was that the city would report to the community-controlled task force and have public meetings on a quarterly basis.

But in between then, there are conversations that are going on between task force members and, you know, staff at the agencies of the city of New York and the mayor's office. It's a very productive relationship.

MR. DABARON: And that's city -- that's citywide?

MS. DE LA UZ: No. That's only

something that we secured as part of the Gowanus re-zoning, and we had to raise our own money privately for our third-party facilitator.

MS. BOZORG: I have a question. First, thank you both for all of your work and housing and all of your service.

Michelle, on the -- I'm curious. You just have so much experience from a range of positions on trying to get affordable housing built as -- in costly neighborhoods and over time.

I'm curious if you could speak to how you see our land use process adding to the costs and challenges of building because you've also negotiated a lot of CBA, community benefit agreements, outside of ULURP. So it doesn't necessarily require ULURP always for communities to get what they want.

But we also -- you -- as you know, the city's housing budget has grown over time, which is great, but what we've been able to do with that budget has not grown as equally because of how costly projects have become.

And folks have talked about the pipeline and the backlog, which is partly because we don't have the right number of resources to actually build as much as we should. So we're able to do not

as	much	while		even	though	our	budget	keeps	growing,
ric	ght, l	because	of	how	expensi	ive p	projects	have	become.

So could you just speak a little bit to what you see as the driving cost increases over the past handful of years? How much is that due to the land use process? How much of it is just due to building costs? Like it -- because it really has become an exponential growth.

MS. DE LA UZ: Yeah. I mean, I think, I mean, I think a lot of it just has to do with uncertainty, right, whether it's uncertainty of the cost of materials, uncertainty, you know, over the -- especially since COVID, with supply chain issues.

You know, we -- you guys have certainly mentioned a number of times the uncertainty of whether or not an elected official at the end is going to approve a project that -- where someone has, you know, spent hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars during the planning process.

So I think a lot of it has increased uncertainty, the whole uncertainty in, you know, in -- with interest rates. All of those things together have added to the increased costs for sure.

MS. WHITE: Hi. Thank you both for your testimony. Good to see -- I just saw you,

Hearing

	Page 155
1	Annemarie.
2	MS. GRAY: Thank you.
3	MS. WHITE: Michelle and I'm going
4	to ask you a question that we've talked about a lot
5	so, you know probably know what's coming. Can you
6	just expand on the impact of rising cost on nonprofit
7	developers and how that is impacting the industry?
8	We've had some testimony on that in
9	prior hearings, specifically on, you know, city
10	contracts and the like. But in general, it's an
11	issue. So would love to, you know, hear your thoughts
12	on that.
13	MS. DE LA UZ: Rising costs
14	specifically of the of affordable housing or
15	MS. WHITE: Yes. As it relates to
16	nonprofit developers.
17	MS. DE LA UZ: Well, I mean, Fifth
18	Avenue Committee, we build 100 percent affordable
19	housing, and we are often trying to build the most
20	deeply affordable housing, which means we're layering
21	multiple sources of subsidy or financing in order to
22	reach the most in need.
23	And so when the costs go up, it just
24	means we got to go out and seek more subsidy dollars
25	in order to reach those in need. And so it that

means the project takes longer as well. Going back to Leila's question, I mean, it is a -- it's a difficult cycle --

MS. WHITE: The impact on the industry though, on a non-profit.

MS. DE LA UZ: Well, the difficult -- I mean, the impact in the industry is that the pipelines are getting longer, the needs are growing, and we're trying to, you know, put our finger in a dike basically. And, you know, whether it's homelessness or, you know, housing cost burden.

And, you know, for organizations like Fifth Avenue Committee, you know, we have the benefit of having earned income from developer fees and property management fees cross-subsidizing the other charitable aspects of our mission. And so when you can't rely on those earned income sources, that means that you are not able to cross-subsidize the other sources of your mission. And that's a huge problem.

MS. WYLDE: Michelle, how would you respond to the -- were you here when the councilmembers testified about how they're needed to represent the interests of their community? As a community-based organization, how would you respond to them? How would you counter their concerns that

Hearing

	Page 157
1	we're if we change the member deference capacity?
2	MS. DE LA UZ: I mean, I think that
3	comprehensive planning can do that as well, right, I
4	think that I think the biggest issue that most
5	legitimate issue that most councilmembers are trying
6	to represent in the process is investment in
7	infrastructure in some way for their communities. And
8	that looks different in different communities
9	MS. WYLDE: Those are the ones that are
10	for development.
11	MS. DE LA UZ: That's well, that's
12	right. Yeah. That's right. That's why I say
13	legitimate concerns, right. I'm not talking about
14	like
15	MS. WYLDE: We're talking about the
16	other ones.
17	MS. DE LA UZ: Yeah. Well, I mean,
18	unfortunately, I think that we need to find a process
19	that balances borough and citywide concerns over the
20	more parochial concerns in that case.
21	MS. WYLDE: Do you think the term
22	limits extending the term limits by four years
23	would help that?
24	MS. DE LA UZ: I think it could. I
25	think that councilmembers or some councilmembers

Page 158
who may not get a ULURP in their district for many,
many years, and it you know, the first one may not
be all that controversial. And I may not you know,
we spend I spend a fair amount of time helping
councilmembers understand the process and, like, the
power that they have and how to wield it early.
MS. BOZORG: I have one more question
if that's okay for Annemarie. I'm curious, we've
heard a lot about builder remedy and fast-
track ideas, and I think a lot of them
are really compelling.
The nexus with Fair Housing have you
all put thought into how there's a complexity there
of, kind of, where you set that threshold, as Howard
was talking about, and then how you track that
threshold over time and have it be dynamics because it
is going to shift.
And the percentages can change very
easily with even just one project in neighborhoods
where that have had very little housing. So have
you all put thought into just what the right threshold
should even be in a Fair Housing Framework that has a
fast-track?
MS. GRAY: Yeah. There are a lot of

ways to design this, and frankly, every state that has

implemented something like this, they've had to, you know, go back and adjust it and figure out how it works or doesn't work. And I do think we decided to latch onto the Fair Housing Framework that just passed in the city council, frankly, partly because it's something that we all just passed.

We all just agreed to. And I think that's a value set that, you know, help was very present in City of Yes, and this is a big follow up. So one, I think that you need something that's legible. You need something that has enough, like, popularity, and the value is there.

I think exactly -- you know, that legislation hasn't fully gone into effect yet. So I think there's a huge amount of work of how you set that and what the threshold is. That, frankly, is going to take some time to, like -- and going back and figuring out how it works or not.

But that -- as something to anchor to and a framework -- I think one lesson learned actually from other states that have created a separate appeals process, a whole separate board, is that level of complexity, like, a whole new process to set targets is very messy, and isn't necessarily working very well.

Hearing

	Page 160
1	The best we can do of using the tools
2	that we have, using the ULURP process that we have,
3	and the Fair Housing Framework that we have, and
4	trying to create something that is simple, and then
5	also that we can, sort of, correct for as we go, is,
6	sort of, just been the guiding principle with a lot of
7	details to figure out still.
8	MR. BUERY: Feel free to ignore this
9	question. But would that also apply to the
10	recommendations from Comptroller Lander, which would
11	also, I think, create some new processes. Would you
12	also, sort of, say similarly that by creating new
13	processes is that not what you would recommend?
14	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 9: The assembly
15	idea.
16	MR. BUERY: I'm sorry?
17	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 10: Meaning, the
18	assembly idea?
19	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 11: Citizens
20	MR. BUERY: Yeah.
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 9: Citizens'
22	Assembly.
23	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 11: Yeah.
24	Citizens' Assembly.
25	MS. GRAY: Yeah. I have talked to

Hearing

	Page 161
1	their team about some of that. I do think that that
2	does feel very complicated and very challenging to me,
3	that particular layer. I actually think that
4	Citizens' Assembly idea and, sort of, this idea that
5	we should do engagement kind of approach it more
6	the more the way we do jury duty, for example.
7	That's actually something that we
8	worked in to a different type of our recommendation of
9	how we should rethink about the process of community
10	boards and borough president input, in a way. But I
11	do think that there's something that feels that
12	doesn't quite connect for me for that part of their
13	recommendation.
14	But as they said and as I've talked to
15	them a lot, I think, like, this baseline idea that the
16	Fair Housing Framework is a backstop and is something
17	that, I think, you've seen a lot of people agree on is
18	the right place to start and try to not overcomplicate
19	something to start.
20	MR. BUERY: Of course, everybody would
21	love another form of jury duty. That would be
22	welcome. Any other questions?
23	Thank you both for the panel. I
24	appreciate it.
25	Our next will be Karl-Henry Cesar and

Benjy Ro	ss.
----------	-----

MR. ROSS: All right. Good evening, members of the Charter Revision Commission. My name is Benjy Ross. I'm a research and advocacy intern with the Permanent Citizens Advisory Committee to the MTA PCAC. Created by the legislator in 1981, PCAC's the official voice of MTA riders. PCAC exists to fight for better service for every rider across the system.

So why am I here today talking about housing? Excellent transit is the key to plentiful housing, and plentiful housing is the key to excellent transit. People want to live where there is good transit -- excuse me -- transit. Unfortunately, there is -- they're too often priced out.

Car-centric requirements for new housing dramatically increase costs, reduce the amount of housing that can be built, and disincentivizes residents to use our city's greatest asset, our robust transit system.

New York City's housing crisis results from an incredible deficit of homes, 473,000 according to the Regional Plan Association. To realistically build the homes that are needed to resolve this crisis, we need to plan around transit. We have four

recommendations for the Charter Revision Commission.

One, expand zoning for accessibility to apply to developments within a larger radius of all subway and rail stations and extend it to include bus stops. Allowing more developers than just those within a close distance of stations to pitch in on accessibility projects and other station improvements is a great way to solve two problems at once.

Two, create a comprehensive citywide plan incorporating transit. New York City is defined by two things, our housing density and our transit system. Creating a citywide plan that addresses our dire need for more -- excuse me -- housing while encouraging residents to utilize transit is critical to solving our housing crisis and cementing a stable future for mass transit.

For example, our analysis showed that City of Yes will eventually bring ride -- increase daily ridership by up to 97,000 day riders, bringing in an additional \$304 million annually in the next 15 years in subway and bus operating funds just from the new housing.

Three, streamline projects that achieve citywide goals. Streamlining developments that eases our housing shortfall and addresses community needs

- will save time and money. With 146,000 New York City public school students experiencing homelessness -- last year, we do not have the time to wait. Curtailing councilmember deference for forming the ULURP process and rationalizing environmental review will go a long way towards letting New York City meet New Yorkers' needs.
- Four, eliminate parking minimums citywide. Car-centric cities like Minneapolis and Austin have already eliminated parking minimums. In the most transit-rich city in the western hemisphere with an acute housing shortage, there should be no reason for developers to be legally required to replace housing with off-street parking. Continuing to build car-centric infrastructure makes transit and our housing costs crisis worse.

The housing crisis is the defining crisis of New York City today, but we have the tools to fight it. Even after City of Yes, our zoning to text today looks more like Houston than it does like "House-ton." This is the greatest city on earth, and New York City needs to start planning like it's New York City. Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you. A best clothing line of the night. Please -- thank you so much.

MR. CESAR: Sure. So folks, good
evening. My name is Karl-Henry Cesar, and I am the
chairperson of Brooklyn Community Board 14. And so I
am testifying here today to raise concerns with
proposals to merge the community board and borough
president review process in ULURP.

The three concerns are, Number 1, said proposal diminishes the community voice and also provides the sense that it could be devalued.

Number 2, said proposal provides an incentive to politicize the appointment of community board members. And then proposal Number 3, it -- concern Number 3 is that this proposal is chasing the wrong outcome in ULURP, which is speed at the cost of quality.

So regarding point Number 1, as you're all aware, ULURP provides 60 days for community boards and then 30 days for the borough president. The concern is that by merging this you are giving people who share their concerns with community boards the opinion and the appearance that their voice only matters at the borough level. It doesn't matter at the individual level.

So that's not good because there's already a lot of concerns at the city level that the city is not listening to their voice.

Concern Number 2 is that, per the city charter, borough presidents already appoint community board members. And so with this proposal of combining the community board and the borough president ULURP review, you are raising the specter that borough presidents could have an incentive to appoint people to give them support for ULURP review as opposed to appointing people because it's at the best benefit for the respective community board.

And for Number 3, the concern is that there's a narrative that the ULURP process takes too long, and one of the culprits is because of the community review process. So given that it can take decades and at least a year and a half, there's a danger that a process that can take at most 90 days and makes up less than 17 percent of the review is somehow the culprit.

And so these are the concerns that I have with the proposal of merging the community board and the borough president review process within ULURP to just sit under the borough president.

And so I thank you very much for listening and thank you for taking your time because I know it's cold up there, and you guys are freezing, and it's been three and a half hours. I'm good, but I

Hearing

	Page 167
1	know you're freezing, so thank you.
2	MR. BUERY: Thank you for your
3	testimony. I appreciate it. And the best shirt of
4	the night.
5	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 12: Yeah.
6	MR. CESAR: Thank you.
7	MR. BUERY: Any questions for the
8	panel?
9	DR. NIEVES: I do have a question for
10	you. I think you're the first community board member
11	that spoke tonight, so thank you. What would you
12	suggest to community boards that are not doing their
13	fair share in this housing crisis? Like, what would
L 4	be a solution you would put forward?
15	MR. CESAR: So I think the first thing
16	would be the painful conversation of going to them and
17	asking them what they think their fair share is.
18	Because, you know, there are 56 community boards,
19	right, and so there are some community boards that
20	felt insulted by Chair Garodnick saying that what they
21	did during City of Yes housing opportunity was
22	community engagement.
23	Where if you do the math, it averaged
24	out to two or three meetings per community board.
25	That doesn't feel like engagement. That feels more

like we came to talk to you versus, like, we came to engage with you regularly.

And so to your point about Fair Share,
I think the first thing would be having to speak with
each of those community boards, which does take a lot
of time and investment, and I understand that. But it
would be sitting down with each of the community
boards and saying, "Hey, right now, from where certain
folks are at a city level, they believe that the
district and the community board are not doing their
fair share for housing. What do you think?"

Right, and then having that conversation, Number 1. And then Number 2, because there's so many advocacy groups that have that housing information, right, between DCP and these other organizations that are here, continuing those conversations and then saying, "Hey, this is what the need is. This is what the city says is needed. This is what you are saying you who live on the ground need. What comes in that?"

DR. NIEVES: I totally got -- I'm just going to jump in for a second because I hear more processes as a solution. I'm a fellow Brooklynite.

That conversation's been going on for 30 years in these communities that have not had additional housing

Page 169 1 put there. I'm just saying that. MR. CESAR: Yes. I understand. 2 I don't -- so I'm just 3 DR. NIEVES: 4 trying to explain the dilemma that I'm digesting too 5 on this and that what we're all trying to digest. So thanks for your feedback. 6 7 Yes, yes. And I thank you MR. CESAR: for sharing that because yes, like the conflict and 8 the pain that you're describing, yes, right. 10 that's one of the challenges of balancing the needs of 11 the people who've been there with the greater picture, 12 right. So thank you. 13 DR. NIEVES: Thank you. 14 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for your 15 testimony. Greatly appreciate it. 16 MR. CESAR: Thank you, folks. 17 Next up is Gabriel Turzo MR. BUERY: 18 and Simeon Bankoff. They'll be followed by Roberta 19 Gratz and Kimberly Cruz. How are you? Please begin. 20 MR. TURZO: Okay. Good evening, and 21 thank you for the opportunity to testify before you 22 today. My name is Gabriel Turzo, and I am the second 23 vice chair of Manhattan Community Board 6, which 24 represents 155,000 New Yorkers in Manhattan Community 25 District 6.

D	4	7	\sim
Page	Т	7	U

Community Board 6 has a long history of
dvocating for affordable housing within our East
idtown district. Rather than opposing new housing
onstruction, we actively seek more affordable housing
ptions.

While advocating for affordable housing by working closely with applicants, agency partners, and our elected officials, ULURP formalizes this collaboration and ensures that there's an opportunity to address community concerns.

A recent example of this successful partnership is the SPARC Kips Bay ULURP application, which involves redeveloping city-owned property in our district. Through collaboration between the applicant, our city councilmember, and Manhattan Community Board 6, the project was able to address multiple needs within the district.

While the project did not ultimately include housing, community input through ULURP led to the preservation of several hundred units of affordable student housing. And furthermore, thanks to our consistent advocacy, the city committed to developing a comprehensive housing plan for Manhattan Community District 6.

And you know, in other words, we don't

want to be protected from development. We are seeking development. But some may seek to dispense with or significantly weaken ULURP for the sake of expediency. But to community boards who are the first point of contact with their city government that many New Yorkers have, we see ULURP as a critical mechanism for better decision making through public input.

Local residents possess valuable insights into what works -- sorry, my voice -- what works and what doesn't work in their communities, and we can share with our elected officials. Public input leads to better designs, more thoughtful zoning changes, and development that compliments rather than conflicts with our neighborhoods.

Well-meaning and competing voices must be heard in land use decisions. The voice of New York City's communities must always be among them.

Community boards offer a vital venue for the public's voice to be heard and shared, ensuring that

New Yorkers have a seat at the table.

We look forward to working with our councilmembers to maintain and enhance our residential community. Members of this charter reform commission, we ask that you preserve New Yorker's seat at the table. Thank you.

		MR.	BANKOFF:	Hello.	Turning	it on.	
Okay.	Hello.	I'm	Simeon Ba	nkoff, a	historio	2	
preserv	ation ar	nd co	ommunity d	levelopme	nt consul	Ltant,	
current	ly worki	ng w	ith the C	ampaign 1	For A Liv	<i>r</i> able	
City.	Roberta	Grat	z will be	coming	up. We'l	ll talk	
is the	convener	of	this camp	aign, and	d we'll t	talk a	
little	more abo	out t	he campai	.gn.			

Thank you to the commission for giving us this opportunity to share our views. As we are all aware and as -- we have discussed greatly, New York is in an affordable housing crisis. The solution, we believe, is not to remove all regulations on development, but to encourage it to be done in a thoughtful, mindful manner.

Development may be appropriate in certain contexts, but we cannot forget the importance of the city that exists. Preservation of our city keeps New Yorkers in their homes. It keeps them connected to the essential amenities that make communities livable such as the network of parks, grocery stores, and reliable transportation that make a house a home.

And we must ensure that these networks are kept in place. Our proposals are aimed in ensuring that what we lose is fully replaced. All too

often -- and Roberta will talk about this -- we see tenants being forced out of their homes only to have the sites replaced with fewer units at a far higher price.

Removing essential affordable housing stock and replacing with fewer, more profitable units is counter to the interest of the city. But currently our policies do nothing to stop it. The Rent Guidelines Board reports that, since 2010, an average of 729 class A buildings and 1,500 units of class A housing have applied for demolition permits annually.

Additionally, since 1994, there have been estimated loss of over 150,000 rent-stabilized units. That's an average loss of over 5,000 rent-stabilized units per year. Even if only 10 percent of those units -- of the 1,500 units demolished, were in some kind of rent stabilization, replacing them and only them would still add 750 units a year or cut the annual losses to rent-stabilized apartments by 15 percent.

We propose that the Department of
Buildings only approve construction permits if no
apartments are lost. To ensure that buildings are not
demolished without a replacement plan, there should be
a short look-back period so that if an owner tears a

buildi	ing	down,	they	can'	t get	permit	s ui	nless	they	Z.
build	son	mething	y with	the	same	number	of	units	or	more
that e	xis	sted be	efore	the o	demol	ition.				

Secondly, we propose the city apply a demolition fee to projects where housing units will be lost. Under our proposal, this fee would help to fray the cost of replacing those units within the community district where the building is located.

The fees would go into a capital reserve fund established specifically for that community district, and the fees would -- and the funds would be used exclusively for affordable housing development.

Finally, we -- the campaign also supports the Community Land Act, land banking, and related bills expanding the certificate of no harassment programs to ensure that New Yorkers can remain in their homes and enhancing the city's commitment to a right to counsel for tenants facing eviction through the permanent allocation of sufficient funding so that all low-income tenants facing eviction can have access to an attorney.

Thank you for your time. It's much warmer up here than is in there.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Any

-- much for your testimony.

Next up we have Roberta Gratz and Kimberly Cruz. They'll be followed by Tara Duvivier, and then you'll move to online testimony. Thank you so much.

MS. GRATZ: I am Roberta Brandes Gratz, and it's a pleasure to join you today. I've spent my entire career as an urbanist; first, as a newspaper reporter, author of six books, and a member of the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Tonight, I'm here on behalf of the Campaign for a Livable City.

We are a new initiative, advocating for the balance approach to planning and development that promotes responsible new development and ensures neighborhood continuity. We are losing affordable housing at an alarming rate. Existing affordable units are being torn down and replaced by towers with fewer units and few affordable.

The city is losing small apartment buildings and renovated tenements to buildings for the rich. It's happening all over the city. In Yorkville, 43 affordable units and 4 commercial units at 202 East 75th at Third were replaced with 38 units and no ground floor commercial.

Similar projects all over Yorkville.
In Harlem, a landlord was sent to jail after he nearly
killed tenants in an attempt to force them out, so the
rent-stabilized units could be upgraded to luxury
housing. 15 West 96th Street, a 321-foot tower with
21 condos replaced three landmark quality five-story
townhouses with 30 rental units.
Height and density are not the same
thing. With all the new high-rise towers all over
Manhattan, for example, including the Supertalls, all
12 of Manhattan's community districts experienced a
net loss of 37,466 affordable units between 2007 and
2020. And that's with the new units at Hudson Yards
and the Upper West Side waterfront.
Co Tim home today to say we say the

So I'm here today to say we cannot just build our way out of this problem. If demolition is necessary, then the replacement building should at least be required on site to contain the same number of lost units.

This commission has a unique opportunity to prevent the diminution of existing number of apartments. You can stand for affordability, preservation, and livability. I thank you for your attention.

MS. CRUZ: Hello. So my name -- ooh.

My na	me is	Kimberly	Cruz.
-------	-------	----------	-------

(Speaking in a foreign language.)

Queens. And I say this because, at this very moment,

it's historical that we can say "Ubuntu," which is

that sometimes translated as "I am because we are" and

also "I am because you are."

And life is complicated, and we can't stick to these words called "affordability" because sometimes affordability means fixing the things that actually exist in front of you, and New Yorkers who are dying from immunocompromised conditions where these conditions and their housing units are leading them to the hospital that we don't have infrastructure for across all the cities.

So "Ubuntu" that "I am because we are."
So every time that we're thinking about our community
boards, they're not our local government. We're, kind
of, piecing together local government here and there
saying borough president, city council, and community
board. That's not a local government. That's not my
representation. They don't know my day to day.

They're not walking the same lines that I'm going to.

I've seen the community boards. They choose them, the same appointees, but why don't we have technocratic citizens assemblies with the

people's assemblies attached to it to remove the shite of our city, right, city services that are not working, but they keep growing, for some reason, when the people are not asking for it.

Health, why don't we have a public health official team that's funded, that's ready for measles? Insurance, there's a lot of fraud in these insurance claims and our elderly are getting hurt. Transportation, there are a lot of disability claims that people don't understand.

I'm wearing my sunglasses because the blind are coming. My generation that has been staring at these phones since they were eight years old, they're coming, and our city services will then in ten years say, "Oh, now, we have a blind population, or maybe we have a deaf population because we've been using our AirPods for the last 15 to 20 years with no regulation," so we should have sign language all the time, not when we can fund it, but all the time because my generation -- I'm 26.

In front of us is not a person of my age. In front of us I hope someone that's menstruating is caring about my privacy because federally we are not being seen. Our neuroprivacy, the charter can add something just like Connecticut,

Page 179 1 just like Colorado. We, you and I, are the local government 2 3 that we're piecing together in this housing crisis, 4 transportation, shite, city services, health 5 insurance, technology, transportation, and education. 6 Because the federal government is defunding our 7 children's education. I went to Yale. I went to Bronx 8 9 I don't think people are going to look like 10 me, so I'm sitting here. "Ubuntu." Please create a 11 local government, and let us fund it. Us. I'm just 12 tired --13 Thank you so much. MR. BUERY: 14 MS. CRUZ: Tired. This is too much. 15 We are sitting here. 16 MR. BUERY: -- much for your testimony. 17 A great way to --18 MS. CRUZ: This is a circus and bread 19 situation. 20 MR. BUERY: Next is Tara Duvivier. 21 MS. DUVIVIER: Good evening. Thank 22 you, Commissioners, for the opportunity to submit 23 testimony to this revision -- Charter Revision 24 Commission. My name is Tara Duvivier. I'm senior 25 planner at Pratt Center for Community Development.

Pratt Center for Community Development works for a more just, equitable, and sustainable

New York City. Our land use and housing justice work ranges from facilitating community plans for neighborhoods across the city, to policy reports on strategies to ensure that value created by city re-zonings is captured for public good.

We call on this commission to prioritize democracy, participatory planning, and racial and economic justice as it considers revisions to our city's charter to improve government transparency and the responsiveness to address our city's housing crisis.

Specifically, we urge this commission to consider revisions to the city charter that mandate the city develop and maintain a comprehensive plan that centers racial, economic, health, and climate equity and ensures intentional, robust, and representative community engagement.

Pratt Center is a member of the Thriving Communities Coalition, a citywide movement of more than 15 grassroots organizing, advocacy, policy, and technical assistance groups advocating for more equitable, participatory, and comprehensive approach to city planning.

We echo the testimony of our TCC partners, including ANHD and recommendations to manage -- mandate an enforceable equity-based comprehensive plan and enforce the city's Fair Housing plan. New York City has never adopted a comprehensive plan to guide land use and resource allocation decisions for present and future needs.

The city, instead, takes -- excuse

me -- an ad hoc approach to planning through

neighborhood- and developer-initiated re-zoning,

subject to ULURP, which limits consideration of

broader community context and needs. Communities and

inducted officials must respond to these proposals

without any coherent guiding framework with inadequate

resources under a highly contentious process.

Our communities, including community boards and grassroots groups, are under-resourced in evaluating these proposals. They rely on each other and, in some cases, outside consultants to assist in understanding and evaluating these applications.

The role of the public and land use processes, while advisory, does have an impact, particularly with their city council reps who are elected by and serve these communities. Community input has helped deepen projects' affordability levels

and secures funding for schools, parks, public housing, and tenant protections.

Communities should not have to rely on piecemeal negotiations to secure public resources.

But absent comprehensive and equitable planning, ULURP is a tool for communities to inform and advocate for their future.

Several of the proposals before this commission focus on streamlining ULURP to reduce the role of community boards or city council or to fast-track projects on city-owned land with -- or with income-restricted housing. Given the lack of resources and other community issues that community board members must attend to, communities are already working on a tight timeline with the public review process.

For example, with City of Yes, for economic opportunity and housing opportunity re-zoning proposals, less than half of the community board submitted recommendations before the City Planning Commission hearings for these proposals.

I'll -- I've submitted a full testimony already, but we just really would like to encourage you all to consider our lengthy -- our outline proposal for comprehensive planning, and again, to

Page 183 1 carefully consider what you would do moving forward with regard to housing affordability. 2 Especially, we know that affordable 3 4 housing isn't exactly affordable, so please -- this idea of fast-5 6 tracking, I -- we don't think is the 7 best idea. We do think that we really need to encourage and support more community involvement and 8 engagement in these processes and not reducing their 10 role. Thank you. 11 MR. BUERY: Ouestions? -- so much. We're now going to move to online 12 Thank you. 13 Is Christie Peale online? testimony. 14 MS. PEALE: Yep. I'm here. 15 MR. BUERY: Thank you. Please begin. 16 MS. PEALE: Okay. Good evening, everybody. Thank you, Commissioners and Chair, for 17 18 your service and your robust conversation and 19 engagement with the hearing tonight and for the 20 opportunity to testify. 21 I am CEO and executive director of the 22 Center for New York City Neighborhoods. We promote 23 and protect affordable home ownership, so that working 24 and middle class New York families can build strong 25 stable communities. You've heard a lot of great

D	10	A
Page	18	4

suggestions	tonight,	but	Ι	wanted	to	highlight	а
couple.							

Taking off some of the recommendations from the Thriving Communities Coalition around a comprehensive citywide planning framework. I think it's really important to be able to proactively invest infrastructure in neighborhoods, especially the neighborhoods that have been a home to historically black and Latino home ownership with the infrastructure investments that they need to be able to receive more housing.

I think communities want more affordable home ownership. They want more housing. They want multi-family home ownership, and they want the investment in their sewer system. They want to be able to move away from a combined water and sewer system to be able to support new housing.

They want the transportation opportunities and a comprehensive citywide planning process with real short, medium, and long-term targets. And accountability, as Michelle mentioned, would be a real way to put that commitment in action and plan for the investments in communities alongside the plan for new housing.

And again, in a way to address citywide

needs. We think this is the only way that we're going to be able to develop more affordable home ownership, by getting more communities on board with more housing. We also think it is critical to be proactively doing citywide community -- citywide comprehensive planning to address the real risk of the climate crisis.

A lot of the neighborhoods that were hit by the foreclosure crisis where we'd -- we've done a lot of our work are impacted by a climate -- climate change with groundwater flooding, rainfall flooding, and obviously sea level rise.

And again, we need to be able to plan for the impacts of climate change on these neighborhoods while also understanding that we need new housing. We talked about the ways to streamline ULURP for deeply affordable housing. I think that makes a lot of sense.

I think the Fair Housing Framework
needs to be enforced and needs to have teeth. I think
that makes a lot of sense, and Commissioner White will
not be surprised to hear me talk about the need for
the timely execution of housing contracts. We know
that the nonprofit sector is essentially financing the
government to the tune of hundreds of millions of

1	dollars	over	the	course	of	multiple	years
---	---------	------	-----	--------	----	----------	-------

And, I think, charter reform and revision would allow us to charge the city financing fees and late fees for the amount that we need to front the city to perform our services on behalf of New Yorkers. So we'll submit a more comprehensive testimony. Thank you for extending the time of the hearing tonight and your service. And I look forward to being in touch.

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

Are there any questions for Ms. Peale?

Next is Susan Nial. Apologies if I mispronounced your name. Susan, N-I-A-L. No? Next up is Nick. Next up is Mark Weller. No? Next up is Alex Maza. Albin Henneberger. Lo van der Valk, Lo van der Valk, V-A-L-K.

MR. VALK: Yes. Yes. My name is
Lo van der Valk. I'm representing Carnegie Hill
Neighbors. Yeah. In the Upper East Side.

We are very -- we are very concerned about this -- the current -- I can't say proposals being considered because they haven't been fully outlined, but we know that there's a -- the direction will be for a greater centralization of decision

	Page 187
1	making in terms of future housing, especially
2	affordable housing, and that this will tend to short
3	circuit or that the streamlining will come at the cost
4	of community inputs.
5	So we want to go on record of as
6	saying that we think community inputs are very
7	valuable and should not be compromised. And I will
8	issue a fuller statement, but I have greatly
9	appreciated the complexity of the issues involved and
10	discussed here and the balancing obviously of the
11	citywide concerns and the local concerns.
12	But we think, mechanisms need to be
13	articulated so that when they are when a proposal
14	is being proposed for the November elections, that
15	there can be a great deal of clarity as to what the
16	new proposals really will entail. And I thank you for
17	this opportunity to speak. Thank you.
18	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Any
19	questions for Mr. Valk? Next up is Ken A.
20	MR. A.: Can you hear me?
21	MR. BUERY: Yes, please continue.
22	Thank you
23	MR. A.: Yeah. Great. So I would just
24	would like to express a lot of support for
25	streamlining the process to fast-track housing in

D	1	റ	റ
Page	1	ŏ	ŏ

every neighborhood. Builder's remedy is probably a
great tool for balancing the member deference issue
where, potentially, we could implement a mechanism
where councilmembers who are using a member deference
as a blockage to housing to, kind of, give them to
stick that the builder's remedy could provide.

I would also recommend and support that the -- you think about Landmarks Preservation

Committee to be advisory in nature as opposed to being a veto when it comes to housing matters. If not, then they must consider housing matters in the consideration of their decision-making process.

I do recall South Seaport being an example of where pretty petty aesthetic considerations were being overrated. Too much emphasis on petty aesthetics over the real need for housing in the city. Yeah. And I would cede the rest of my time and -- but just generally just fast-track housing. We really need it. And yeah.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Are there any questions? Next Maria Danzilo.

MS. DANZILO: Hi. Good evening. Thank you, Commissioner. Thank you, Chair and members of the commission for your service, and thank you so much for staying so late tonight.

I'm executive director of One City
Rising, a nonpartisan good government grassroots
group. We actually are grassroots. We do not accept
any money from special interest groups. We are fully
funded by our members. We have several thousand
members citywide.

I'm a lifelong New Yorker, an attorney and a mother of three who raised my three children here in New York City. And I'm deeply committed to a positive future for our city so that it is a thriving place for my children and future generations. One City Rising members include people from both political parties -- we're not a political club -- as well as many independents.

We believe in listening to each other respectfully, and we look for common ground on what is needed to improve government in New York City. Our members hold a wide range of political views, and we view a successful meeting -- and we have many meetings -- as where no one actually kicks a chair or runs out of the room and threatens to quit our group.

We disagree on many things, but there is one issue where our members are clear and that is the need for electoral reform and, specifically, the need to franchise every voter, including the one

million independent voters in New York City through Open Primaries.

Twenty-three of the thirty largest cities in the country have opened primaries. It is a clear and undisputed fact that leaders are elected in the primaries. Yet New York City primaries have, perhaps, the lowest or among the lowest voter turnouts anywhere in the whole country.

It is clear and glaring problem, and we appreciate that this commission has been taking a serious look at this issue and, hopefully, will make a recommendation to finally open our primaries. We have five million voters in New York City, and we're looking at turnout under 10 percent, which means the vast majority of New Yorkers are not the ones who are electing our leaders.

This is not representative democracy, and it is a crisis. Open primaries will fix this by, first, franchising the million independent voters and, second, allowing every voter to participate in crucial primaries regardless of their party affiliation. In cities that have open primaries, voter turnout has significantly improved because people participate when they feel they have a voice.

We can't continue to just ask people to

Hearing

	Page 191
1	register in the party that has the power in a
2	particular district. It's just not fair to them.
3	There are positions that one or the other party might
4	take that might prevent someone in good conscience
5	from joining that party.
6	We don't ask people to switch their
7	religious affiliations. We shouldn't ask them to
8	switch their party affiliations. We believe that open
9	primaries will inspire and motivate people to vote in
10	general elections where turnout in New York City is
11	also abysmally low.
12	For example, in the 2024 general
13	election, which was a presidential year, New York City
14	was 49 out of 50 states in low voter turnout. New
15	York voters need to be given a reason to vote and we
16	can do that
17	MR. BUERY: All right. Ms. Danzilo
18	time.
19	MS. DANZILO: Yeah. Sure. May I
20	please have another 30 seconds?
21	MR. BUERY: Sure.
22	MS. DANZILO: Thank you. New Yorkers
23	need to be given a reason to vote, and we can do that
24	by doing what every other large city has done. Let me
25	also mention that voters vote with their feet. We

Page	1	92)
raye	_	2	•

have a city and state that is losing our tax base and the fast -- at the fastest rate in the country and a city with the highest tax rate and highest inflation in the country. Open primaries will make it possible for every New Yorker to have a say in who is going to lead us out of this.

One other issue I just want to mention is that the primaries are held at the end of June, which is a very hard time for many families in New York City. And we would also, respectfully, ask the commission to consider moving the primary date to either before Memorial Day or after Labor Day. Thank you for your time.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Any questions? Next is Frampton Tolbert.

MR. TOLBERT: Good evening,

Commissioners. I'm Frampton Tolbert, the executive

director of the Historic Districts Council. HDC is

the citywide advocate for New York's historic

neighborhoods, and we represent a constituency of more

than 500 community partner organizations to help them

preserve the places that matter to them.

Part of the Charter Commission's role is to review existing land use processes and propose changes. We strongly support new housing and believe

that preservation should be seen as a tool to make that happen, especially through adaptive reuse projects and contextual development. We cannot build ourselves out of this problem.

As Dan Gronik [ph] has said, 90 percent of buildings that will exist in 2025 already exist, so we need to incentivize their reviews for housing, especially affordable housing. We do understand that the commission may make changes to the -- propose changes to the ULURP process.

We oppose any plan that would diminish or eliminate public participation efforts to shut out the public out of the process that shapes their lives and opportunities, follows a dangerous local and national trend of dismantling civic structures and perpetuating the idea that only the wealthy and connected can or should make decisions for us.

HDC is a longtime proponent of public processes. For more than 50 years, we have reviewed all major applications to the Landmarks Commission because we believe community input makes our city stronger. We have seen time and time again how public testimony has added vital information to the public record and helped shape these projects into better versions of themselves.

Hearing

	Page 194
1	We also say I'll just lastly say, we
2	believe that there may need to be an improvement to
3	ULURP process so that small time developers and
4	property owners can create projects and more housing
5	in a process that mostly benefits now large developers
6	who have the time and resources to fund these projects
7	and timelines. But the solution is not to stifle
8	community participation. Thank you.
9	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for your
10	testimony.
11	Any questions? All right. Next is
12	Melanie Wesslock.
13	MS. WESSLOCK: Hi. Good evening. Can
14	you hear me?
15	MR. BUERY: Yes, we can. Thank you.
16	MS. WESSLOCK: Okay. Great. Thank you
17	for the opportunity to speak. My name is Melanie
18	Wesslock. I am a lifelong New Yorker, a parent, and a
19	small business owner. I'm also a proud member of One
20	City Rising, a grassroots organization of bipartisan
21	New Yorkers throughout New York City, and we're
22	working to support common sense policies.
23	I'm here to speak about my support of
24	getting open primaries on the ballot. Open primaries
25	are a system where it's a system where voters are

required to be affiliated with the political party to participate in primary elections.

As Maria mentioned, I believe that they are especially important in a diverse and politically dynamic city like New York, and it would create a more inclusive and democratic electoral process. Here in New York City, many registered voters identify as independents, and under the current closed primary system, these voters are excluded from helping to choose the candidates in a major party primary.

And these primaries often determine the eventual winner in a heavily one-party district.

Currently, voter turnout in New York is really shameful. It's like 10 percent. Allowing all voters to participate in primaries can lead to higher voter turnout and greater civic engagement.

Often primaries are encouraged. Open primaries would encourage candidates to appeal to broader range of constituents rather than just catering to their own party's base.

Candidates would then have to consider the perspectives and priorities of all voters. This could result in a more moderate and consensus-driven leader, and they would be better equipped to govern a diverse and complexity like New York.

Page	19	6
		_

As a business owner, I have a personal
stake in the success of our city, which depends on
proper representation. Open primaries would foster an
environment where independent voters would finally
have a voice. Open primaries promote fairness and
transparency. They empower voters rather than
parties.
In a city like New York, embracing open
primaries would be a step toward a more equitable
democracy instead of a one-party rule. In conclusion,
open primaries would lead to a greater voter
participation, to more balanced representation, and a
more robust democratic process.
New York City is one of the few major
cities not to have open primaries. We pride ourselves
in being a leader and an example of a great city.
It's time our primaries live up to this expectation.
Thank you so much for the time tonight, and I know
it's a late evening, so thank you very much.
MR. BUERY: Thank you for your
testimony. I appreciate it.
Any questions? Finally, Michael Lewyn.
MR. LEWYN: Hi. I'd like to thank you
for your service tonight, first of all. I'm a law

professor at Touro Law School. I live in Midtown.

I'm a member of Open New York, but I don't really -- I don't speak for them. And I don't get warrant that they would necessarily agree with everything that I'm about to say.

First of all, I would like to endorse Annemarie's call -- Gray's call for fast-tracking housing, especially affordable housing, especially in areas that haven't been adding much housing. But really the best thing about being able to testify late in the meeting is that, instead of just reiterating what other people have said, a person can respond to things that other people have said, which I actually think is more interesting.

So one argument that seems to be used against streamlining is this concern that well, builders are just going to tear down -- have to tear down existing units to build new housing. And the -- I don't really find that argument that persuasive.

And the reason is, it seems to me that when new housing is proportional on vacant lots, it gets the same type and maybe even the same volume as community resistant -- of community -- "community resistance" that tearing down older housing does.

So for example, there is a development at 250 Water Street that's been taken years to -- it

was on a vacant lot. It's taken -- but it's still
taken years to litigate because there's been this kind
of "community opposition."

Another argument as well, it's much more important to have "more community input" than to have new housing. But I'm a little skeptical of that argument for two reasons. First of all, the people who testify in these kind of meetings aren't necessarily representative in the public.

There's actually been a lot of research saying the people who testify in zoning relating meetings tend to be very unrepresented. The public, they're older. They're wider. They're more likely to be homeowners. I think there's a book -- I forget who wrote -- I think there's a book called Neighborhood Defenders by Katherine Einstein that goes to a lot of detail about this.

And second, sort of community input creates a, sort of, individual rationality, collective irrationality situation as to say, it may be rational for each individual neighborhood to exclude housing for a variety of reasons, but it's still not rational for the city as a whole.

Someone else mentioned concerns about infrastructure. I just say given New York's high

Hearing

	Page 199
1	taxes, if new infrastructure create a new or let me
2	rephrase that. If new tax more taxes and more
3	government spending led to more housing, we would be
4	building housing at a faster pace than low tax states,
5	which, of course, is, sort of, the opposite of
6	reality. So on that note, thank you for your time.
7	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for your
8	testimony.
9	With that, I believe we are included
10	concluded. The next public hearing of the commission
11	will be in Brooklyn on May 19th. If I could have a
12	motion to adjourn.
13	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 13: So move.
14	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 14: So move.
15	MR. BUERY: Some of us have moved with
16	their feet. Is there a second?
17	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 15: Second.
18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 16: Second.
19	MR. BUERY: All in favor?
20	MULTIPLE SPEAKERS: Aye.
21	MR. BUERY: So the next all right.
22	We are adjourned. The next meeting will be at Medgar
23	Evers College in Founders Auditorium at 1650 Bedford
24	Avenue in Brooklyn. And we almost made it to the end.
25	//

Hearing

```
Page 200
                       (Whereupon, at 9:07 p.m., the
 1
 2
                       proceeding was concluded.)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

-	_		
•	1		
	ı		
•			

CERTIFICATE

2 I, PAUL GRASSO, the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby certify 3 that any witness(es) in the foregoing proceedings, 4 5 prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that the 6 proceedings were recorded by me and thereafter reduced 7 to typewriting by a qualified transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of said proceedings are a 8 9 true and accurate record to the best of my knowledge, 10 skills, and ability; that I am neither counsel for, 11 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the 12 action in which this was taken; and, further, that I 13 am not a relative or employee of any counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor 14 15 financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of 16 this action.

17

7 Jun

18 PAUL GRASSO

Notary Public in and for the State of New York

21

19

20

22

23

24

_		
7		
_	L	
_	_	

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, BETHANY JOY DAVIS, 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.

Bethany Joy Davis

BETHANY JOY DAVIS

[**0.9 - 35**] Page 1

0	199:17	2,300 31:21	2025 1:5 193:6
0.9 107:21	150,000 173:13	20 13:20 39:16	21 104:11
	155,000 169:24	61:8 122:11	107:20 108:11
1	16 25:1 68:25	124:8 135:17	176:6
1 9:2 165:7,15	69:1 134:14,15	135:22 140:3	23 1:5 27:10
168:13	199:18	146:14 178:17	25,000 126:23
1,057 116:24	160 80:15	20,000 22:2	250 51:15
1,500 149:3	1650 199:23	91:14 126:14	152:7 197:25
173:10,16	17 166:16	132:8,16	25488 201:17
10 57:13,14	175,000 87:18	200 126:14	26 178:20
146:21 160:17	179,355 127:18	152:6,6	29,000 11:4
173:15 190:14	18 9:22 12:5	2000 116:5,18	3
195:14	27:10 49:8	122:10	3 60:25 165:12
100 31:8 90:6	180,000 116:6	2007 176:12	165:12 166:10
155:18	124:9 127:20	2009 68:23	3,000 101:21
10013 1:11	185 1:10	2010 51:25	152:4
11 160:19,23	195 12:5	173:9	30 53:9 57:12
111 13:15	1975 74:21	2012 117:6	111:2 117:10
12 6:8 22:18,19	1981 162:6	121:22	121:9 123:4
85:11 167:5	1985 113:22	2014 134:21	132:5 135:18
176:11	1989 75:6	2018 110:23	152:3 135:16
12,000 121:21	77:18	202 175:24	168:24 176:7
12,698 117:4	1994 173:12	2020 102:13	191:20
120,000 11:4	19th 199:11	105:4 116:5,19	304 163:20
13 87:18	2	122:10 176:13	31st 30:8
199:13	2 29:25 51:13	2021 115:14	321 176:5
13th 65:25	116:6,18	116:7 152:2,15	32993 202:14
14 165:3	122:11 124:10	2022 11:2	32bj 87:16,16
199:14	126:19 165:10	13:15,16,25	87:22
146,000 164:1	166:1 168:13	2023 13:20	339 50:23
15 27:9 104:8	2,000 12:17	113:18 134:22	60:20
117:10 163:21	31:21 149:6	2024 116:15,16	35 151:14
173:20 176:5	31.21 117.0	116:23 117:5	
178:17 180:22		146:20 191:12	

[**350 - access**] Page 2

350 50:18	50s 50:25	83 110:24	121:13 123:19
60:21	51 47:12,19	890 116:25	126:1 141:13
37,466 176:12	55 80:17	9	142:18,20
38 175:24	56 167:18	9 104:8 160:14	153:19,25
39,490 127:17	5:21 1:6	160:21	156:18 170:16
4	6	90 90:25 91:2	184:6,10,16,17
4 57:4 67:22	6 50:25 114:21	91:11 166:15	185:2,13 197:9
127:7 175:23	169:23,25	193:5	abortion 93:7
40 135:22	170:1,16,24	90,000 97:12	above 138:13
400 133:9	60 5:11 104:14	126:20	absent 150:11
136:5	104:18 165:16	90s 51:1	182:5
400th 5:6	64 132:18,22	96th 176:5	absolute
407 82:19	133:16	97,000 163:19	146:16
421 70:7	7	9:07 200:1	absolutely 36:9
43 175:23	-	9th 8:25	48:7
47 149:2	7 139:22	a	abstentions 9:7
473,000 162:22	70 103:20		abuse 79:5
485 70:8	105:17	abdul 3:12	abysmally
488 134:21	7215034 1:18	99:13 114:16	191:11
49 146:22	729 173:10	115:2	accelerate
191:14	750 173:18	ability 15:18	32:20
4th 8:24	75th 175:24	18:23,24 25:20	accept 137:3
5	8	54:2 66:18	189:3
	8 8:10 140:13	69:4 78:7 86:2	acceptable
5 47:19 100:2	140:17	97:3 147:16	57:19
5,000 21:22	8,000 126:25	148:3 201:10	access 10:13
23:12 173:14	8,500 152:3	202:7	80:2,17,20
5,500 23:12	80 121:8	able 17:7,9	82:14 103:17
50 32:2 33:17	127:25 135:11	21:18 31:22	104:22 105:9
42:21 68:19	135:12,13	33:5 34:6	111:11,16,18
191:14 193:19	80,000 80:17	36:21 37:4	111:23 112:2,6
500 12:6 22:1	82 152:3	41:12 46:25	117:13,21
192:21	152.5	49:22 88:3	174:22
		101:24 112:11	

accessibility	achieve 22:4	actually 20:2,3	173:18 178:25
81:21 163:2,7	45:13 69:11	22:4 26:21	added 108:25
accessible	86:3 163:23	27:6 28:24	109:12 146:21
79:23 82:13	achieved 62:15	39:17 44:15	154:23 193:23
accommodate	66:9	49:14 55:3,24	adding 86:8
38:9	acknowledge	57:6 58:9	92:4 108:8
accomplish	82:22	61:12 70:10	153:12 197:8
145:10	acknowledging	74:8 76:21	addition 65:24
accomplished	24:25 95:25	77:11 91:24	additional 12:9
126:2	96:6 134:14	92:6 93:5,8,11	35:14 38:9
accordance	acoustics	96:12,23,24	65:1 66:12
101:16	112:17	97:23 98:9,25	91:14 108:21
account 38:12	act 32:3 116:25	99:4 101:4,11	108:22 163:20
38:21 63:25	174:15	101:13,14	168:25
94:16	acted 148:15	102:5 108:2,19	additionally
accountability	acting 65:16	109:6,8,10	91:11 173:12
15:24 80:25	78:20	110:19 111:3	address 12:7,12
100:13 102:15	action 19:10	111:11 128:7,9	32:6 38:8,10
103:15,22	31:15 65:23	133:6 137:1,9	44:5 66:13
104:1,16,25	82:23 83:11	147:13 153:24	71:15,22,23
105:22 109:8	96:7 184:22	159:20 161:3,7	90:4 92:16
111:15 116:1	201:12,16	177:10 189:3	93:3 147:3
116:14,23	202:8,12	189:20 197:12	150:10,17
117:7,16 118:2	actions 66:7	198:10	170:10,16
118:4 119:8	75:9 80:15	acute 164:12	180:12 184:25
120:6,17,24	85:10,15 90:22	ad 181:9	185:6
121:3,18	91:2 149:14	adams 52:2	addressed
147:13 184:21	actively 170:4	144:7	96:17
accountable	activities 27:21	adams's 147:12	addresses
13:8 115:7	actors 13:10	adaptive 193:2	163:12,25
120:12	74:5	add 18:7 78:4	addressing
accurate 201:9	actual 69:15,19	78:21 97:1	82:21 96:23
202:5	148:6,17	108:20 113:17	adequately
		123:6 144:21	144:13

	110	10.00.00	
adhere 70:13	advocacy 11:8	19:22 22:5	115:21 151:1
adhered 152:13	80:11 97:10	31:8,21 36:8	152:20
adjourn 199:12	129:13 133:22	57:9,16 66:14	agency 13:10
adjourned	141:1 162:4	66:16,19 67:15	19:25 35:4
199:22	168:14 170:22	67:19 68:7	41:2 49:6 54:3
adjust 159:2	180:22	76:5 83:6	54:9 111:7,13
adjustments	advocate	127:6,12,14,21	112:7 123:9
25:11	121:17 182:6	127:22 128:2,4	170:7
administered	192:19	129:1,12,17,23	aggressive 7:14
116:17 122:10	advocating	130:14,22,24	ago 5:11 22:18
124:10	82:18 123:8	131:2,4 132:19	22:19 38:17
administration	170:2,6 175:13	132:20 135:20	106:22 111:5
13:24 15:19	180:23	135:23,25	122:6,7 123:7
41:16,17 42:14	aesthetic	136:8 138:3	140:3
44:13 45:22	188:14	144:25 145:6,8	agree 5:17 23:1
49:10 52:2	aesthetics	146:25 149:4,5	32:13 48:6,7
81:17 122:14	188:16	149:17 150:19	52:13 76:6
138:8 145:5	affect 73:23,24	150:20 152:5	92:16 94:25
adopt 90:12	affects 81:18	153:9 155:14	98:22 161:17
93:22 126:1	affiliated 195:1	155:18,20	197:3
adopted 9:7	affiliation	170:2,4,6,21	agreed 152:15
91:9 126:4	190:21	172:11 173:5	159:7
181:5	affiliations	174:12 175:16	agreeing 111:2
advance 49:22	191:7,8	175:17,19,23	agreement
88:11 129:15	affordability	176:12 183:3,4	54:18 67:17
147:7 148:9	6:21 11:7 41:7	183:23 184:13	112:22,25
advancing	64:11 90:5	185:2,17 187:2	125:9 152:13
14:17 80:2	138:7 145:1	193:8 197:7	152:14
advice 13:25	176:23 177:8,9	age 178:22	agreements
54:18	181:25 183:2	agencies 20:20	149:13 153:14
advised 115:21	affordable 5:14	28:14 38:24	agrees 95:16
advisory	10:13 11:6	54:1,1,20	96:22
100:21 162:5	14:11 16:15	80:14 93:16	ahead 79:17
181:22 188:9	17:1 19:7,13	107:8,12	96:10

aimed 172:24	89:15 104:25	amenities	annual 173:19
aiming 144:21	186:3	11:23 172:19	annually
air 7:2	allowing 28:7	american	163:20 173:11
airbnb 132:13	32:16 42:20	140:12,18	answer 18:8
airpods 178:17	65:21 85:19	ami 132:3	46:13 47:4,14
airport 87:20	103:9 131:1	amount 20:8	49:21 50:21
alarming	163:5 190:20	22:5 39:1 46:4	52:16 55:12
175:17	195:14	48:17,19 70:15	59:11 67:2
albany 70:5	allows 30:25	148:8 158:4	107:25 108:6
148:15	96:13 106:11	159:15 162:17	149:22 151:21
albin 2:23	126:6	186:4	answerable
186:15	alluded 78:5	amounts 17:6	47:4
alden 53:3	106:2	analysis 101:20	answered 47:2
alex 2:22	alongside 11:21	163:17	answering
186:15	40:22 47:17	analyze 26:3	61:20 122:1,2
alexa 4:2 39:11	90:1 184:23	anchor 159:19	anthony 2:11
68:13	alternative	ancient 106:10	6:12
aligned 89:21	90:24	anger 40:15	anticipated
141:25	altogether	angry 62:16	18:18 111:7
alike 10:22	90:21	63:21	anybody 51:8
alleged 121:24	alvin 53:3	anhd 89:22	55:23 70:10
alleging 117:5	amanda 4:11	150:2 181:2	anyway 150:25
alleviated	9:20 68:13	anita 2:4 6:11	apartment
31:23	amazing 24:19	annemarie 3:8	175:20
allocation	24:20,21 26:1	139:19 145:16	apartments
174:20 181:6	135:14	145:22 155:1	126:14,20,21
allocations	amend 118:9	158:8	127:2 135:11
14:22	amended 89:25	annemarie's	173:20,23
allotment	91:6,10	197:6	176:22
16:25	amendment	annie 4:5 79:15	apologies
allotted 16:4	44:10	87:11 88:23	186:13
allow 10:3	amendments	anniversary	apologize
14:25 15:7	88:16 95:8	5:6 70:5	139:17 140:19
67:8,23 74:15	126:10		

apparent	apply 113:24	approach 6:17	architects 27:6
143:22	160:9 163:3	38:20 39:5	architectural
appeal 69:23	174:4	72:14 77:10	143:17
124:20,23,24	appoint 56:16	81:3 130:17	archived 8:22
125:4 195:18	110:10,17	161:5 175:14	area 11:16
appeals 66:17	166:2,6	180:24 181:9	12:16,16 35:16
85:7 125:2	appointed	appropriate	56:19 57:2,13
130:25 142:16	106:14	45:21,25,25	57:20 59:6
142:18 159:21	appointees	144:3,19	81:6 92:19
appear 13:7	110:5 177:24	172:15	127:15,16,17
62:16	appointing	appropriately	areas 12:14
appearance	166:8	45:14 70:19	24:9,10,11
165:20	appointment	appropriation	66:19 93:6
appetite 150:12	65:25 104:12	54:10,12	98:8,10 197:8
applaud 91:22	108:14,20	approval 13:18	arena 73:19
applause 63:22	110:9,13,18	14:2 22:11	arenas 74:2
applicable	165:11	32:4 91:4	argue 13:5
77:22	appointments	130:13,21	argument
applicant	104:9,16	147:7	197:14,18
170:15	108:16	approvals	198:4,7
applicants	appreciate 16:3	147:16	arguments
170:7	18:12 21:8	approve 8:24	113:14
application	26:13 29:18	68:19 154:17	arias 3:7
17:16 26:24	37:8 39:8	173:22	army 62:8
30:20 51:21	43:13 50:8	approved 11:3	arrived 73:13
52:20 86:9	60:14 67:5	13:1 22:20	articulate 74:8
142:21 170:12	79:12 86:16	24:7 31:19	articulated
applications	99:10 125:14	34:1 35:22	187:13
11:3,5 12:23	139:15 161:24	april 1:5 8:25	arts 83:16
142:11,19	167:3 169:15	aptly 75:1	aside 40:13
181:20 193:20	190:10 196:21	arbiter 114:8	asked 27:1 36:2
applied 104:19	appreciated	arbitration	138:10
115:11 173:11	61:24 187:9	125:9	asking 62:15
			63:9 77:25

44 1 1 26 22	•1 1 •1•	1 1 64.00
	_	back 64:22
		100:1 126:15
	available 68:8	126:15,21
attempt 146:14	115:4	132:9,17
176:3	avenue 149:1,8	136:17 137:16
attend 7:2	149:15 150:1	138:14 146:6
182:14	155:18 156:13	146:22 156:1
attendees 2:2	199:24	159:2,17
attending 6:9	avenues 32:7	173:25
7:12	average 122:16	backed 89:13
attention 35:17	122:17 173:9	background
176:24	173:14	115:10
attorney	averaged	backlog 36:11
174:22 189:7	167:23	153:23
201:14 202:10	aviles 4:2 39:11	backstop
attraction 46:7	39:12,15,21,23	161:16
audio 201:8	44:9,21 45:3	backup 110:15
202:3	48:10,14,25	bad 113:14
auditorium	50:6,9 68:14	bag 35:3
199:23	77:15	balance 10:21
auditoriums	avoiding 15:21	26:10 58:14
61:18	award 52:2	88:17 96:5
austin 164:10	aware 97:4	123:11 150:7
author 175:10	133:18 165:16	175:14
authored 126:6	172:10	balanced 15:20
126:16	awesome	78:18 142:8
authority 10:7	127:11	144:3 196:12
43:1 66:21	aye 9:5 199:20	balances
74:3 85:13,20	b	144:16 157:19
103:15 105:21		balancing
112:23 117:14		24:12 169:10
118:10 119:19		187:10 188:2
120:16 142:2	uany 42:18	ballot 91:13
		104:3 194:24
	attend 7:2 182:14 attendees 2:2 attending 6:9 7:12 attention 35:17 176:24 attorney 174:22 189:7 201:14 202:10 attraction 46:7 audio 201:8 202:3 auditorium 199:23 auditoriums 61:18 austin 164:10 author 175:10 authored 126:6 126:16 authority 10:7 43:1 66:21 74:3 85:13,20 103:15 105:21 112:23 117:14 118:10 119:19	81:13 91:17 178:1 available 68:8 attempt 146:14 176:3 avenue 149:1,8 attend 7:2 149:15 150:1 155:18 156:13 attendees 2:2 199:24 avenues 32:7 attending 6:9 avenues 32:7 average 122:16 attention 35:17 176:24 173:14 attorney 173:14 averaged 174:22 189:7 167:23 aviles 4:2 39:11 201:14 202:10 aviles 4:2 39:11 39:12,15,21,23 audio 201:8 44:9,21 45:3 48:10,14,25 auditorium 50:6,9 68:14 77:15 auditoriums 50:6,9 68:14 77:15 author 175:10 authored 126:6 172:10 authority 10:7 43:1 66:21 avesome 126:16 avesome 127:11 authority 10:7 43:1 66:21 ave 9:5 199:20 b b 11:9 27:7 60:7 baby 42:18

[bank - board] Page 8

hamls 52.10	hadraarra 20.2	homo64a 11.11	L:II 92.10
bank 53:10	bedrooms 28:2	benefits 11:11	bill 82:19
banking 174:15	28:3 128:6,6	43:6 88:4	billions 11:9
bankoff 3:15	136:2	119:7 149:13	bills 23:8
169:18 172:1,2	beds 138:9,12	194:5	174:16
bargain 113:2	138:13	benjamin 3:24	binary 25:9,13
113:3,10 114:6	beg 76:23 77:2	125:15	binding 56:3
bargainable	beginning 29:4	benjy 3:2	105:21 125:9
113:6	115:17	145:20 162:1,4	bipartisan
bargaining	begins 52:20	best 5:22 8:8	194:20
112:22,24	behalf 46:15	10:20 20:21	bit 20:9 87:3
113:7,9 125:8	87:16 88:24	25:21 89:18	92:18 107:24
barnett 60:7	143:14 175:12	95:4 99:22	109:19 116:2,3
barriers 117:6	186:5	100:5 160:1	134:4 148:4
base 62:9 97:12	beholden	164:24 166:8	154:3
192:1 195:20	101:11	167:3 183:7	black 10:8
based 66:22	believe 37:18	197:9 201:9	31:14 40:12
68:16 69:6	49:7 54:18	202:6	184:9
129:14 136:13	55:1 58:8	bethany 202:2	blasio 51:10
136:15 143:15	61:10 108:17	202:15	138:8
144:6 156:24	108:21 141:4	better 17:20	blind 178:12,15
181:3	142:12 143:20	20:17 25:14	block 25:15
baseline 161:15	150:2,6 151:2	32:9 41:10	30:22 36:21
basic 38:7	151:7 168:9	69:22 131:18	40:6 77:1
basically 27:22	172:12 189:15	142:24 145:2	127:14 132:4
75:7 96:13	191:8 192:25	162:8 171:7,12	138:11 146:16
152:11 156:10	193:21 194:2	193:24 195:24	147:17 148:3
basis 142:19	195:3 199:9	beyond 11:8	blockage 188:5
152:17	believes 87:22	31:19	blocking 76:25
bath 42:19	ben 114:17	bias 118:19,19	blocks 30:24
battery 53:21	benefit 26:22	big 60:8 92:23	152:3
bay 170:12	49:23 50:2	97:2 126:1	blunt 49:23
beautiful 56:23	153:14 156:13	159:9	board 29:3,6
bedford 199:23	166:8	biggest 157:4	54:5 55:18
		00	56:2,5,15 57:4
			2 3 . = , 2 , 1 2 2 ,

57:7 58:22	bodies 44:15	157:19 161:10	bread 179:18
59:2,24 63:21	98:16,17	165:5,17,21	break 22:3,22
66:17 75:1	body 6:19 15:2	166:2,4,5,20,21	breathe 7:3
85:9 103:4	17:23 21:15	177:19	brendan 3:18
104:9,11,18	41:18 65:13	boroughs 47:19	114:18 125:16
106:18,19,21	72:13 74:14	56:20 97:13	129:9 133:21
106:22 109:24	75:8,8 93:9	119:2	brewer 4:9
110:2 113:19	94:6 97:5	boroughwide	47:14 50:11,17
120:16 130:24	100:21 105:6	54:12 74:7,20	50:22,24 55:8
131:15 137:12	111:18 124:12	77:10 130:17	55:20 56:8,12
137:16 138:17	124:13 144:7	bottleneck	57:1,22,25
138:18,19	145:5	12:22 34:6	58:3,6,8,12,19
151:4 159:22	bog 98:24	bottlenecks	60:15,18 68:14
165:3,5,11	bold 10:1 80:22	32:6 35:2 76:9	140:2,6,23
166:3,4,9,19	82:24 126:1	bottom 28:22	brewer's
167:10,24	bonding 20:7	bought 135:17	138:18
168:10 169:23	20:25 76:11	bound 6:4	brief 52:19
170:1,16 173:9	bonea 53:3	box 60:9	146:23
177:20 182:14	bonilla 2:8 6:11	bozorg 2:10	briefing 53:1
182:19 185:3	book 61:22	6:11 24:17	briefly 14:19
board's 104:10	198:14,15	35:25 95:10,13	bring 11:18,22
105:18	books 175:10	95:20,22	12:3 49:23
boards 18:4	boost 89:11	133:20 136:19	56:24 75:13
29:5 52:19,21	borough 5:24	137:18 138:20	91:1 92:15
55:14,22 61:16	13:9 39:25	139:10 153:4	134:6 163:18
85:2 90:19	44:14 51:22,22	158:7	bringing 42:16
94:1,10,14	56:16 58:11,15	brad 88:24	152:3 163:19
150:24 161:10	58:23 59:1,10	89:3,18	britny 3:14
165:16,19	59:12,14,19,22	brad's 89:14	79:12
167:12,18,19	61:19 85:3,6,9	branches 15:22	broad 129:14
168:5,8 171:4	90:19 108:15	brand 11:21	broader 65:20
171:18 177:17	108:16 131:14	127:25	69:23 72:14
177:23 181:17	131:16,20,21	brandes 175:7	74:8 75:3 86:3
182:10	138:18 151:4,5		104:13 108:17

117:23 181:12	hudgots 51.9	170.12 16 20	22.25 25 27.14
195:19	budgets 54:8 buery 1:4 2:3	179:13,16,20 183:11,15	22:25,25 27:14 38:22 45:13
broadest 5:21	5:2,5 9:3,6,17	186:10 187:18	46:5 48:12
	12:10 16:6	187:21 188:20	
broadway 1:10			57:10,12,15
broken 121:2	18:11 21:6	191:17,21	59:6 62:5
broker 30:25	29:17,21 30:4	192:14 194:9	67:25 70:19
31:22	32:23 39:6,10	194:15 196:20	71:4 87:21
bronx 9:23	39:14,19,22	199:7,15,19,21	99:5 128:1,11
10:13 11:15,18	43:10 50:7,10	bug 75:10	131:7 135:18
129:20 179:8	50:13,15 55:6	build 18:6	135:18 137:23
brooklyn 39:18	55:9 60:13,17	24:10,15 27:6	151:17 153:13
39:25 100:3	60:20 61:1	41:10 48:3,4	154:7 174:1,8
140:2 165:3	64:16 67:4	49:15 62:3,8	176:17 199:4
199:11,24	71:9,11 75:17	63:1 64:9,21	buildings 27:14
brooklynite	77:12 79:11	70:17 88:18	28:20 53:12
39:17 168:23	82:6 83:12	89:12 92:12	57:14 68:24
brooks 4:10	86:14,16 87:7	93:18,21 95:19	127:23 132:25
29:24 30:2,6,8	87:10 88:25	97:9 119:5	133:8 135:7,9
33:15 34:24	91:21 95:21	128:9 134:10	173:10,22,23
37:8 39:9	97:15,20 98:13	138:9 142:4	175:21,21
brought 26:15	99:9,23 102:18	146:4,14	193:6
brown 10:8	105:24 109:15	153:25 155:18	builds 32:19
40:12	111:16,24	155:19 162:24	built 13:16
brownfields	112:14 114:13	164:15 174:2	24:22 46:7
70:18	114:16 121:5	176:16 183:24	57:9 60:5
brownstones	123:13 124:6	193:3 197:17	61:11 96:14
127:24	124:16 125:3	builder 158:9	134:1,21 135:2
bsa 66:21 67:8	125:12 128:14	builder's 188:1	135:7 136:22
budget 15:14	139:11,15	188:6	149:3 153:9
34:21 35:11	140:10,18	builders 148:14	162:18
53:25 153:18	160:8,16,20	197:16	bumper 62:25
153:19 154:1	161:20 164:24	building 5:13	bunch 23:13
budgetary	167:2,7 169:14	13:17 14:1	124:2
14:21	169:17 174:25	16:25 17:5,19	

ll 22.17	II-J 52.17	 -1 144.0	4
burden 23:17	called 53:17	careful 144:2	categories
23:21 83:5	61:22 132:15	carefully 183:1	85:11,17
156:11	146:23 148:14	caring 178:23	category 67:15
bureau 142:17	177:8 198:15	carl 2:5 6:13	catering 195:20
bureaucracies	calling 119:18	52:17	cause 102:23
143:22	calls 81:2	carnegie	cba 153:14
buried 98:19	cam 105:6	186:19	ccrb 100:15,20
bus 163:4,21	111:18 124:12	carrots 45:18	101:2,14,24
business 46:8	124:13	carry 103:12	103:5,7,12,21
132:5 194:19	campaign	carrying	103:23 104:8
196:1	99:17 102:21	122:22	104:21 105:2,5
businesses	115:4 172:4,6	carve 75:25	105:14,21
10:22	172:7 174:14	76:7,12	107:10 109:17
butler 3:21	175:12	case 36:10 38:5	110:8,20,21,25
79:13 83:14,15	candidate	64:6 71:3	111:17 112:8
86:15 87:9	88:25	105:1 113:6,18	112:11 113:12
buy 29:14 92:6	candidates	113:24 114:7	115:5,6,9
92:11,20 127:2	195:10,18,21	122:16 123:3	116:15,16,20
buying 127:8	capable 118:3	157:20	116:23 117:4
bypassed 85:12	122:1	cases 103:20	117:15,20
bypassing	capacity 17:13	105:7 116:18	118:3,9 119:18
110:11	20:7,24 28:15	116:24 118:10	119:19 120:13
c	34:19 65:16	119:20,25	120:22 121:8
c 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	76:11 157:1	122:5,11	122:6 123:6
27:7 60:7	capital 12:19	124:10 144:25	124:21
cabinets 53:21	14:22 18:25	181:19	ccrb's 105:12
	97:24 174:9	cassandra 3:11	118:19
cafes 53:20	captured 180:7	87:12 99:12	cecs 18:4
cafeterias	car 162:16	102:20	cede 188:17
61:19 call 7:16 39:10	164:9,15	cassie 108:5	celebrates 5:6
	care 40:19	114:4	143:16
122:15 180:8	career 114:25	catastrophic	celeste 2:21
197:6,6	119:4 175:9	22:1	cementing
			163:15

	1	1	
census 127:14	certificate	35:6 37:20	126:1 130:6
132:4	174:16 201:1	38:8 62:2	131:23 144:3
center 27:24	202:1	66:13 68:14	171:13 192:25
28:21 61:18	certification	94:21 153:13	193:9,10
76:25 79:20	12:23 13:22	169:10	changing 41:9
86:20 179:25	18:22 22:11	challenging	130:4
180:1,20	29:13 32:3	60:8 80:4	character
183:22	69:3,13 85:1	161:2	66:23 144:17
centers 11:12	86:9	championed	charge 120:18
15:13 180:17	certify 201:3	89:19	186:3
central 10:15	202:2	chance 16:24	charged 144:9
51:1 52:4	cesar 3:5	148:20	charitable
centralization	145:19 161:25	change 15:1	156:16
186:25	165:1,2 167:6	25:21 49:13	charter 1:1 5:4
centralize 13:7	167:15 169:2,7	61:10 63:12	5:7,12,16,19
centralized	169:16	67:1,2 70:21	6:16 7:7 8:3,14
109:11	cetera 33:14	72:11 85:4,18	10:2,6 14:3,13
centric 162:16	chain 154:13	101:13 109:25	15:1 21:14,14
164:9,15	chair 2:3,12 5:5	120:9 121:10	22:14 51:12,20
ceo 183:21	6:10 51:1	122:2 123:16	53:11 64:24
ceqr 13:21	64:16 88:25	124:3 127:9	70:21 71:15
certain 18:17	100:3 104:20	142:15 143:24	75:6 77:18
38:7 45:13	110:10,17,19	157:1 158:18	80:22 81:10,16
47:22,22 49:15	128:25 167:20	185:11,14	82:2,9 88:16
63:4 67:8	169:23 183:17	changed 24:6	89:4,24 90:24
70:13 75:25	188:23 189:20	64:15	91:5,10 100:17
76:2,4 78:9	chair's 117:21	changes 5:16	100:18 103:3
96:2 124:7	chairperson	5:18,18 10:2	108:3 113:3,4
168:8 172:16	165:3	14:1,2 22:10	114:1,11,12
certainly 40:1	chairs 104:15	25:18 39:18,24	118:1,9 125:20
41:20 42:5,10	challenge 6:19	41:8 59:1,2,3	125:24,25
46:18 48:21	36:3,13	82:25 104:4	126:3,10
69:8,9 70:17	challenges 7:5	110:1 116:8,15	127:10 134:7
150:2 154:14	10:20 15:4	123:17,17,23	146:24 148:16

[charter - city] Page 13

	1	1	
151:10 162:3	children's	161:4 162:5	82:9,18,20
163:1 166:2	179:7	177:25	83:1 84:13
171:23 178:25	choice 45:8	city 5:9,11,14	85:5,8,12,14,24
179:23 180:11	50:24	6:4,20 9:22,25	86:12,13 87:6
180:15 186:2	choose 102:14	10:5 11:17	88:1,2,24
192:23	106:23 107:2	12:6 14:16,25	89:15,19 90:20
charter's 6:17	177:24 195:10	15:1,3 16:14	90:22 91:13
charters 52:23	chr 81:22	16:23 17:3	93:16 94:17,17
chartertestim	christie 2:20	18:7 19:17	94:21 97:14,23
8:17,18	183:13	20:7 21:1,16	98:2,17 99:21
chasing 46:14	christine 51:25	21:24 24:1,5	100:10,16
46:18,19	chronically	24:20,21 25:16	101:17 102:20
165:13	61:17	30:7,12,18	103:3,22
chat 8:6	church 138:11	31:13 33:11,12	104:17 107:11
check 15:19	138:13	35:8 37:23	108:15,16,20
65:18,18	circle 48:1	38:18 41:1,11	109:1 112:9
125:10	circuit 75:6	42:3,17 44:25	113:2,10,17,21
checks 144:15	187:3	45:8,10,11,14	113:23,25
cheers 28:16	circumstances	45:21 46:7,15	114:1,3,7,11
cheney 3:18	66:4	46:24 47:12,17	115:14,16
114:18 125:16	circus 179:18	47:17 48:22	118:9,13,23
129:8,9 139:7	cite 91:25	49:2 50:18,23	125:21 126:25
chicago 107:6	cities 83:2	50:24 52:7,18	128:5,24
111:21,24	86:10 92:11	53:2,10,17	129:15,24,25
112:1	102:1,1 164:9	54:16 59:3,9	130:5,10 131:2
chicago's 112:3	177:14 190:4	59:15,20 60:11	131:5,11 132:2
chief 10:4	190:22 196:15	61:24 65:7,10	132:19 133:23
100:19 101:12	citing 117:1	65:21 66:1	134:5,17 135:4
102:3,5 106:12	citizens 55:2	68:1 70:6,12	135:6,14,23
106:19 110:4	64:19 90:4,7	70:12 73:20,23	136:16 137:2
113:5 114:8	90:18,23 91:3	73:24 75:7	137:13 141:18
childcare 11:12	92:1 93:4	76:22 77:9	141:23 142:5
children 189:8	94:23 160:19	79:25 80:20	142:22 143:4
189:11	160:21,24	81:15,16 82:2	144:5,10,16,21

146.1 15 25	106.2 9 14 16	civic 14:22	alaak 01.1
146:1,15,25	196:2,8,14,16		clock 91:1
147:21,22	198:23	151:14 193:15	148:6,11 151:2
149:7,24 150:3	city's 5:7 15:25	195:16	close 47:24
150:15,21	40:13 80:24	civil 79:21	132:5 140:3
151:3,8,9,14	86:1 87:22	civilian 103:4,8	163:6
152:13,15,15	88:9 89:5,9,11	107:3,5 120:14	closed 195:8
152:21,23	89:23 90:14	civilians 106:25	closely 11:23
155:9 159:5,9	96:21 97:24,25	107:3	42:11 119:10
163:10,18	118:16 131:7	claims 12:21	170:7
164:1,6,11,18	145:1 149:11	178:8,9	closer 47:1
164:19,21,22	153:18 162:19	clarify 73:11	closest 10:17
164:23 165:24	162:21 171:17	clarity 187:15	30:17 48:6
165:25 166:1	174:18 180:11	class 13:14	closing 20:25
167:21 168:9	180:13 181:4	30:14 40:12,25	34:4 35:24
168:18 170:13	citycharter.n	173:10,10	69:5 120:24
170:15,22	8:17,18	183:24	closings 20:8
171:5 172:5,17	citywide 16:10	classes 9:13	20:10
172:17 173:7	18:15 19:16	79:6,10	clothing 164:24
174:4 175:12	25:23 26:11	clear 30:11	club 189:13
175:20,22	31:1 37:16	92:9 98:22	coalition 81:1,5
177:19 178:2,2	65:13,15 71:24	100:18 103:25	81:11,12 83:19
178:14 179:4	72:14 74:7,19	114:8 115:5	89:23 129:14
180:3,5,6,15,16	75:1,7 77:10	119:16,24	149:9 150:2
180:25 181:5,8	92:12,17,21	120:16 189:23	180:21 184:4
181:23 182:10	118:24 130:17	190:5,9	coalition's
182:11,17,20	137:21 141:8	clearer 93:20	83:17
183:22 186:3,5	142:9 146:12	clearly 68:2,5	coastal 38:1
188:16 189:1,9	150:9 152:24	92:20 112:4	codes 81:16
189:10,12,17	157:19 163:9	click 8:3	coherent
190:1,6,13	163:12,24	climate 15:4	181:14
191:10,13,24	164:9 180:21	86:4 147:8	cohesion 40:5
192:1,3,10	184:5,19,25	180:17 185:7	cold 166:24
193:21 194:20	185:5,5 187:11	185:10,10,14	collaboration
194:21 195:5,7	189:6 192:19		170:9,14

colleague 30:19	45:5 113:13	125:11,20,24	100:25 109:21
116:25 117:22	142:11 168:20	131:11 141:4	114:19 117:12
colleagues	188:10	141:24 142:24	120:9 123:5
19:20 21:18	comfortable	143:8 144:8,14	126:9 137:25
31:6 33:16	124:19	147:21 148:16	179:22 183:17
37:4 41:13	coming 20:3	149:7 150:16	192:17
42:7 52:14	26:20,22 34:8	162:3 163:1	commissions
116:1 135:4	47:7 79:13	171:23 172:8	54:25 58:3
collective	134:24 145:18	175:11 176:20	106:14
198:19	155:5 172:5	179:24 180:8	commitment
college 199:23	178:12,14	180:14 182:9	43:7 119:13
color 30:14	commend	182:21 188:24	120:1 174:19
36:20 83:4	120:4 143:2	190:10 192:11	184:22
colorado 179:1	comment 90:25	193:9,20	commitments
comb 42:20	94:12	199:10	152:5
combination	comments 42:2	commission's	committed 5:20
64:4	commercial	82:17 88:17	49:11 79:21
combined	28:22 87:19	89:7 192:23	102:22 152:13
146:22 184:16	175:23,25	commissioner	170:22 189:9
combining	commiserating	103:18 105:16	committee 51:2
136:4 166:3	40:1	109:16 110:24	51:19 149:1,8
come 9:12	commission 1:1	111:1 120:4	149:15 150:1
23:19 28:19,20	5:4 6:3,16 7:20	121:7,11,14	155:18 156:13
28:20,21,21	8:15 21:8	122:3,7,9,13,21	162:5 188:9
29:2,16 34:7	22:14 32:18	123:25 145:13	committees
37:11 38:3	35:15 51:7,10	185:21 188:23	29:4
47:21 54:17	51:11 54:6,19	commissioner's	common
64:2 69:5	61:7 64:8,22	112:23 116:13	144:11 148:12
96:16 137:16	65:3,22 66:1,9	122:21,25	189:16 194:22
140:23 148:4	66:10 70:21	commissioners	communicate
187:3	80:22 88:16	5:20 6:9 7:20	18:1
comes 16:18	89:1 90:22	8:23 9:20	communicating
17:16 19:19	91:12 106:11	60:23 64:17	20:13
23:18 30:21	118:1,9 123:22	79:18 89:1	

•4•	25 20 22 26 10	156041610	4.0
communities	25:20,22 26:10	156:24 161:9	competing
10:3,9,12 11:1	26:21 27:2,12	163:25 165:3,5	48:22 171:15
11:15 13:14	27:15,20,24	165:8,11,16,19	complaint
14:14,20 18:2	28:21 29:2,3,5	166:2,4,9,13,19	103:4 123:18
18:10 23:11,21	29:6,16 31:6	167:10,12,18	complaints
24:13 29:14	31:23 32:17,21	167:19,22,24	80:5 81:23
30:14,20,24	33:13,21 36:5	168:5,7,10	103:10,10
32:8 33:12	36:7 37:2,19	169:23,24	106:6 107:15
36:19,19,20	38:1,13,14,19	170:1,10,16,19	116:6 117:5
38:6 40:7,16	39:2 42:22	170:24 171:4	121:20,22
40:17 42:21	43:5,8 46:2,6	171:18,23	124:9
43:3,14,15,16	47:20 48:7,17	172:3 174:7,11	complete
44:1 49:23	48:18 49:16	174:15 176:11	105:11
79:23 81:1,5	52:19,21 55:14	177:16,19,23	completed
81:11,12 83:4	55:18,22 56:2	179:25 180:1,4	44:23
83:17 87:2,5	56:5,15 57:4,6	180:19 181:12	completely
89:22 93:18	58:22,22 59:2	181:16,24	40:17 42:1
97:13 128:16	59:23 61:15,21	182:10,13,13	completion
137:6 150:2,9	62:5 63:21	182:19 183:8	15:9
151:19 153:16	74:21,24 83:24	185:5 187:4,6	complex 15:3
157:7,8 168:25	84:1,16 85:2,9	192:21 193:21	98:18
171:10,17	86:6 87:24	194:8 197:22	complexity
172:20 180:21	90:19 93:25	197:22,22	98:14,15
181:12,16,24	94:10,14 98:25	198:3,5,18	158:13 159:23
182:3,6,14	99:6 127:3	community's	187:9 195:25
183:25 184:4	131:14 136:10	21:2,4 25:5	compliance
184:12,23	136:13,14,15	compared 54:8	80:16 122:14
185:3	136:25 137:7,7	123:4	complicated
community	137:9,12,16,19	compel 134:12	84:3,5 107:6
5:25 11:11,20	146:21 149:2,9	compelled	161:2 177:7
11:24 12:2,18	149:13 150:24	139:25	compliments
14:5 15:9	151:3,10,16,18	compelling	171:13
17:18 18:4	151:24 152:16	18:16 158:11	comply 90:23
19:5,21 25:14	153:14 156:23		91:3

complying	comptroller	concession	conflicts
116:13,13	88:24 108:20	51:18 52:8	171:14
component	109:1,4,9,13	concessions	conforms
21:2 29:12	160:10	131:25	150:21
components	comptroller's	conclude 82:21	confronting
26:23	109:3,7	concluded	88:10
composition	concentrate	199:10 200:2	confusing
66:10	13:12	conclusion	83:24
comprehensive	concentrated	196:10	congress 21:17
33:18 45:9	10:9 146:20	concrete	connect 75:22
47:8,10 48:2	concept 16:18	101:13	161:12
81:3,11,12	17:24 92:21	concur 86:24	connected
83:18 89:18	conception	concurrent	172:19 193:17
91:6,9 92:10	138:1	15:21 85:3	connecticut
92:22,24 95:3	concepts 12:18	concurrently	141:2 178:25
96:18 97:16,16	concern 123:10	85:6	connection
97:17 115:22	165:12,18	conditions 40:9	30:18
149:2 150:3,7	166:1,10	177:11,12	conscience
150:10,11	197:15	condominiums	191:4
157:3 163:9	concerned	12:20	consensus 76:3
170:23 180:16	139:1,4 144:7	condos 176:6	89:12 92:12
180:24 181:4,5	186:21	conduct 85:3	93:22 95:19
182:5,25 184:5	concerns 31:23	coney 68:22,23	96:14 99:5
184:19 185:6	41:14 51:13	conference	141:20,21
186:6	61:21 65:16	129:11,12	195:23
comprehensi	74:22 76:22	140:5	consent 53:23
45:11 46:16	111:17 150:8,8	conference's	54:19
compromise	150:18 156:25	133:22	consents
57:19 65:20	157:13,19,20	conferences	131:25
86:1	165:4,7,19,24	134:20 138:21	consequence
compromised	166:18 170:10	confidence	120:15
187:7	187:11,11	69:19	consequences
compromises	198:24	conflict 16:10	119:25
10:25 31:23		16:13 169:8	

10.2		20-4 15.15	4
consider 10:2	constituency	continue 15:15	controversy
78:14 141:5	15:11 69:23	17:4 40:10	63:17
151:3,8 180:15	192:20	42:20 63:16	convene 90:4
182:24 183:1	constituents	140:20 144:18	convened 94:6
188:11 192:11	10:20 63:25	148:19 187:21	94:9 144:7
195:21	195:19	190:25	convener 172:6
consideration	constraints	continues	convenience
5:17 60:5	76:13	117:23	104:6
181:11 188:12	construction	continuing	convening 89:1
considerations	34:11 82:5,11	164:14 168:16	converge 46:20
46:1 188:14	142:2 170:4	continuity	conversation
considered	173:22	14:21 15:6	10:16 17:15
52:1,11 74:10	construe 78:6	175:16	23:5,18 34:25
78:18 144:13	consultant	contract 52:3	112:20 115:24
144:18 186:23	172:3	125:8	128:19 167:16
considering	consultants	contracts 24:4	168:13 183:18
6:16 42:14	181:19	101:19 113:1	conversation's
52:9 65:4	cont'd 3:1 4:1	155:10 185:23	168:24
149:20	contact 171:5	contrary 12:21	conversations
considers 88:16	contain 117:7	contribute	12:1 17:8
180:10	176:18	79:19 117:16	33:19 98:25
consistency	contentious	control 12:25	152:19 168:17
15:10	181:15	54:24,25 86:2	cooperative
consistent	context 94:11	105:1 113:22	17:1 66:2
120:11 121:1	95:6 181:12	113:23 114:5	coordinated
170:22	contexts 172:16	controlled	66:2 82:23
consistently	contextual	135:13 151:10	119:3
17:15,17,21	193:3	152:16	copa 112:3
20:13	contextualize	controls 104:8	copies 108:4
consolidating	27:9	104:23	cornerstone
86:11	contextualized	controversial	32:15
constantly	28:24	58:20,21,25	corporation
56:17	continually	59:5,17 158:3	149:3
	147:18	,	

4 10 5	50 10 54 1 6	44.10.40.6	4 25 20
correct 10:7	53:18 54:16	44:12 48:6	count 35:20
25:12,18,23	59:1,3,16,20	50:11,25 55:7	128:3
26:8 55:20	64:19 65:8,12	55:19 56:6,8	counter 156:25
128:25 160:5	65:23,25 68:1	58:10,13,15	173:7
correction 54:5	73:20 75:7,12	59:10,21 77:15	counterbalance
correctly 140:4	75:14 82:18,20	92:17 127:10	67:20
corruption	85:5,9 86:13	128:24 134:3	counties 79:25
119:7	90:20,21 91:4	142:14 146:15	countless 30:13
cost 34:9 154:4	92:15,16 94:13	150:24 164:4	country 87:17
154:12 155:6	95:11,14	170:15	93:7 99:19
156:11 165:14	108:15,17	councilmemb	100:10 101:20
174:7 187:3	125:23 132:2	134:13	101:21 102:2
costly 153:10	138:5 143:3	councilmemb	113:1 190:4,8
153:20	146:15 147:23	10:16 13:11	192:2,4
costs 6:23	150:13 159:5	15:8 21:25	couple 20:5
40:10 126:25	177:19 181:23	30:17 43:5,14	21:10 61:19
146:17 153:12	182:10 192:18	43:19 44:6	106:21 184:2
154:7,23	council's 10:5	45:23 47:23	coupled 21:4
155:13,23	14:17 15:18	49:21 55:25	course 7:6 8:20
162:17 164:16	21:3 27:1	63:23 64:1	40:15 73:25
council 9:22	30:12 32:2,9	68:19 93:19	150:25 161:20
10:6 11:3,8,9	33:4 42:4	134:16 141:19	186:1 199:5
11:17,23 12:3	46:25 65:10,13	143:1 147:17	cover 59:4,10
12:25 13:5,6	66:6 74:2	148:2 149:16	126:17
13:18 14:25	95:15 104:17	156:22 157:5	covid 124:1
15:12 18:10,18	councilman	157:25,25	154:13
19:11 21:17,22	125:17	158:5 171:22	cpc 85:19,20
23:7 24:22	councilmember	188:4	147:23
30:7,8 33:8,13	14:24 16:9,16	councils 18:4	cradle 5:9
35:10 37:14,17	16:17 19:20	councilwoman	create 11:24
38:23 41:1,11	29:23 32:24,25	21:10 47:7	14:7 27:15
43:1 47:12,17	35:23,25 37:18	counsel 174:19	37:15 39:3
47:19 51:1,5	39:7,11,14	201:10,13	47:17 65:18
51:10 52:7	43:12 44:2,3,7	202:7,10	70:7 74:4 79:8

93:3 95:5	89:10 90:5,5	cumbersome	d.c. 111:22
96:19 111:13	92:16 93:17	13:22 28:14	112:2
130:13,14	96:23 129:22	curious 26:7	da 107:8,8,9
134:18 137:5	137:21 142:5	36:23 95:10,23	dabaron 2:9
145:7 147:4	145:2 162:21	107:23 134:3	6:11 33:1
160:4,11 163:9	162:25 163:15	134:17,24	34:17 71:12
179:10 194:4	164:16,17,18	137:24 153:7	72:18 73:7
195:5 199:1	167:13 172:11	153:11 158:8	93:24 94:3
created 21:22	179:3 180:13	current 15:2	151:22 152:23
47:11 64:7	185:7,9 190:18	24:23 63:14	daily 163:19
92:7 120:13	critical 9:24	64:7 103:24	damages 80:18
159:21 162:6	10:14 12:6,11	109:20 141:13	dan 193:5
180:6	76:6 89:13	186:22 195:8	danger 166:15
creates 99:5	94:11 96:23	currently 78:22	dangerous
198:19	103:2 117:13	82:19 98:5	193:14
creating 22:5	117:22 145:9	104:17,22	danzilo 3:23
27:19 33:8	163:14 171:6	108:14 115:5,6	188:21,22
39:1 88:6	185:4	142:20 144:21	191:17,19,22
95:17 96:13	critique 92:23	172:4 173:7	data 81:23
98:17 104:9	critiques 93:3	195:13	100:25 102:23
160:12 163:12	cross 156:15,18	curriculum	106:25 110:22
creation 21:25	crowd 62:16	119:1	111:19 115:3,4
crest 31:3	crucial 147:25	curtailing	115:8 116:4,15
crime 119:1	148:2 190:20	164:4	116:17 117:23
crimes 118:24	crumbling	cut 173:19	122:9,12
criminal	37:25	cutting 63:22	123:18 124:5,8
115:14	cruz 4:6 169:19	68:25	124:11,12
crippling 115:9	175:4 176:25	cycle 44:16	129:21,22,25
crisis 6:21,25	177:1 179:14	95:4 156:3	130:1 138:24
10:1 18:8	179:18	cycles 55:3	139:2,3,5,7
21:23 38:11,25	culprit 166:17	d	database
39:4 42:17	culprits 166:12	d 5:1	105:10 109:12
64:11 71:16,24	cultural 11:12		112:25
72:16 88:9,10	143:17		

databases	dealing 26:11	declaring 94:7	deferred
104:22	79:3	declined	146:15
date 192:11	deals 23:20	116:25	deficiencies
davis 202:2,15	decade 31:10	decrease 106:6	117:8
day 30:21 32:2	61:14 111:5	dedication	deficit 162:22
33:17 34:10	118:12 146:1	119:12	define 47:9
42:21 43:25	decades 69:18	deep 20:16	defined 163:10
44:24 90:25	80:1 88:2	146:3	defining 164:17
91:11 104:14	89:19 122:12	deepen 181:25	definitely 18:12
120:2 163:19	166:14	deepened 10:9	33:7 35:13
177:21,21	decent 129:17	deepens 146:18	148:7 149:22
192:12,12	decided 159:3	deeply 10:11	defunding
daycare 76:24	decision 21:3,5	21:1 41:13	179:6
days 56:11	28:8,10 52:10	50:8 119:11	delaine 4:3
68:19 90:6	53:16 74:9	125:13 152:4	delay 146:16
91:2 94:7	75:2 78:16,17	155:20 185:17	delayed 53:22
104:18 165:16	78:24 85:19	189:9	105:3 117:13
165:17 166:15	86:11 113:20	defend 88:4	delays 12:22
dcp 27:1 44:13	114:2 116:13	defenders	32:1,1 33:9
168:15	122:23,25	198:16	42:7 103:17
dcp's 27:18	125:2 146:10	defer 44:6	105:9
de 4:4 13:6	171:7 186:25	deference	deliberations
51:9 138:8	188:12	16:16,18 17:24	52:12
139:20 148:23	decisions 10:8	21:12,13 26:12	deliberative
148:25 152:1	22:8 30:15	36:15 65:19	74:14
152:25 154:9	48:8 73:13,15	69:15 72:23	deliver 19:7
155:13,17	103:16 105:13	74:2,13 75:5	91:14 92:21
156:6 157:2,11	130:16 151:19	77:9 128:19,20	94:9 127:11
157:17,24	171:16 181:7	129:6 147:4	delivering
deaf 178:16	193:17	157:1 164:4	118:4
deal 12:6 16:16	declaration	188:2,4	delivery 127:11
19:21 53:20	90:6	deferential	demand 88:10
54:3 187:15	declare 89:25	142:13	demands 10:1

democracy	depends 44:11	designed 63:14	detriment 43:2
32:15 63:4	125:7 196:2	70:25 93:2	devalued 165:9
88:19 95:24	deputy 118:21	designs 171:12	develop 19:5
96:12 142:5	118:22	desirable 78:11	45:7 90:12
180:9 190:17	der 2:24 186:16	desires 44:7	92:11 95:14
196:10	186:16,19	desperately	180:16 185:2
democratic	deray 3:10	16:14 62:19	developer
87:23 95:24	87:12 99:11,16	despite 12:21	19:21 34:15
96:6 97:2,7	103:5	24:10 80:18	44:12,19,24,24
195:6 196:13	deregulate	116:5,14	45:20 53:13
demolished	144:10	destabilizing	142:20 156:14
173:17,24	deregulating	15:21	181:10
demolition	144:1	destroying	developer's
173:11 174:3,5	deregulation	143:23	45:18
176:16	145:8	detail 78:14	developers
dena 2:16	dereliction	91:20 123:22	10:21 18:16,20
139:16 143:13	103:21	125:10 198:17	18:21 34:7
denied 111:8	derided 75:1	detailed 90:15	43:18 45:6
111:13	describe 65:1	126:8 132:21	46:14 83:23
density 31:5	97:15	135:5	84:17 87:25
38:1,9 89:16	described 8:14	details 91:17	149:13 155:7
90:12 163:11	19:16 83:1	108:6 160:7	155:16 163:5
176:8	143:1	detective 54:12	164:13 194:3,5
department	describing	determinations	developing
50:23 52:18	169:9	81:24	53:7 99:4
54:4,11 103:11	deserve 5:14	determine	170:23
115:22 118:16	103:25 118:4	44:15 45:4	development
120:5 173:21	120:25,25	63:9 104:24	10:25 14:21
departments	design 82:5,11	195:11	17:1,10,14
102:2	148:1,18	determined	19:15 25:16
depend 44:18	158:25	85:21 122:6	27:5,7,25
120:18	designated	determines	30:20 31:8
depending	53:15	90:23	34:10 36:18
150:11			37:6,21 38:4

45:1,19,21	died 63:18	diminution	discipline
46:3,10,23	difference 27:9	176:21	100:15,20
47:25 49:19	116:18	dire 146:12	101:14,17,19
55:23 63:13	differences	163:13	101:21,25
64:5 66:14	124:8	direct 104:21	102:3 105:15
70:4 85:25	different 17:8	105:9 111:11	113:2,3,5,10,12
90:2 91:6	19:10 20:6	111:18,23	114:6,9 116:7
128:11 129:16	23:19 26:3	117:21	116:17 119:20
130:15 131:7	35:11 46:1	direction 17:5	120:22 122:20
133:24 139:8	50:4 52:1	150:6 186:24	124:9
144:12,16,19	73:24,25 84:18	directly 100:6	disciplined
145:4 149:3	85:8 94:1	director 64:18	107:2
157:10 171:1,2	97:13 109:7	99:17 102:21	disciplining
171:13 172:3	113:21 122:5	115:3 118:14	118:10
172:13,15	122:14 123:14	118:22,23	disclosure
174:13 175:14	141:21,25	129:9 145:23	78:23 82:19
175:15 179:25	142:6,7 148:1	149:1 183:21	112:3
180:1 193:3	157:8,8 161:8	189:1 192:18	discretion
197:24	difficult 40:8	disabilities	122:20
developments	98:18 156:2,6	82:13	discrimination
66:19 82:12	digest 169:5	disability 178:9	79:22 80:19
135:19 144:10	digesting 169:4	disabled 79:4	81:23,25 87:1
144:23 163:3	digital 201:8	disagree 55:15	discriminatory
163:24	202:3	189:22	80:5,13 86:22
devoted 114:25	dike 156:9	disagreement	discuss 91:20
dhs 24:3	dilemma 169:4	107:7	115:8 126:9
dialogue 17:11	diligence	disciplinary	discussed
17:22,24 26:25	112:12	103:19 105:13	145:10 146:13
diane 2:15 6:13	diminish	105:21 113:20	172:10 187:10
26:15	193:11	114:2 116:9,10	discussion 9:3
dictate 121:18	diminishes	116:11,21	22:18 53:19
dictates 114:1	165:8	117:14 119:14	65:6 79:20
die 63:11	diminishing	120:16 121:8	disempowering
	42:25 86:7	123:2,8 124:18	14:14

disenfranchise	16:25 18:14	disturbing	domain 73:3
10:8	19:6 21:22,25	116:15	doors 126:22
disenfranchis	22:21 28:17	dive 7:8 132:15	double 125:10
30:13	30:9,22 31:20	diverged 112:7	dr 2:6 6:12
disincentivizes	35:21 37:22,24	divergent	91:24 92:3
162:18	38:20 39:3	10:24	94:2 107:19
disinvestment	44:8 45:2	diverse 48:22	108:9,24
83:7	48:13 50:25	90:8 93:9	109:14 124:11
dismantling	54:7 74:15,17	195:4,25	124:15 167:9
32:7 144:2	93:19,20	diversity 94:17	168:21 169:3
193:15	127:24 128:23	division 23:7	169:13
dismissed	133:8 134:20	27:1 54:13,13	draft 23:7
101:1 120:15	135:8 136:3,11	doctoral	83:17
dispense 171:2	137:1 143:3	115:25	drafting 139:3
dispersed 40:4	158:1 168:10	document	dramatic
disposal 41:20	169:25 170:3	108:5	121:10 122:2
disposition	170:14,17,24	documents	dramatically
85:23	174:8,11 191:2	81:15 143:16	93:6 162:17
disproportion	195:12	doi 55:1	drill 35:1
48:17,19	district's	doing 16:25	drive 19:5,10
disregarded	138:15	22:2 23:3	133:5
40:18 42:1	districts 17:8	39:13 45:22,23	driven 15:9
distance 9:13	18:17 19:11,13	45:24 71:1,2,6	41:18 138:24
9:14 163:6	26:4 38:3,7,19	84:15 98:5	195:23
distinguished	44:4 47:12,19	134:5 136:9	driver 17:22
125:19	47:22 49:20	143:4 145:10	drives 86:22
distributed	129:7 131:9	167:12 168:10	146:17
129:24	134:10 135:1	185:5 191:24	driving 16:23
distribution	136:8,24	dollar 46:18	17:25 154:4
15:20 45:15	138:22 143:8	dollars 11:10	drop 8:5
130:5,9 133:24	146:21 148:3	12:14 126:6	due 15:15 31:5
134:1	150:13 176:11	135:19,24	85:12,12
district 9:22	192:18	154:19 155:24	112:11 121:10
12:5 16:12,13		186:1	154:5,6

duly 201:5	easy 46:12	120:5 144:9	elephant 73:18
duty 93:10	58:20 78:10	193:12	elevate 14:11
161:6,21	echo 181:1	eight 52:22,23	63:4
duvivier 4:7	economic 15:5	55:16,18 122:6	elevating 76:2
175:4 179:20	180:10,17	126:4 135:22	eliminate 33:13
179:21,24	182:18	178:13	164:8 193:12
dying 177:11	editorials	eighteen	eliminated
dynamic 70:22	128:20	126:10	164:10
94:16,22 195:5	edits 108:3	eighty 31:11	eliminating
dynamics	educate 88:5	einstein 198:16	79:22
90:10 158:16	educated 28:5	either 20:7	else's 51:8
e	education 14:5	77:20 102:3	email 8:16
e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1	18:3 29:12	106:6,9 107:13	embed 80:23
4:1 5:1,1	76:24 80:11	138:12 192:12	embody 71:8
eager 148:19	179:5,7	elderly 178:8	embrace
earlier 30:19	effect 5:19	elected 5:25	148:17
early 37:12	15:21 65:9	22:7 35:4	embracing
158:6	67:9 159:14	40:21 55:25	196:8
earned 156:14	effective 5:13	63:15 74:15	emergency
156:17	15:19 62:13	154:16 170:8	72:6 90:1,7
earth 164:21	75:5 104:2	171:11 181:24	91:5,8 94:7
eases 163:24	119:8	190:5	95:1,13,25
easier 130:13	effectively	electing 190:16	96:7,17
130:21	45:16 73:20	election 5:18	emerging 119:3
easily 119:8	75:8	55:2 191:13	eminent 73:3
158:19	effects 146:11	elections	emotional
east 11:18	efficiency	187:14 191:10	113:13
	84:22 119:6	195:2	empathy 62:4
39:17,22 99:21	effort 62:18	electoral	emphasis 66:24
99:24 127:4,5 127:16 136:12	81:18	189:24 195:6	89:7 188:15
138:2 143:18	efforts 20:22	element 35:3	emphasize 65:6
170:2 175:24	23:3 27:11	65:17	employed
	81:20 87:4	elements 38:13	201:11,14
186:20	115:23 118:25	65:4 145:9	202:8,11

employee	81:8,20 82:1	ensures 144:11	equitable
201:13 202:10	106:3 115:21	170:9 175:15	149:11,23
empower 89:25	123:12 147:14	180:18	180:2,24 182:5
126:1 128:16	enforcing 26:5	ensuring 11:1	196:9
196:6	engage 29:4,5	15:24 144:3	equity 14:15
empowering	77:3 87:25	152:12 171:19	31:15 32:21
14:14 27:12	98:16 168:2	172:25	76:22 77:7,11
28:9	engaged 28:10	entail 187:16	80:2 83:8
enabled 12:4	28:13,23 29:11	enter 34:2	127:8 146:24
enabling 145:3	37:12	69:18	180:18 181:3
enacted 116:8	engagement	entered 15:12	erode 98:25
encourage 21:7	11:25 12:2	entering 34:1	erodes 120:3
91:12 146:25	14:16,23 27:20	entire 5:16 6:16	es 201:4
172:13 182:23	150:23 161:5	7:19,21,22	especially 6:24
183:8 195:18	167:22,25	26:18 148:5,10	15:2 31:14
encouraged	180:19 183:9	175:9	33:4 39:23
92:6 195:17	183:19 195:16	entrenched	83:22 146:4
encouraging	engaging 45:6	90:9	154:13 183:3
27:12 145:3	enhance 171:22	environment	184:7 187:1
163:14	enhanced	117:23 196:4	193:2,8 195:4
ended 26:16	54:10	environmental	197:7,7
104:15	enhancing	12:24 32:4	essential 6:23
endorse 197:5	174:18	70:14 144:12	14:17 104:4
ends 29:10	enormous 46:2	164:5	105:6 120:17
endure 120:10	46:3	environments	172:19 173:5
enforce 82:3,10	ensure 5:8 15:6	85:17	essentially
103:15 119:20	25:7 37:5	envisioned	67:15 185:24
181:4	82:11,16 89:13	77:18	establish 53:10
enforceable	103:14 104:13	equal 18:6	85:14 90:24
89:24 181:3	116:8,8 118:2	equally 129:24	118:19
enforced 119:9	144:17 145:7	153:20	established
185:20	172:23 173:23	equipped	174:10
enforcement	174:17 180:6	195:24	establishing
49:5,12 79:24			84:24,25 85:7

estate 88:5	eventual	122:5 147:19	149:1 183:21
estimate 75:2	195:12	161:6 163:17	189:1 192:17
estimate 75.2		170:11 176:10	
	eventually		exempt 131:4
173:13	163:18	182:17 188:14	exempted
estimates 54:16	evers 199:23	191:12 196:16	133:15
et 33:13	everybody	197:24	exist 94:5,13
evaluate 81:16	29:20 141:24	examples	106:10,16
evaluated	141:24 148:24	111:21	107:9,13
137:22	161:20 183:17	excellent 11:14	177:10 193:6,6
evaluating	everyday 32:16	143:5 162:11	existed 174:3
85:10 181:18	eviction 174:20	162:12	existing 12:19
181:20	174:22	exception	44:6 71:22
evaluation	evidence 106:5	117:17	142:17 144:25
85:15 144:19	117:13	exchange 76:25	175:17 176:21
evaporate	evident 141:8	excited 28:18	192:24 197:17
119:9	exacerbate	28:19	exists 35:2
evaporates	76:13	exclude 21:14	69:12 81:25
105:20	exacerbated	198:21	100:15 107:11
evening 8:11	77:8	excluded 195:9	162:7 172:17
9:19 21:9 30:6	exacerbates	exclusion	expand 20:7,7
64:16,21 87:14	76:21	146:18	32:19 69:4
88:21,23 89:8	exact 111:1	exclusive 146:5	82:14 93:7
91:17 102:19	exactly 47:8	exclusively	126:16 155:6
114:19 118:6	92:23 144:8	89:9 174:12	163:2
129:8,9 143:12	159:13 183:4	excuse 58:1	expanded 41:4
145:22 162:2	examine	77:14 81:18	119:1 143:7
165:2 169:20	142:24	86:12 151:4	expanding
179:21 183:16	example 11:14	162:14 163:13	104:11 107:20
188:22 192:16	13:15 19:19	181:8	108:10 117:20
194:13 196:19	20:10 31:2	execution	132:22 174:16
event 8:10	37:24 52:7	185:23	expansion
65:19,19 66:8	54:3 81:22	executive 64:18	89:13
73:17	91:25 92:5	99:17 118:22	expectation
	93:5,13 112:4	118:22 145:23	196:17

expectations	extend 163:4	174:22	159:4 160:3
77:19 104:5	extended 16:4	fact 25:12	161:16 167:13
expediency	27:16 84:16	43:25 44:18	167:17 168:3
171:3	extending	46:2 47:21	168:11 181:4
expedite 85:24	14:24 157:22	51:4 61:21	185:19 191:2
89:16	186:7	77:8 98:19	fairness 36:24
expensive	extent 77:21	123:10 136:1	82:16 196:5
83:22 127:4	86:21 88:15	190:5	faith 19:12
131:22 138:15	129:21	factors 121:11	105:20
154:2	extraordinary	122:4 123:15	fall 68:2,6
experience	70:15	failed 89:19	familiar 30:22
68:16 69:7	f	128:8	56:21
75:21 152:1	fabric 17:18	failing 72:11	families 7:3
153:8	face 10:20	103:12	27:16,16 31:11
experienced	40:24	fails 105:5	40:4 127:3,8
176:11	faced 62:2	failure 105:18	128:6 183:24
experiences	faces 15:3	failures 117:18	192:9
115:10 140:2	21:24	fair 16:23	family 127:1
experiencing	facet 48:15	25:25 26:1,3	128:9 133:12
62:3 98:10	facets 20:14	45:14 49:3,4,7	133:13 184:14
164:2	46:17	64:12 67:25	fan 61:13
expertise 81:6	facilitate 88:12	72:25 77:16,17	far 15:12 31:3
experts 5:25	149:23	77:21 78:6,21	
57:7 72:13	facilitating	79:20,24 80:7	173:3
93:16	180:4	80:9,23 81:3,7	farias 4:11 9:11
expiring 52:3	facilitator	81:8,10,14,19	9:15,19,20
explain 169:4	153:3	86:19 89:5,23	12:11 16:17
explore 5:11	facilities 48:16	90:14 92:19	19:18 23:4
exponential	49:9 78:9	93:15 96:21	26:13 29:19
154:8	facility 49:8	121:1 124:6	68:13
expose 117:15	78:11	131:7,9 146:24	fast 86:4 90:2
express 187:24	facing 9:25	147:6,7,12	96:7 130:23
extell 60:7	66:13 174:19	150:5,14 158:4	147:5,15 158:9
		158:12,22	158:23 182:10

	T	I	I
183:5 187:25	186:4	filled 104:18	finish 95:23
188:18 192:2	feet 191:25	final 85:19	147:20
197:6	199:16	105:13 112:15	finished 7:22
faster 130:15	felix 3:19	112:23 113:20	105:15
199:4	fellow 5:20	114:1 116:22	fire 102:5
fastest 192:2	7:20 8:23 40:2	117:14 118:10	106:11
fatigue 99:2	168:23	120:16 124:22	firmly 143:20
favor 9:4 36:25	fellows 53:4	134:13	first 19:18
51:20 62:22	felt 62:21 69:22	finally 22:20	24:18 26:19
102:9 199:19	136:16 167:20	66:6 70:5	31:5,8 34:1
favorite 93:5	fewer 116:6,17	131:12,23	35:4 36:16
fcrc 51:19,24	122:11 124:10	174:14 190:12	40:21 43:18
fears 62:11	173:3,6 175:19	196:4,22	44:10 47:6
feature 75:11	fhjc 79:20 80:1	finance 69:4	55:11 56:9
february 64:22	80:12 81:1	financially	63:1 64:7
146:22	fiction 61:21	201:15 202:11	68:11 71:6
federal 80:7	field 69:7 109:5	financing 13:2	74:22 75:9,19
129:15 179:6	fifth 149:1,8,14	32:5 34:8	77:5 79:16
federally	150:1 155:17	155:21 185:24	92:9 98:3,7
178:24	156:13	186:3	99:15,19
fee 174:5,6	fight 25:14	find 5:22 8:1,14	102:25 104:7
feedback 169:6	40:22 64:12	14:11 22:4	118:21,25
feel 27:13 28:13	111:13 119:6	33:5,10 34:15	126:12 130:20
28:14 29:7,15	162:8 164:19	73:2 76:17	130:22 133:21
33:17 43:14	fighting 57:18	157:18 197:18	139:24 142:10
52:10 54:21	138:2	finding 23:11	153:4 158:2
59:14 139:25	figure 60:7	64:8	167:10,15
141:19 145:20	159:2 160:7	findings 66:22	168:4 171:4
160:8 161:2	figuring 159:18	119:24	175:9 190:19
167:25 190:24	file 103:9	fine 42:20	196:24 197:5
feels 49:23	filed 121:23	106:3 110:6	198:7
161:11 167:25	files 112:5	finely 42:19	firsthand 10:19
fees 156:14,15	filing 80:5	finger 156:9	119:7,12
174:9,11 186:4			

[fiscal - fresh] Page 30

G and 90.6	100.02 102.01	f ormer 02.22	162.25 164.0
fiscal 89:6	120:23 123:21	forgo 93:23	162:25 164:8
fit 129:19	125:11 159:9	form 7:25 8:5	fourth 34:2
fits 22:24	followed 79:14	103:24 161:21	fraction 128:1
five 22:25	87:12 114:17	formal 69:18	framework
26:19 56:20	169:18 175:4	formalized	25:25 26:1
95:9 119:2	following 99:13	85:1	68:1 89:6,24
135:9 146:24	109:16 126:3	formalizes	90:3,14 92:19
176:6 190:13	follows 49:4	170:8	93:15 96:22,23
fix 190:18	193:14	former 61:6	131:8,10
fixing 13:4	foot 70:22	128:24 132:2	147:12 150:5
177:9	176:5	134:3	150:15 158:22
fleshed 107:25	footage 105:6	formerly 62:14	159:4,20 160:3
flexibility 86:2	111:18	forming 164:4	161:16 181:14
flood 12:14	force 13:18	forms 96:12	184:5 185:19
flooding 185:11	80:19 115:18	formulas 78:19	frampton 3:4
185:11	151:10,24	forward 19:1	192:15,17
floor 175:25	152:16,19	22:12 43:22	franchise 51:18
flow 104:23	176:3	56:7 69:12	189:25
focus 7:6 13:4	forced 92:17	136:14 137:9	franchising
14:4 32:18	173:2	143:9 167:14	190:19
35:17 83:20	forces 105:2	171:21 183:1	frankly 41:16
89:8 130:17	forcing 27:22	186:8	158:25 159:5
131:16 147:2	foreclosure	foster 196:3	159:16
150:18 182:9	185:9	found 8:2	fraud 178:7
focused 36:12	foregoing	86:23 105:4	fray 174:6
59:21 115:25	201:3,4 202:4	132:16	fred 127:1
130:11 146:4	foreign 177:2	founders	free 145:20
folks 17:25	foremost 98:3,7	199:23	160:8
23:9,15 27:3	forensic 54:13	four 11:18	freezing 166:24
133:25 153:22	forever 98:23	17:20 31:19	167:1
165:1 168:9	99:8 110:11	34:2 35:21	frequently
169:16	forge 10:25	127:24 128:6,9	105:3
follow 18:11	forget 172:16	133:13 135:8	fresh 5:7
47:6 109:15	198:14	136:2 157:22	

[front - go] Page 31

front 17:16	funded 15:16	140:23	156:8 178:8
20:14 28:6	136:12 178:6	game 62:22	185:3 194:24
29:7 177:10	189:5	148:8	giant 50:1
178:21,22	funding 34:15	gander 128:17	give 37:24
186:5	34:22 35:9	gap 34:14	39:19 51:12
fruition 45:5	76:10,24,24	gaps 15:14	74:21 92:5
64:3	129:16 174:21	19:24	99:1 101:14,24
fulfill 90:13	182:1	garodnick	105:21 118:9
103:23	funds 163:21	167:20	147:13 166:7
full 12:16 80:8	174:12	gary 60:7	188:5
112:3 120:22	funnest 83:21	gates 3:6	given 44:5
126:5 129:18	further 13:13	139:16,21,24	75:20 81:6
147:1 182:22	18:1 114:13	140:7,8,22,24	86:19 89:7
fuller 187:8	126:9 201:12	general 73:23	109:17 110:15
fully 15:16	202:9	118:15 155:10	120:1 123:9
28:12,13 47:2	furthermore	191:10,12	166:13 182:12
47:3 82:12	170:21	generally 110:1	191:15,23
116:21 159:14	future 41:10	188:18	198:25
172:25 186:23	63:25 86:4	generation	gives 36:25
189:4	95:7 141:11,13	178:12,20	giving 65:25
functioning	163:16 181:7	generational	70:5 111:3,17
20:21 110:21	182:7 187:1	31:16 143:6	137:15 146:16
functions 76:21	189:10,11	generations	165:18 172:8
100:21	futures 10:4	189:11	glad 140:22
fund 53:2	g	geographies	glaring 190:9
136:25 137:5	g 5:1	66:15 67:18	glasses 9:10,14
174:10 178:19	gabriel 3:9	68:2,5	9:14
179:11 194:6	169:17,22	geography	globally 39:1
fundamental	gail 47:14	74:25	go 5:19 17:19
45:10 63:6	gale 4:9 50:11	getting 23:23	28:1 29:22,22
109:22	50:24 56:11	24:9,11 27:20	29:23 34:4,15
fundamentally	60:16 68:14	43:15 68:24	35:8 43:22
64:14	138:18 140:2	127:21 128:4	51:9 56:4,20
	130.10 170.2	134:1 135:1	56:23 57:15,18

[go - gray's] Page 32

	T		
61:15 63:20	56:24 60:21	143:25 145:21	governments
68:20 76:20	67:16 70:10	154:25 162:2	70:3
79:17 84:20	71:14 72:17	162:13 165:1	governs 132:18
93:21 94:10,12	76:17,17 78:18	165:23 166:25	gowanus
95:15 96:10	78:19 83:20	169:20 179:21	149:10 151:11
98:23 99:8,14	84:6,15,20	180:7 183:16	152:2 153:1
102:6 111:12	93:21 96:25	188:22 189:2	grace 2:8 6:11
131:3,5,21,24	112:10 129:18	191:4 192:16	62:19
132:9 134:15	130:2,7 131:20	194:13	grade 99:20,22
138:16 139:5	136:24 140:19	goodness 54:10	100:4,5
143:9 150:22	142:6 147:2	136:9,14	gradually
155:23,24	152:19 154:16	gotten 25:1	74:24
159:2 160:5	155:3 156:1	36:5 136:22	granted 123:7
164:6 174:9	158:17 159:17	govern 195:24	128:13
187:5	159:17 167:16	governance	granting
goal 5:8 39:1	168:22,24	15:7,23 80:24	116:20 120:15
78:16	177:22 179:9	104:17 117:14	grants 115:22
goals 14:18	183:12 185:1	governing 5:7	grasso 1:17
22:4 45:13	192:5 197:16	97:5	201:2,18
86:4 131:10	good 9:16,19	government	grassroots
141:4 150:14	15:23 19:12	10:17 15:22	145:24 180:22
163:24	21:9 27:14	30:18 61:6,9	181:17 189:2,3
god's 57:18	30:6 37:12	70:23 83:6	194:20
goes 29:3,7	46:8,20 50:12	99:1 115:12,13	grateful 27:3
34:11 58:22	58:19 59:20	118:13 119:6	64:8
107:8 110:18	60:1 64:16	141:22 143:21	gratz 3:16
122:24 198:16	68:12 84:15	146:1,2 151:13	169:19 172:5
going 9:9,10	87:14 88:6,21	151:15,18	175:3,7,7
18:3 23:5 24:7	97:9,10 98:4	171:5 177:17	gray 3:8 139:19
26:21 27:15	98:23 102:19	177:18,20	145:21,22
29:15,21,22,23	111:20 113:9	179:2,6,11	155:2 158:24
35:9 39:10	114:19 118:6	180:11 185:25	160:25
45:1 47:5 51:3	119:13 129:8,8	189:2,17 199:3	gray's 197:6
51:13 53:5	132:2 143:12		-

[great - health] Page 33

	1	1	1
great 5:3 9:19	groundwater	guiding 31:18	36:19 37:5
25:3 26:15	185:11	160:6 181:14	51:11 87:1,6
38:1 39:14,15	groundwork	guts 56:9,10,13	129:7 175:22
98:5 107:25	89:17 95:3	gutting 13:5	happens 28:23
125:21 133:22	group 54:14	guys 87:15	38:14 102:11
134:6 135:14	90:7 107:8	88:20 129:22	110:22 150:25
139:10 145:21	136:13,13,25	133:23 154:14	151:19
153:19 163:8	152:9 189:3,21	166:24	happy 23:6,8
179:17 183:25	groups 87:24	h	91:19 123:21
187:15,23	168:14 180:23	half 11:5	139:5 149:21
188:2 194:16	181:17 189:4	166:14,25	151:20
196:16	growing 40:3	182:19	harassment
greater 37:16	154:1 156:8	hamstring	174:17
92:6 116:9	178:3	110:21	hard 60:10
141:1 169:11	grown 153:18	hamstrung	88:4 192:9
186:25 195:16	153:20	111:14	hardest 93:18
196:11	growth 89:12	handful 154:5	harlem 127:16
greatest 162:19	90:10,13 93:21	hands 63:9	136:12 176:2
164:21	98:11 147:9	72:8 104:3	harm 143:24
greatly 169:15	154:8	134:13 152:11	harsher 119:18
172:10 187:8	grunwald	happen 12:22	120:23
greenberger	102:13	13:14 17:12	hassan 3:13
2:12 6:10	guarantee	19:6 26:16	99:13 114:17
143:11 145:12	105:23	32:1,3 57:23	118:7 121:16
greenwich	guardrails	85:6 94:25	hate 118:24,25
143:17	42:13 45:19,25	95:7 148:13	119:1
grocery 172:21	46:17	151:2 193:2	hdc 192:18
gronik 193:5	guards 87:20	happened 11:8	193:18
gross 103:21	guess 19:3 54:4	26:25 31:17	hdfc 67:17
105:18	84:10 121:24	36:17 75:2	head 35:21
ground 36:22	123:12	140:6	heads 13:10
38:13 168:19	guide 181:6	happening	72:10
175:25 189:16	guidelines	19:16,16 25:8	health 79:4
	173:9	17.10,10 23.0	178:5,6 179:4

180:17	heated 61:25	helps 58:24	highly 181:15
hear 5:2,24	heavily 59:22	hemisphere	hill 186:19
7:17 8:8 26:7	195:12	164:11	hiring 32:11
30:2 36:23	heed 13:24	henneberger	historic 144:17
50:10 61:11	heeded 100:23	2:23 186:16	172:2 192:18
76:11 86:23	heeled 76:23	henry 3:5	192:19
91:25 107:23	heels 61:20	145:19 161:25	historical 177:4
112:19 134:4		165:2	
	height 176:8		historically
139:22 155:11	held 192:8	hereto 201:14	184:8
168:22 185:22	hell 54:15 59:8	202:11	histories 41:10
187:20 194:14	59:15	heritage 143:17	history 10:7
heard 7:18	hello 39:12,12	hesitate 58:1	40:1 51:12
14:23 18:15,20	99:16 139:21	hey 168:8,17	149:11 170:1
21:11 42:6	139:21 145:21	hi 30:2,6 35:25	hit 71:25 185:9
43:17 68:13	172:1,2 176:25	61:3 83:14	hitting 46:23
72:21 75:23	helm 120:13	87:14 148:24	93:18
76:8 77:15	121:17,18	154:24 188:22	hoc 181:9
84:6,8 113:18	help 9:10 10:24	194:13 196:23	hold 7:21,21
129:23 130:22	18:1 23:3 27:2	high 121:20	60:23 63:16
137:25 141:24	27:8 28:7	148:21 176:9	95:22 101:8
149:21 151:23	35:17 46:25	198:25	115:7 189:18
158:9 171:16	53:4 62:8	higher 63:5	holding 114:20
171:19 183:25	71:15 93:21	74:25 95:18	holistically
hearing 1:1 5:3	95:19 108:22	173:3 195:15	33:23
5:21 7:6,9,10	136:7 150:17	highest 117:6	home 31:8,13
8:4,4,21 36:12	157:23 159:8	121:22 192:3,3	31:13 32:10
61:20 74:23	174:6 192:21	highlight 64:22	40:24 57:16
89:2 151:5	helped 28:4	66:11 81:7	82:14 138:11
183:19 186:8	118:19 149:9	117:18 142:7	172:22 183:23
199:10	181:25 193:24	184:1	184:8,9,13,14
hearings 5:24	helpful 53:7	highlighted	185:2
8:15,19,20	133:25	73:17	homeless 61:17
21:10 155:9	helping 158:4	highlighting	62:14,19 63:10
182:21	195:9	36:4 65:4	64:12 72:2,5

126:24 127:3	host 24:1	39:1,3,4 41:5	129:23,25
129:4 138:3,9	102:16	42:16 43:15,20	130:7,8,8,14,15
138:11,12	hotels 46:6	44:3 47:18	130:16,22,24
homelessness	hour 29:10	48:12,21 49:3	131:2,4,6,8,9
62:3 71:19	hours 29:10	49:20 53:8	131:10 132:19
90:5 156:10	166:25	57:9 59:7 61:8	132:20,23
164:2	house 126:24	61:11,16 62:10	133:10,22,23
homeowners	133:13 164:21	62:23 63:2,2,8	134:6,9,11,15
10:22 198:14	172:22	63:13,24 64:1	134:18,19
homes 11:4	housed 62:23	64:1,6,9,19,24	135:1,6,20,23
40:19 41:9	96:1	66:14,17,19,21	135:25 136:3,6
146:14,17	household	67:15,19,25	136:8,21,22
147:17 162:22	127:15	68:7 70:18,19	137:20,23
162:24 172:18	houser 61:5	71:2,4,15	138:3,12,21,23
173:2 174:18	houses 127:8	72:16 76:16	139:8 140:24
honest 59:25	housing 6:18	77:24 79:2,20	141:5,9,10,11
60:11 136:9,13	6:23,25 9:24	79:22,24 80:2	143:20 144:22
138:7	9:25 10:13	80:7,9,13,20,23	145:1,6,7,24
honestly 21:12	11:9,22 12:17	81:8,8,10,14,19	146:4,12,19,21
137:24	13:3 14:7,12	81:21 82:16	146:24 147:6,8
honor 5:5	15:4 16:15,24	83:6 86:3,20	147:12 149:4,5
61:15 99:20	17:1,2,2 18:7,8	86:22,25 87:2	149:17 150:5
140:11	19:7,13,15,22	87:3 88:9,18	150:14,19,20
hook 40:11	20:2 21:23,23	89:10,11,14,24	152:4 153:5,9
hope 73:10	22:1,5 23:13	90:1,4,14 91:8	153:18 155:14
178:22	23:14,14,15,19	92:19,22 93:15	155:19,20
hopeful 88:15	23:22,23 24:2	95:1,25 96:21	156:11 158:12
hopefully 7:14	24:6,9,15,19,20	100:6 126:13	158:20,22
59:4 190:11	24:21,22 26:1	126:17,24	159:4 160:3
hopes 62:4	26:23 28:1	127:6,12,14,21	161:16 162:11
hoping 94:24	31:20 32:1,20	127:22 128:2,4	162:12,12,17
horizon 15:17	33:11 35:7,18	128:11,23	162:18,21
hospital 177:13	36:9 37:15	129:1,3,7,10,12	163:11,13,15
	38:11,22,25	129:13,17,21	163:22,25

	I	I	
164:12,14,16	33:24 34:19,23	161:15 183:5,7	impact 37:17
164:17 167:13	34:25 35:12	193:16	63:13 71:1,1,4
167:21 168:11	36:8 37:6 69:3	ideas 5:22,24	85:21 86:6
168:14,25	hubs 23:22	6:5 27:21	144:4 155:6
170:2,3,4,6,19	hudson 176:13	134:6,25	156:4,7 181:22
170:21,23	huge 17:22	137:18 148:20	impacted 39:4
172:11 173:5	61:13 63:12	158:10	185:10
173:11 174:5	148:8 156:19	identified 48:3	impacting
174:12 175:17	159:15	identify 109:10	155:7
176:5 177:12	human 62:23	195:7	impacts 112:22
179:3 180:3,13	63:2,3,8 72:7	idiosyncrasies	144:12 185:14
181:4 182:2,12	hundred 94:7	41:14	impartial 103:8
182:18 183:2,4	126:23 135:23	ignore 103:18	imperfect
184:11,13,17	149:17 150:19	160:8	41:21
184:24 185:4	150:20 170:20	ignored 100:22	impetus 143:9
185:16,17,19	hundreds	105:3	implement
185:23 187:1,2	88:12 145:25	ilan 3:3	82:15 89:20
187:25 188:5	154:18 185:25	illegal 113:15	119:5 188:3
188:10,11,16	hurricane	image 116:16	implementati
188:18 192:25	71:25	imbalance	20:4 63:21
193:7,8 194:4	hurt 178:8	25:19,23 26:8	115:18 147:11
197:7,7,8,17,20	hyper 71:21,22	imbalanced	151:20
197:23 198:6	146:10,11	142:13	implemented
198:21 199:3,4	148:9	immediate	15:15 54:23
housing's 134:1	i	71:24 96:20	93:1 96:24
housings 88:13	ibo 54:3	immediately	159:1
houston 164:20	idea 34:7 48:12	89:16	importance
how's 114:20	63:20 67:13	immigrant	14:20 84:12
howard 3:17	68:2 74:18,21	40:25	88:6,19 95:24
60:22 64:18	75:2 76:2,3,12	immigrated	172:16
71:12 72:18,20	93:14 95:12	5:10	important 15:6
130:23 158:14	98:23 160:15	immunocom	17:8 29:14
hpd 13:1 20:10	160:18 161:4,4	177:11	35:10 41:22,25
20:13 32:5	100.10 101.4,4		42:23 63:4

69:11 75:13	incentivize	174:21 182:12	119:22 123:15
78:13,15 79:19	45:21 193:7	incomplete	145:24 190:1
83:25 104:20	incentivizing	86:6	190:19 196:4
114:24 144:18	46:8 85:23	inconsistency	independently
146:6 184:6	inclined 93:8	123:11	109:24
195:4 198:5	include 21:13	inconsistent	independents
importantly	65:24 82:17	119:15	189:14 195:8
6:2 30:23	97:17 163:4	incorporate	individual 44:7
105:12	170:19 189:12	65:9	92:12 125:21
impose 118:10	included 38:19	incorporating	142:11,13,20
119:18	65:2 109:4	85:17 163:10	165:22 198:19
improve 14:1	152:5,6 199:9	increase 14:5	198:21
41:21 68:17	includes 12:18	126:12,22	individually
77:11 115:23	including 11:4	133:10 162:17	53:15 72:16
116:14 119:6	11:19 13:20	163:18	individuals
180:11 189:17	33:17 77:24	increased	41:19 80:4
improved	80:9 81:15	80:16 89:16	inducted
77:21 190:23	84:1 87:19,24	90:12 154:20	181:13
improvement	106:12 115:15	154:23	industries
194:2	118:18 127:3	increases 34:9	144:1
improvements	129:1 176:10	154:4	industry 61:9
13:21 69:10	181:2,16	increasing	88:4,5 155:7
163:7	189:25	84:22 108:15	156:4,7
improving	inclusion 32:19	increasingly	inequality 77:9
31:24 84:22	inclusive 5:13	15:3 31:14	inflation 192:3
inaccessible	14:7 79:23	incredible	influence
31:14	149:24 195:6	39:24 162:22	104:12 117:15
inadequate	inclusivity	independence	inform 56:5
86:5 181:14	82:16	53:25 104:10	182:6
incarceration	income 6:22,24	independent	information
99:19	36:19 83:5	6:3 70:20	93:15 104:24
incentive	127:13,15,15	93:16 101:7	105:1,8 111:16
165:10 166:6	127:17,23	103:8 104:1,8	115:10 129:21
	156:14,17	105:11 117:9	130:2 168:15

193:23	inside 61:9	119:20	49:1
informed	insight 149:19	intense 56:15	interventions
102:23	insights 171:9	intent 103:23	49:1
infrastructure	inspector	intentional	intimate 41:15
10:14 12:7,12	118:15	180:18	42:4
15:14 37:25	inspire 191:9	intentions	intimately
38:7 81:17	instance 52:3	37:12	30:21 40:24
89:14 90:16	instances 106:6	interest 46:9,15	introduce
97:25 98:4,11	institute 115:20	46:19,23 65:20	74:18
157:7 164:15	institution 16:2	74:8 154:22	invest 43:24
177:13 184:7	118:3	173:7 189:4	184:6
184:10 198:25	institutionali	interested	investigate
199:1	119:9	42:16 45:6	116:21
inherent 74:13	institutions	86:23 106:4	investigated
inhibit 117:8	142:17	129:5 139:6	103:11
inhibits 64:6	instrument	201:15 202:12	investigating
initial 23:10	41:24	interesting	116:6
initiated	insufficient	16:18 197:13	investigation
181:10	66:16,20 67:18	interests 10:24	51:2 54:4,6,13
initiative 81:2	68:7	16:1,10,10,13	103:17 105:4
175:13	insulted 167:20	40:16 41:18	118:17 120:22
initiatives 15:9	insurance	43:3,8 48:23	investigations
innovative 20:9	178:7,8 179:5	90:9 142:9,19	80:10 101:4
input 25:20	integrated 75:4	142:22 156:23	105:8 107:16
26:10 32:21	integrates	interim 83:15	118:17 119:24
33:13,13 37:1	97:23	104:15,15	investigative
86:6 94:11	integrating	110:9,11	80:12 87:4
96:14 161:10	65:15	117:21	119:22
170:19 171:7	integrity	intern 162:4	investigator
171:11 181:25	119:12 120:2	internal 120:6	118:15
193:21 198:5	121:2	interrupt 44:18	investigators
198:18	intelligent 60:3	99:24 140:10	111:18
inputs 187:4,6	intended 73:11	intervention	investigatory
	103:7 107:4	42:11 46:25	112:5

investment	57:3 66:13	jessica 3:20	133:19 135:3
81:17 157:6	71:21 72:23	60:22 61:1,5	136:23 137:24
168:6 184:15	74:4 79:4,5	68:11 71:13	139:1,14
investments	93:11 100:8,13	120:4	karl 3:5 145:19
11:10 12:6,12	100:14 114:23	job 1:18 11:12	161:25 165:2
14:22 89:14	121:15 122:18	61:14 62:8	katherine
98:8 184:10,23	135:5,25 146:7	72:3 84:15	198:16
invite 60:21	147:4 155:11	97:9,10 98:5	kathryn 2:14
87:10	157:4,5 187:8	99:20 112:11	6:14 16:8
inviting 61:4	188:2 189:23	jobs 11:22 88:6	katz 3:20 60:22
involved	190:11 192:7	join 175:8	61:3,5 69:8
151:13 187:9	issues 12:7,13	joining 6:8	70:24 71:18
involvement	20:24,25,25	191:5	75:20 76:15
26:19 32:9	34:19 41:5	joy 202:2,15	78:21
88:2 183:8	51:12 65:3	judgment 6:5	keep 7:12 23:4
involves 170:13	71:23 74:16	78:20	178:3
ippaso 3:11	77:7,11 78:17	julie 2:7 6:13	keeping 7:15
87:13 99:12	82:22 92:13	jump 168:22	keeps 154:1
102:19,20	100:8 115:9	june 192:8	172:18,18
108:13 111:20	117:1 130:12	jurisdictions	ken 2:25
112:1 113:16	154:13 182:13	92:15	187:19
114:10,15	187:9	jury 93:10	kept 172:24
ireland 93:6	it'd 101:16	161:6,21	keri 3:21 79:13
irrationality	107:25	justice 79:20	83:14
198:20	item 66:12	86:20 105:9	key 64:24 65:17
irrespective	items 23:5	115:14,22	100:13 162:11
44:25	j	180:3,10	162:12
ish 146:14	jail 176:2	k	kicks 189:20
island 56:22	james 51:4	k 186:17	kids 27:16
57:2 68:23,23	jams 22:22	kallos 3:24	killed 176:3
129:2	jerrod 4:3	114:17 125:15	kimberly 4:6
issue 16:16	jersey 141:1	125:19 128:15	169:19 175:4
21:11 44:5		132:14 133:15	177:1
53:20 56:13			

[kind - lander] Page 40

			I
kind 25:12,20	46:12 47:13,23	156:13 158:2,3	123:11 182:12
25:23 26:6,8	48:3,5 49:15	159:2,8,13	lacking 45:9
26:11 31:16	51:19 53:9,13	166:24 167:1	60:4
36:15,25 44:16	54:15,20 55:11	167:18 170:25	lacks 103:15
45:4 52:9	55:12,24 56:19	177:21 183:3	laid 68:1
54:18 59:15	56:20,21,22	185:23 186:24	land 9:24 10:6
71:19 72:11,16	57:1,11,12,13	196:18	10:16 11:3,24
73:1 75:22	57:14,22 58:4	knowing 25:19	13:17 14:1,6
77:2,4 78:24	60:2,4,8,10,18	40:6	14:17 18:5
79:2,9,10	65:6 69:4,17	knowledge	21:4 27:1 29:4
97:25 108:21	70:6,9,9 71:25	84:2 201:9	30:12 35:14
133:5 141:6	74:14,21 76:1	202:6	41:2 51:17
142:16 158:14	78:2,7 84:11	known 148:14	52:24 53:10
161:5 173:17	93:18 94:6	knows 6:20	55:17 56:14
177:17 188:5	95:4,6 96:2,15	47:14 51:6	57:6 58:16,23
198:2,8	97:9 99:6,12	krueger's	59:20 60:11
kinds 67:8	100:15 106:3,5	138:17	64:7,24 65:8
77:22,23	106:15 109:1	l	65:10,23 66:7
111:19	111:1,5 112:8	l 186:14,17	71:22 73:15,19
king 106:18	114:1 123:22	l.a. 102:4	84:3 88:3 89:7
kips 170:12	123:24 124:1	106:17	90:16 93:18
knew 50:20	125:7,8 128:12	la 4:4 139:20	98:1,9 131:2,5
55:11 62:9	128:18 130:10	148:23,25	137:8 141:5,12
know 5:19 8:11	133:13 134:14	152:1,25 154:9	141:16 142:11
9:15 14:23	138:21,23,24	155:13,17	142:18,21
16:23 17:7	139:19 140:23	156:6 157:2,11	146:9 147:20
20:12 21:12,17	147:23 148:5	157:17,24	149:14 150:21
21:20,24 22:6	149:25,25	labor 87:24	153:12 154:6
23:12 24:6,7	151:23 152:7	192:12	171:16 174:15
25:3 26:2 27:3	152:11,20	lack 10:13	174:15 180:3
29:8 30:23	153:17 154:12	20:21,22 38:7	181:6,21
33:2 34:10,20	154:14,17,21	56:14 77:3	182:11 192:24
35:2,5 36:8	155:5,5,9,11	84:2 117:4,14	lander 88:24
40:23 45:15	156:9,10,11,12	07.2 117.7,17	89:4 160:10

landlord 176:2	197:9	leadership	legislation
landlords	latest 130:2	10:15 15:6	159:14
133:2	latino 184:9	18:19 19:4	legislative 15:2
landmark	launch 118:25	31:17 92:18	15:17 21:15
53:12 118:18	law 1:9 47:9	120:7,8	22:12 23:2,5,7
176:6	51:5 54:22	leading 80:2	93:5
landmarked	106:10 112:15	177:12	legislatively
53:14,17	112:21 113:11	leads 122:22	53:11
landmarks	113:24 114:2	171:12	legislator 162:6
53:15 175:11	115:21 126:16	lean 59:22,23	legislators 88:6
188:8 193:20	132:15,18,22	65:13	legislature
language 113:7	133:16,18	learn 52:24	21:17
140:12,17,19	196:24,25	55:17,17,19	legitimacy
177:2 178:18	laws 73:22	93:11 129:5	120:3
lap 26:17	79:24 80:7	learned 111:4	legitimate
laremont 2:4	81:16	111:10 159:20	150:8 157:5,13
6:12 94:15	lawyers 106:25	leave 102:14	leila 2:10 6:11
large 43:4	lay 95:2	133:4,4 140:13	leila's 156:2
108:18 191:24	layer 92:4	leaves 103:22	lengthy 182:24
194:5	161:3	leaving 102:15	lens 37:19
largely 37:25	layering 155:20	102:16	38:24,25 71:20
102:10 135:7	laying 89:17	led 118:24	79:1 109:7
larger 23:22	lead 86:5 101:4	123:16 137:7	lesson 159:20
43:2 97:11	123:16 192:6	149:9 170:19	letting 99:8
133:2 163:3	195:15 196:11	199:3	164:6
largest 87:16	leader 9:9,11	left 11:1 30:15	level 10:17 11:7
190:3	9:21 16:6	83:5 109:5	23:2 45:13
lasting 120:8	24:18,19,20	legal 80:6,15	55:18 56:15
lastly 14:19	36:2 68:13	111:12	60:9 74:7,18
42:3 194:1	110:18,20	legally 63:3	74:20 75:1,3
lasts 110:11	195:24 196:16	164:13	76:5 92:13
latch 159:4	leaders 5:25	legible 159:11	148:13 159:22
late 186:4	19:11 20:23	legislate 21:13	165:21,22,24
188:25 196:19	24:21 190:5,16		168:9 185:12

levels 74:25	limits 6:25 7:1	livability	127:18 132:18
141:22 181:25	14:25 15:25	176:23	132:22 133:16
leverage 11:14	63:13,23 64:4	livable 84:4	134:13,16
25:7 86:3	64:14 86:9	172:4,20	142:8 146:10
leveraging 25:3	157:22,22	175:12	146:11,15
25:4	181:11	live 7:1 8:19	147:17 148:9
levers 4:5 79:15	line 32:5	10:19 47:24	150:7,8,24
87:11 88:21,23	147:11 164:25	62:20 63:10	171:8 177:17
92:2,8 94:4,23	lines 177:22	135:13 162:13	177:18,20
95:12,17 96:9	link 8:5	168:19 196:17	179:2,11
96:11 97:19,21	lisette 2:6 6:12	196:25	187:11 193:14
98:21	list 2:2 34:3	lived 39:16	localities 70:13
lewyn 4:8	51:4,13,14	47:23 77:18	locally 152:7
196:22,23	52:8 54:1	lives 6:24 41:9	located 174:8
life 44:16 51:16	listen 30:19	62:18 63:10	location 81:20
99:20 151:14	53:8 136:17	64:13 129:2	log 22:22
177:7	listening 16:3	144:4 193:13	long 10:7 15:8
lifelong 61:5	72:20 165:25	living 72:4	15:25 32:3,4
114:24 189:7	166:23 189:15	lo 2:24 186:16	41:6 44:2
194:18	listing 8:16	186:16,19	63:16,17 64:5
light 74:10	lists 57:8	local 10:15	68:15 69:6,24
76:12	litigate 198:2	11:15 12:15	70:10 86:1
likely 64:2	litigation 80:10	13:12 15:14	89:17 92:25
107:1 143:24	little 20:9 41:5	16:10 18:18	103:17 108:5
149:16 198:13	51:12 56:9	19:4 22:6	119:17 123:7
limit 104:12,14	62:18 63:24	23:23 25:2	164:6 166:12
110:17	73:3 84:7 87:2	31:17 32:11	170:1 184:20
limitations	92:18 107:24	36:7 48:5	longer 15:17
117:2	109:19 116:2,3	54:22 63:15	96:18 148:3
limited 18:24	128:2 134:4,11	65:15,16 70:3	156:1,8
83:6 103:16	135:1 136:22	70:23 71:21,22	longstanding
limiting 30:11	154:3 158:20	73:21,22 74:24	12:7,12 143:23
117:20	172:7 198:6	75:8,9,13,15	longtime 31:12
		80:6 87:16	193:18

[look - make] Page 43

17:18 20:16	look 5:7 17:18	176:12	109.10 16	102.1 2 102.20
21:1 27:8,22			198:10,16	102:1,2 193:20
29:1 34:17				
37:9 38:10,18 173:23 174:6 loudest 14:9 30:7 36:2 43:19 74:16 176:19 love 23:4 106:9 65:21 68:13 78:15,19 98:6 lot 19:24 24:8 107:9 108:3 73:8 108:7 100:24 110:22 25:6 35:18 128:3 155:11 109:25 144:24 110:22 123:21 36:10,12 38:19 161:21 190:15 124:4 138:25 40:7 41:25 loved 54:21 make 5:12,12 145:5 171:21 43:15,17,24 lovely 62:24 10:25 13:25 173:25 179:9 48:22 52:13,20 low 6:22,24 20:1,19 22:8 186:8 189:16 56:13 57:5,9 36:19 57:16 25:5,12,14 190:11 60:1,10 61:12 83:5 85:21 30:24 36:6 1ooking 6:17 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 100:9,22 13:13 114:22 13:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 23:23 190:14 128:15,18 168:8 147:25 <td>,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	,			
43:19 74:16 176:19 love 23:4 106:9 65:21 68:13 78:15,19 98:6 lot 19:24 24:8 107:9 108:3 73:8 108:7 100:24 110:22 25:6 35:18 128:3 155:11 109:25 144:24 110:22 123:21 36:10,12 38:19 161:21 190:15 124:4 138:25 40:7 41:25 loved 54:21 make 5:12,12 145:5 171:21 43:15,17,24 lovely 62:24 10:25 13:25 10:25 13:25 173:25 179:9 48:22 52:13,20 low 6:22,24 20:1,19 22:8 25:5,12,14 190:11 60:1,10 61:12 83:5 85:21 30:24 36:6 25:5,12,14 190:11 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 23:11,12 29:12 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 39:2 190:14 128:15,18 13:21 136:20				· /
78:15,19 98:6 lot 19:24 24:8 107:9 108:3 73:8 108:7 100:24 110:22 25:6 35:18 128:3 155:11 109:25 144:24 110:22 123:21 36:10,12 38:19 161:21 190:15 124:4 138:25 40:7 41:25 loved 54:21 make 5:12,12 145:5 171:21 43:15,17,24 lovely 62:24 10:25 13:25 173:25 179:9 48:22 52:13,20 low 6:22,24 20:1,19 22:8 186:8 189:16 56:13 57:5,9 36:19 57:16 25:5,12,14 190:11 60:1,10 61:12 83:5 85:21 30:24 36:6 1ooking 6:17 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 39:2 190:14 128:15,18 made 10:10 20:23 31:13 32:9 53:16 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 148:12,18 <t< td=""><td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
100:24 110:22 25:6 35:18 128:3 155:11 109:25 144:24 110:22 123:21 36:10,12 38:19 161:21 190:15 124:4 138:25 40:7 41:25 loved 54:21 make 5:12,12 145:5 171:21 43:15,17,24 lovely 62:24 10:25 13:25 173:25 179:9 48:22 52:13,20 low 6:22,24 20:1,19 22:8 186:8 189:16 56:13 57:5,9 36:19 57:16 25:5,12,14 190:11 60:1,10 61:12 83:5 85:21 30:24 36:6 looking 6:17 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 160xb 23:20 131:21 136:20 153:14 154:10 20:23 31:13 32:9 53:16 16op 12:24 153:14 154:10 108:4 144:6 107				
110:22 123:21 36:10,12 38:19 161:21 190:15 124:4 138:25 40:7 41:25 loved 54:21 make 5:12,12 145:5 171:21 43:15,17,24 lovely 62:24 10:25 13:25 173:25 179:9 48:22 52:13,20 low 6:22,24 20:1,19 22:8 186:8 189:16 56:13 57:5,9 36:19 57:16 25:5,12,14 190:11 60:1,10 61:12 83:5 85:21 30:24 36:6 looking 6:17 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 175: 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 81:24 82:24 16obs 23:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 100:3,21 101:7 10pgdd 104:9 154:20 155:4 154:20 155:4 151:19 199:24 100:3,21 101:7	ĺ .			
124:4 138:25				
145:5 171:21 43:15,17,24 lovely 62:24 10:25 13:25 173:25 179:9 48:22 52:13,20 low 6:22,24 20:1,19 22:8 186:8 189:16 56:13 57:5,9 36:19 57:16 25:5,12,14 190:11 60:1,10 61:12 83:5 85:21 30:24 36:6 looking 6:17 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 89:23 91:10 96:20 98:7 164:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 153:14 154:10 73:16 75:23 106:716,21 10psided 104:9 158:9,10,24 160:6 161:15 130:16,21 127:23 130:6		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
173:25 179:9 48:22 52:13,20 low 6:22,24 20:1,19 22:8 186:8 189:16 56:13 57:5,9 36:19 57:16 25:5,12,14 190:11 60:1,10 61:12 83:5 85:21 30:24 36:6 looking 6:17 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 13:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 made 10:10 96:20 98:7 164:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 154:20 155:4 158:9,10,24 158:9,10,24 160:6 161:15 160:6 161:15 151:19 199:24 110:7,12,19 116:21 120:14 127:23 130:6 10sing 40:5 161:17 165:24 168:5 178:7,9 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 171:22 180:16 140:13 142:25 145:1				
186:8 189:16 56:13 57:5,9 36:19 57:16 25:5,12,14 190:11 60:1,10 61:12 83:5 85:21 30:24 36:6 looking 6:17 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 35:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 89:23 91:10 10oks 23:20 131:21 136:20 89:23 91:10 96:20 98:7 57:15 157:8 146:8 147:25 168:4 144:6 100:3,21 101:7 104:7 107:15 10oped 29:15 154:20 155:4 158:9,10,24 151:19 199:24 100:7,12,19 10se 17:25 160:6 161:15 130:12 130:16,21 10sing 40:5 161:17 165:24 135:10 175:16 168:5 178:7,9 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 145:1,6 172:19		' '		
190:11 60:1,10 61:12 83:5 85:21 30:24 36:6 looking 6:17 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 made 10:10 96:20 98:7 160sks 23:20 131:21 136:20 73:16 75:23 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 100:3,21 101:7 1opsided 104:9 158:9,10,24 158:9,10,24 151:19 199:24 100:7,12,19 116:21 120:14 127:23 130:6 1osing 40:5 161:17 165:24 168:5 178:7,9 183:25 185:8 171:22 180:16 140:13 142:25 145:1,6 172:19 140:13 142:25 145:1,6 172:19 172:21 190:11 <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>· ·</td> <td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td>		1	· ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
looking 6:17 62:13 71:23 147:9 174:21 38:14 39:2 17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 109:4 48:8 53:8 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 made 10:10 96:20 98:7 164:20 146:8 147:25 148:12,18 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 153:14 154:10 154:20 155:4 108:4 144:6 104:7 107:15 10psided 104:9 158:9,10,24 160:6 161:15 151:19 199:24 110:7,12,19 10sing 40:5 161:17 165:24 168:5 178:7,9 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 130:16,21 140:13 142:25 175:20 192:1 185:10,18,21 172:21 190:11 172:21 190:11	186:8 189:16	56:13 57:5,9	36:19 57:16	25:5,12,14
17:5 20:6,11 73:25 78:12 191:11,14 44:10 45:12,13 23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 199:4 48:8 53:8 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 1uxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 89:23 91:10 96:20 98:7 160:8 23:20 146:8 147:25 146:8 147:25 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 148:12,18 32:9 53:16 100:3,21 101:7 10opp 120:24 153:14 154:10 158:9,10,24 108:4 144:6 151:19 199:24 100:10,21 10psided 104:9 158:9,10,24 158:9,10,24 130:12 130:12 110:7,12,19 10sing 40:5 161:17 165:24 168:5 178:7,9 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 130:16,21 140:13 142:25 175:20 192:1 185:10,18,21 172:21 190:11 172:21 190:11	190:11	60:1,10 61:12	83:5 85:21	30:24 36:6
23:20 24:3,13 83:25 84:10,19 199:4 48:8 53:8 25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 89:23 91:10 96:20 98:7 157:15 157:8 146:8 147:25 32:9 53:16 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 104:7 107:15 1oop 120:24 153:14 154:10 158:9,10,24 151:19 199:24 107:16,21 1opsided 104:9 158:9,10,24 160:6 161:15 130:12 110:7,12,19 1osing 40:5 161:17 165:24 168:5 178:7,9 171:22 180:16 130:16,21 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 145:1,6 172:19 1oss 136:3 185:10,18,21 172:21 190:11	looking 6:17	62:13 71:23	147:9 174:21	38:14 39:2
25:9 27:18 87:2 94:11 lowest 190:7,7 57:23 58:25 28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 89:23 91:10 89:23 91:10 looks 23:20 131:21 136:20 146:8 147:25 166:6 70:18 89:23 91:10 57:15 157:8 146:8 147:25 148:12,18 100:3,21 101:7 100:3,21 101:7 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 148:12,18 153:14 154:10 158:9,10,24 158:9,10,24 158:9,10,24 151:19 199:24 100:7,16,21 100:7,16,21 110:7,12,19 116:21 120:14 127:23 130:6 130:16,21 127:23 130:6 130:16,21 140:13 142:25 145:1,6 172:19 145:1,6 172:19 172:21 190:11 172:21 190:11	17:5 20:6,11	73:25 78:12	191:11,14	44:10 45:12,13
28:11,12 29:12 100:9,22 luxury 127:25 61:16 62:24 33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 89:23 91:10 96:20 98:7 100ks 23:20 131:21 136:20 96:20 98:7 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 148:12,18 153:14 154:10 108:4 144:6 107:16,21 10oped 29:15 154:20 155:4 158:9,10,24 158:9,10,24 151:19 199:24 107:16,21 10se 172:25 160:6 161:15 160:6 161:15 130:12 130:16,21 135:10 175:16 168:5 178:7,9 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 177:22 180:16 145:1,6 172:19 10ss 136:3 185:10,18,21 152:8 86:12 172:21 190:11	23:20 24:3,13	83:25 84:10,19	199:4	48:8 53:8
33:23 42:11,19 107:12 111:4 135:18 176:4 66:6 70:18 72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 made 10:10 89:23 91:10 looks 23:20 131:21 136:20 made 10:10 96:20 98:7 57:15 157:8 146:8 147:25 146:8 147:25 146:8 147:25 164:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 100:3,21 101:7 loop 120:24 153:14 154:10 154:20 155:4 158:9,10,24 151:19 199:24 107:16,21 107:16,21 lose 172:25 160:6 161:15 160:6 161:15 130:12 main 126:11 130:12 130:16,21 135:10 175:16 168:5 178:7,9 171:22 180:16 145:1,6 172:19 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 152:8 86:12 172:21 190:11	25:9 27:18	87:2 94:11	lowest 190:7,7	57:23 58:25
72:7,14 121:20 113:13 114:22 m 81:24 82:24 139:2 190:14 128:15,18 made 10:10 89:23 91:10 looks 23:20 131:21 136:20 20:23 31:13 96:20 98:7 57:15 157:8 146:8 147:25 32:9 53:16 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 104:7 107:15 looped 29:15 154:20 155:4 158:9,10,24 158:9,10,24 151:19 199:24 107:16,21 lose 172:25 160:6 161:15 161:17 165:24 main 126:11 127:23 130:6 losing 40:5 161:17 165:24 maintain 171:22 180:16 140:13 142:25 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 major 11:11 122:21 190:11 loss 136:3 185:10,18,21 72:28 86:12	28:11,12 29:12	100:9,22	luxury 127:25	61:16 62:24
139:2 190:14 128:15,18 89:23 91:10 looks 23:20 131:21 136:20 96:20 98:7 57:15 157:8 146:8 147:25 148:12,18 164:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 100:3,21 101:7 loop 120:24 153:14 154:10 154:20 155:4 108:4 144:6 107:16,21 lopsided 104:9 158:9,10,24 158:9,10,24 110:7,12,19 116:21 120:14 lose 172:25 160:6 161:15 168:5 178:7,9 171:22 180:16 130:16,21 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 171:21 10:11 loss 136:3 185:10,18,21 172:21 190:11	33:23 42:11,19	107:12 111:4	135:18 176:4	66:6 70:18
looks 23:20 131:21 136:20 20:23 31:13 96:20 98:7 57:15 157:8 146:8 147:25 32:9 53:16 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 104:7 107:15 loop 120:24 153:14 154:10 108:4 144:6 107:16,21 looped 29:15 154:20 155:4 151:19 199:24 110:7,12,19 lose 172:25 160:6 161:15 130:12 130:16,21 losing 40:5 168:5 178:7,9 171:22 180:16 130:16,21 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 172:21 190:11 loss 136:3 185:10,18,21 172:21 190:11	72:7,14 121:20	113:13 114:22	m	81:24 82:24
looks 23:20 131:21 136:20 20:23 31:13 96:20 98:7 57:15 157:8 146:8 147:25 148:12,18 100:3,21 101:7 164:20 148:12,18 73:16 75:23 104:7 107:15 loop 120:24 153:14 154:10 108:4 144:6 107:16,21 looped 29:15 158:9,10,24 151:19 199:24 110:7,12,19 lose 172:25 160:6 161:15 130:12 162:11 losing 40:5 161:17 165:24 130:12 130:16,21 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 171:22 180:16 140:13 142:25 175:20 192:1 185:10,18,21 152:8 86:12 172:21 190:11	139:2 190:14	128:15,18	mada 10:10	89:23 91:10
57:15 157:8 146:8 147:25 164:20 148:12,18 loop 120:24 153:14 154:10 looped 29:15 154:20 155:4 lopsided 104:9 158:9,10,24 lose 172:25 160:6 161:15 losing 40:5 161:17 165:24 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 loss 136:3 185:10,18,21 32:9 53:16 100:3,21 101:7 104:7 107:15 104:7 107:15 109:44:6 107:16,21 110:7,12,19 116:21 120:14 127:23 130:6 130:16,21 140:13 142:25 145:1,6 172:19 172:21 190:11 172:21 190:11	looks 23:20	131:21 136:20		96:20 98:7
164:20 148:12,18 loop 120:24 looped 29:15 lopsided 104:7 108:4 144:6 154:20 155:4 158:9,10,24 158:9,10,24 lose 172:25 108:4 144:6 151:19 199:24 main 126:11 130:12 130:16,21 maintain 171:22 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 185:10,18,21	57:15 157:8	146:8 147:25		100:3,21 101:7
loop 120:24 153:14 154:10 108:4 144:6 107:16,21 looped 29:15 154:20 155:4 151:19 199:24 110:7,12,19 lose 172:25 160:6 161:15 160:6 161:15 130:12 127:23 130:6 losing 40:5 168:5 178:7,9 171:22 180:16 140:13 142:25 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 major 11:11 52:8 86:12 172:21 190:11	164:20	148:12,18		104:7 107:15
looped 29:15 154:20 155:4 151:19 199:24 110:7,12,19 lopsided 104:9 158:9,10,24 160:6 161:15 160:6 161:15 130:12 127:23 130:6 losing 40:5 168:5 178:7,9 183:25 185:8 171:22 180:16 140:13 142:25 loss 136:3 185:10,18,21 major 11:11 172:21 190:11	loop 120:24	153:14 154:10		107:16,21
lopsided 104:9 158:9,10,24 main 126:11 127:23 130:6 losing 40:5 161:17 165:24 maintain 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 171:22 180:16 130:12 130:16,21 140:13 142:25 145:1,6 172:19 172:21 190:11	looped 29:15	154:20 155:4		110:7,12,19
lose 172:25 160:6 161:15 130:12 130:16,21 135:10 175:16 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 185:10,18,21 160:6 161:15 130:12 130:16,21 140:13 142:25 145:1,6 172:19 172:21 190:11 172:21 190:11	_	158:9,10,24		
losing 40:5 161:17 165:24 maintain 130:16,21 135:10 175:16 168:5 178:7,9 171:22 180:16 140:13 142:25 175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 major 11:11 172:21 190:11 loss 136:3 185:10,18,21 52:8 86:12 172:21 190:11	_	' '		127:23 130:6
135:10 175:16 175:20 192:1 loss 136:3 168:5 178:7,9 183:25 185:8 185:10,18,21 168:5 178:7,9 171:22 180:16 major 11:11 52:8 86:12 140:13 142:25 145:1,6 172:19 172:21 190:11	losing 40:5	161:17 165:24		
175:20 192:1 183:25 185:8 major 11:11 172:21 190:11 152:8 86:12 145:1,6 172:19				· ·
loss 136:3 185:10,18,21 major 11:11 172:21 190:11		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
22:8 80:12				· '
	173:13,14		52:8 86:12	192:4 193:1,9

193:17	managing	mas 83:16 84:3	mayoral 15:19
makers 28:8	115:3	84:21	41:17 42:14
88:11	mandate 16:20	mass 15:21	54:24,25 88:25
makes 10:22	52:18 80:23	99:19 163:16	maza 2:22
21:19 34:12	103:13 151:1,9	match 98:9	186:15
53:24 59:1,2,2	180:15 181:3	matched 98:11	mckenzie 3:14
69:15 97:22	mandated	matching 126:4	79:12,17 82:7
98:10 99:3	52:16	126:5	83:13 86:25
110:6,8 115:4	mandates	materials 111:3	mckesson 3:10
164:15 166:16	90:14	154:12	87:12 99:11,16
185:18,21	mandatory	math 99:21	99:17,25 100:4
193:21	66:7	167:23	106:8 108:2,25
makeup 109:20	manhattan 8:4	matrix 101:17	109:22 112:24
109:23	56:19 57:4,15	116:11,11,14	114:4,12
making 6:3	169:23,24	matter 60:1	mean 17:21
16:24 21:3,5	170:15,23	73:12 120:12	19:18 23:25
22:10 28:10	176:10	123:7,10	26:15 27:5,21
78:16,17,24	manhattan's	165:21 192:22	27:25 28:1,2
85:19 86:11	176:11	matters 165:21	48:14 59:1
92:9 97:9 99:6	manner 172:14	188:10,11	68:22 69:8
99:6 109:18,20	march 8:24	mayor 13:9,19	71:18 75:12
116:11 122:23	marginalizing	82:18 86:12,13	76:15 93:4
122:25 127:20	13:13	89:25 90:3	96:4 97:21
133:2 146:10	maria 3:23	94:7 101:12	112:3,9 121:13
171:7 187:1	188:21 195:3	104:8 106:14	123:20 124:18
188:12	mark 2:19	107:21 110:1,3	124:22 125:6
manage 18:14	136:11 186:15	110:10,16	132:10 133:6
181:3	market 126:16	138:10 144:7	154:9,10
managed 18:15	126:21,24	145:10	155:17 156:2,7
115:15	127:2 128:8	mayor's 13:16	157:2,17
management	132:9,18 133:5	51:20 54:17,21	meaning
12:13 156:15	markets 82:16	110:7 115:14	104:23 160:17
manages 109:3	133:4	118:23 152:21	171:15

meaningful	141:13 142:1	members 7:10	184:21 195:3
11:25 14:1,16	164:6	16:21 17:25	198:24
117:7 120:13	meeting 8:1,1,9	23:24 25:7	mentioning
meaningfully	8:24,25 29:9	36:13,14 37:10	132:3
10:4	36:7 63:21	37:11 38:2,8	mere 98:14
meaningless	131:9 141:8	42:15,20 43:8	merely 105:19
116:16	150:13 189:19	49:19 74:15	143:23
means 18:6	197:10 199:22	83:24 84:2	merge 165:5
52:24 63:8,23	meetings 8:3	85:8 87:18,24	merging
75:14 78:6	62:1 152:17	99:6 104:11	131:14 151:3
114:4 155:20	167:24 189:20	109:25 125:19	165:18 166:19
155:24 156:1	198:8,12	137:7 143:8	message 120:17
156:17 177:9	meets 25:5	145:25 152:20	messy 159:24
190:14	131:3	162:3 165:11	metro 11:16
meant 40:6	melanie 3:25	166:3 171:23	22:17 26:16
measles 178:7	194:12,17	182:14 188:23	28:17
measure 62:15	melissa 136:11	189:5,6,12,18	metropolitan
70:25 71:5	member 6:1	189:23	141:2
measures 104:4	17:23 21:11,13	membership	michael 4:8
mechanism	25:2 26:12	97:3,12 143:15	196:22
25:22 26:4	36:15 65:19	memo 138:7	michelle 4:4
36:25 41:22	69:14 72:23	memorial	139:20 145:16
96:20 171:6	74:1,13,15	192:12	148:25 153:7
188:3	75:5 77:8	menstruating	155:3 156:20
mechanisms	80:25 83:18	178:23	184:21
45:15 49:13,16	104:18 108:7	mental 79:4	middle 100:5
90:1 187:12	128:19,20	mention 42:7	183:24
medgar 199:22	129:6 147:4	52:6 72:21	midst 6:20 35:5
median 127:13	157:1 167:10	191:25 192:7	midtown 170:3
127:15,15,17	175:10 180:20	mentioned 22:9	196:25
mediate 10:24	188:2,4 194:19	22:17 41:13	might've 71:13
medium 184:20	197:1	95:23 103:5	mildly 77:19
meet 47:20	member's	116:25 117:22	million 12:5,6
62:10 91:19	25:20	121:16 154:15	80:17 135:19

[million - nasa] Page 46

	I	I	
135:24 152:6,8	mission 103:14	164:1 189:4	multiple 9:5
163:20 190:1	103:23 129:14	month 126:25	11:24 118:17
190:13,19	156:16,19	135:12,13	132:24 155:21
millions 6:22	misspelling	months 66:11	170:17 186:1
6:24 12:14	139:18	91:2 94:8	199:20
154:18 185:25	mistaking 83:9	morale 120:3	multitude
mind 19:19	mixed 35:2	moses 3:6	20:14
23:10 120:20	127:23	139:16 140:8	municipal
122:25	model 46:8	140:24	83:15
mindful 172:14	106:13 107:5,7	mother 189:8	mute 30:1
mine 132:4	107:11	motion 8:23 9:4	n
minimums	models 27:6	199:12	n 2:1 3:1 4:1
164:8,10	106:2,5,9	motivate 191:9	5:1 186:14
minneapolis	moderate	move 9:8 14:3	name 5:4 9:20
164:9	195:23	17:4 19:1	61:22 83:14
minor 131:19	moderated 1:4	22:12 33:24	87:15 88:22
minority 9:9	modernize	34:6 35:18	102:19 115:2
minute 126:7	120:5	40:5 46:25	117:25 118:6
minutes 7:13	modernizing	56:7 121:2	129:9 140:7,24
7:15 8:24 9:7	89:6	150:4 175:5	143:13 145:22
misconduct	modest 37:7	183:12 184:16	162:3 165:2
104:22,23	modification	199:13,14	169:22 176:25
105:10,14	65:22	moved 135:16	177:1 179:24
106:7 109:4,11	modified 58:17	199:15	186:14,18
109:12 116:24	modify 67:9	movement	194:17
117:4,5 118:11	moment 28:5	180:21	name's 61:5
119:21,24	177:3	moving 46:10	narcisse 19:20
120:21 121:24	moments 61:25	183:1 192:11	narcotics 54:13
misgivings	62:21	mta 98:16	narrative
62:12	moms 27:17	162:6,7	166:11
mispronounce	money 43:24	multi 184:14	narrow 71:20
139:18	44:20 46:11	multifamily	nasa 38:16
mispronounced	127:2 137:1	126:17 132:10	11 asa 30.10
186:13	138:15 153:2	132:11,23	

0.10	2610271516	100.15	10 15 61 04
nasser 3:12	36:10 37:15,16	189:17	42:15 61:24
115:2	38:8 41:7	needing 35:3	66:23 76:23
national 193:15	46:16,24 47:20	needs 10:21	78:7 81:2
nature 73:21	49:2,10,12,13	16:14 17:9,12	84:14 92:13,22
73:23 74:14	52:25 53:1,22	17:12 19:8	115:16 127:16
75:16 94:17,22	54:9 63:1,25	25:5 31:1	136:20 137:22
122:5 123:18	72:24 76:23	35:17 36:7	144:17 149:10
124:2 188:9	77:2 88:18	37:19 47:1	151:8,12 152:2
naveed 3:13	92:21 94:19,24	48:22 56:9	175:16 181:10
99:13 114:17	96:2 98:7,8,12	70:6 74:9 96:7	188:1 198:15
118:6,7 121:19	98:16,22 104:2	97:18 140:14	198:21
122:19	112:12,19	140:16 141:8	neighborhoods
near 146:16	119:19 120:11	141:14,23	10:11,19 17:13
nearly 11:4	123:20,24	150:9 156:8	30:16 40:3,11
12:5,5 33:18	124:3 128:7,10	163:25 164:7	40:19,23 41:15
66:10 146:1	141:9,10,11	164:22 169:10	47:13 50:18
176:2	144:2 147:6	170:17 181:7	53:6 60:19
necessarily	150:22 151:2	181:12 185:1	77:2,23 84:5
23:13 33:12	151:17 155:22	185:20,20	90:17 109:11
37:10,23 55:14	155:25 157:18	negotiate 36:5	134:18,25
72:15 77:25	159:10,11	69:17 114:6	136:21 137:19
98:17 113:14	162:25 163:13	negotiated	137:25 138:4
153:15 159:24	168:18,20	19:21 149:12	144:5,20 146:5
197:3 198:9	183:7 184:10	152:6 153:13	146:20 147:9
necessary 15:1	185:13,15,22	negotiating	147:10,14,20
64:10 80:22	186:4 187:12	12:4 43:5	153:10 158:19
96:5 119:17	188:16,19	negotiation	171:14 180:5
144:15 176:17	189:24,25	77:4	183:22 184:7,8
necessity 66:23	191:15,23	negotiations	185:8,15
neck 70:22	193:7 194:2	19:12 32:14	192:20
need 13:3 14:11	needed 15:10	35:11 76:20	neighbors 12:1
18:9 19:12	60:3 62:20	91:15 182:4	31:5 40:2,12
22:5,24 24:12	117:19 156:22	neighborhood	40:22 49:9
34:5,9,22	162:24 168:18	11:11,16 31:1	62:6 63:10

64:12 140:4	63:24 64:6,8	146:25 147:17	nexus 158:12
186:20	70:6,7,11,12	147:19 148:4	nial 2:17
neither 201:10	79:25 80:20	148:15 151:14	186:13
202:7	82:12 83:1	152:15,21	nice 26:5
nest 11:19	85:17 87:21	159:23 160:11	nick 2:18
net 176:12	88:1,9,13,24	160:12 162:16	186:14
network	89:11,23 90:2	162:21 163:10	nieves 2:6 6:12
172:20	90:8,15,20	163:22 164:1,6	91:24 92:3
networks	91:13 95:5	164:7,18,22,23	94:2 107:19
172:23	96:13 99:21,24	169:24 170:3	108:9,24
neuroprivacy	100:16 102:20	171:5,16,20,24	109:14 124:11
178:24	103:3,22,25	172:10,18	124:15 167:9
never 43:6	104:13 107:11	174:17 175:13	168:21 169:3
52:24 56:1,20	108:18 109:1	175:15 176:9	169:13
69:18 72:8	113:2,17,21,23	176:13 177:10	nieves's 109:16
92:25 113:23	113:24,25	180:3 181:5	night 164:25
151:23 181:5	114:3,7,10,24	183:22,24	167:4
nevertheless	115:13,16	184:17,24	nimby 38:4
46:22	118:4,13,23	185:16 186:6	nine 31:11
new 1:9,11 5:6	119:5 120:24	187:16 189:7,9	noho 143:18
5:8,10,14,21	125:9 127:12	189:17 190:1,6	non 56:3 156:5
6:22,24,25	127:23,25	190:13,15	nonpartisan
9:21,25 11:18	128:10 129:3	191:10,13,14	189:2
11:21 12:17	129:10,12,17	191:22 192:5,9	nonprofit
14:24 21:16,23	129:25 133:22	192:19,25	79:21 83:23
24:2,14 30:7	135:6 137:20	194:18,21,21	115:12,19
30:18 31:15	140:1 141:1,1	195:5,7,13,25	129:12 140:9
37:23 38:17	141:23 142:5	196:8,14 197:1	143:15 145:24
39:17,22 40:10	142:22 144:10	197:17,20	149:2 155:6,16
40:25 47:13,16	144:12,19,22	198:6,25 199:1	185:24
47:18 50:17,18	144:23,24	199:1,2 201:20	north 11:16
53:2,10 60:11	145:7,23	newspaper	22:17 26:16
60:19 61:17	146:14,16,17	175:9	28:17
62:3,5,14,19,23	146:19,21,23		

[notably - open] Page 49

4 11 116 10	4 40 20	600 11.00	07.20.06.11
notably 116:10	nurture 40:20	office 11:23	95:20 96:11
notary 201:19	ny 1:11	54:17,21 63:16	97:20 99:14
note 84:13	nyc.gov 8:3,14	64:2 109:3,7,9	114:22 133:17
128:22 148:7	nycha 152:7	110:7 115:14	138:20 139:12
199:6	nypd 103:9,17	115:16 118:15	139:12 140:19
noted 141:15	104:22,23	118:23 151:6	158:8 169:20
nothing's 130:4	105:5,9 112:9	152:21	172:2 183:16
notify 79:14	113:2 115:7	officer 100:16	194:16
notion 24:8	116:7,8,17,24	100:20 102:4,6	old 70:7 135:9
notoriously	118:11,16,18	106:12 125:1,4	149:2 178:13
13:22 83:22	119:11 120:1,4	201:2	older 144:25
november	122:10	officers 101:15	197:23 198:13
187:14	0	102:14 103:10	omb 54:4
nuance 42:1	o 5:1	107:1 118:11	once 7:18 32:21
nuanced 38:5	o'neill 110:24	119:11 120:2	94:25 99:23
39:5	121:8 122:7,13	120:25 121:23	163:8
nuances 42:15	o'neill's 123:25	offices 54:12	onerous 18:23
46:1	objective 33:10	official 61:6	ones 43:20 52:9
number 47:18	78:6,11	148:11 154:16	56:21 58:21
49:8 50:3	obstacles 32:14	162:7 178:6	77:4 107:9
51:13 67:19		officials 6:1	157:9,16
72:2 109:2	obstructed	22:7 55:25	190:15
126:19 127:7	103:16	63:15 74:6,6	online 7:25 8:6
127:19 128:3	obstructs 105:8	170:8 171:11	8:21,22 175:5
135:25 136:5	obviously	181:13	183:12,13
149:8,12	94:10 185:12	offs 27:23	ooh 176:25
150:18 152:14	187:10	oftentimes	op 82:19
153:24 154:15	occurs 66:4	55:22	opaque 83:24
165:7,10,12,12	ocean 31:2	oh 30:1 50:12	open 7:18
165:15 166:1	offenses 124:3	50:16 54:10	12:18 19:12
166:10 168:13	offer 24:2	71:12 178:15	28:21 32:11
168:13 174:2	171:18	okay 9:15	35:15 80:16
176:18,22	offering 15:20	39:12 73:9	89:23 104:15
- , –		85:21 95:13,16	113:8 145:23

146:22 190:2	64:17,20 74:7	66:1,13 67:19	outlines 97:24
190:12,18,22	79:18 80:20	69:11 85:4	outreach 27:19
191:8 192:4	87:25 88:22	133:5 135:6	29:12
194:24,24	91:16 99:7	155:21,25	outright 92:4
195:17 196:3,5	101:22 103:1	organization	95:18
196:8,11,15	114:23 118:2,8	52:5 53:17	outs 75:25
197:1	119:5 125:4	79:21 80:8	76:12
opened 62:5	126:8 129:11	99:18 102:22	outset 43:13
190:4	143:13 148:24	129:13 156:24	outside 42:8
operate 109:24	167:21 169:21	194:20	60:9 61:9 94:2
operates 80:8	170:9 172:9	organizations	94:3,5,13
operating	176:21 179:22	80:4 137:6	103:11 112:19
163:21	182:18,18	156:12 168:16	153:14 181:19
operation 52:3	183:20 187:17	192:21	outsized 110:8
operational	194:17	organize 149:9	outward 18:1
26:14	oppose 86:4,11	organizers	overall 42:6
operations	144:9 193:11	101:6	overarching
54:14 129:10	opposed 9:6	organizing	141:4
opinion 63:7	47:25 48:13	180:22	overcame
72:9 165:20	55:22 57:3	oriented 90:13	62:17
opinions 84:11	85:23 166:7	original 74:20	overcomplicate
opponents 62:8	188:9	91:13	161:18
62:9	opposing 170:3	outcome 66:9	overdue 119:17
opportunities	opposite 111:1	69:20 165:13	overhauling
14:7 23:23	199:5	201:15 202:12	126:22
24:3,9 28:6	opposition	outcomes 51:19	overlooked
32:10 66:2	18:18 31:4	117:3	40:23
82:15 95:8	56:1 198:3	outdated 85:16	overrated
96:14 184:19	option 106:24	outdoor 53:20	188:15
193:14	optional 66:7	outfit 52:5	override 65:22
opportunity	options 28:7	outlier 101:25	109:21
5:9 9:23 17:2	83:6 170:5	outline 182:24	overrule
30:10 31:12	order 29:22	outlined 65:11	105:16 142:18
32:22 62:1	33:22 44:22	150:14 186:24	142:21

		I	
oversight 13:5	owns 24:5	parkchester	70:25 71:19
51:2 53:25	oxford 115:25	11:19 12:19	123:3 147:4
82:4,10 101:3	\mathbf{p}	parking 164:8	161:3 191:2
103:6,9 104:5	p 2:1,1 3:1,1	164:10,14	particularly
105:10,20	4:1,1 5:1	parks 76:24	10:12 18:25
107:8,12 111:7	p.m. 1:6 8:10	172:20 182:1	30:13 66:15
113:19 117:9	140:13 200:1	parochial	70:14 79:1
117:24,25	pace 199:4	157:20	105:7 108:10
118:14 120:14	page 8:1	part 13:22	119:25 181:23
120:17 121:3	pain 169:9	17:11 27:19	parties 189:13
144:2,11 145:4	painful 167:16	28:9,23 33:23	196:7 201:11
145:9 151:10	pair 137:8	36:3,11 37:23	201:14 202:8
151:24	paltry 107:13	52:12 65:6	202:11
overturn	panama 5:10	73:6 75:9 97:2	partly 134:11
103:19	pandemic 35:5	97:5 98:24	153:23 159:5
own 11:19	124:1	107:22 112:9	partner 192:21
13:24 16:25	panel 7:17,18	118:17 128:10	partners 31:6
24:5 27:13,13	7:19,22 16:7	133:2 150:1	170:7 181:2
31:13 102:6	60:21 67:6	151:9,11,18,20	partnership
136:18 137:2	79:12,14 85:7	152:2,12 153:1	125:22 170:12
153:2 195:20	86:17 91:23	161:12 192:23	parts 13:4
owned 67:17	107:2,3 161:23	participants	33:20 73:24
85:24 131:2,5	167:8 175:1	65:14	144:18
132:24 150:21	panels 72:13	participate	party 153:3
170:13 182:11	paper 29:7	14:8 190:20,23	190:21 191:1,3
owner 173:25	par 150:25	195:2,15	191:5,8 195:1
194:19 196:1	parameters	participation	195:10,12
owners 194:4	97:10	42:4 43:7	196:10
ownership 31:9	parent 194:18	193:12 194:8	party's 195:20
31:13 32:10	parents 5:10	196:12	pass 82:18
57:16 82:15	park 39:16	participatory	137:12
183:23 184:9	40:11 51:1	180:9,24	passed 11:16
184:13,14	52:4 139:8	particular 6:17	28:17 51:5,6
185:2	J2.T 1J7.U	42:12 63:18	54:22 159:4,6

. 00.10	20 10 10 20 0	150 10 20	110 5 100 0 04
passing 92:19	28:18,19 29:8	150:19,20	113:5 132:2,24
past 51:24	30:23 48:11	155:18 166:16	178:21 197:11
68:17 111:4	55:3 56:16	173:16,20	personal 84:10
118:12 130:4	57:2 59:7,8	190:14 193:5	112:7 196:1
154:5	60:10 72:1,5	195:14	personally
path 148:10	78:20 79:3,9	percentages	24:19
patterns	82:13 84:8	158:18	perspective
146:18	93:10 96:1	perfect 31:2	6:18 72:8
paul 1:17 201:2	99:7 100:9	perform 186:5	134:4
201:18	101:6,8,8,9	performative	perspectives
paved 126:5	102:9,10	83:9	75:3,13 195:22
pay 135:23	106:13 107:4	perfunctory	persuasive
paying 135:13	107:14 108:8	69:16	197:18
135:15	111:5 112:17	period 33:17	petty 188:14,15
pc 124:24	125:21 127:20	42:21 69:13	ph 53:3 193:5
pcac 162:6,7	128:4 135:15	84:16 90:25	phase 12:23
pcac's 162:6	136:4,7 142:22	114:5 173:25	29:13 85:1
pdf 29:8	152:10 161:17	permanent	phones 178:13
peale 2:20	162:13 165:18	91:10 138:12	phrase 62:24
183:13,14,16	166:6,8 169:11	145:6 162:5	picture 169:11
186:12	178:4,10 179:9	174:20	piece 18:3 29:7
penalties 80:18	189:12 190:23	permanently	piecemeal
120:23	190:25 191:6,9	127:5 152:4	182:4
pending 82:19	197:11,12	permit 53:23	piecing 177:18
penenberg 3:22	198:7,11	permits 131:24	179:3
79:15 87:11,14	people's 41:9	173:11,22	pipeline 13:4
87:15 96:8,10	72:10 178:1	174:1	33:25 69:12
97:1	percent 31:8	perpetuating	70:7 149:6
people 7:16	103:20 105:17	193:16	153:23
10:17 18:5	110:24 111:2	persistent	pipelines 156:7
20:2 21:11	116:7,18 121:8	80:19 117:17	pitch 51:24
22:7 25:13	121:9 122:11	person 7:24	61:16 163:6
26:20 27:7,8	123:4 124:10	27:20 48:6	place 23:19
27:21 28:4,9	135:22 149:17	100:19 102:3	27:17 36:16

[place - policy] Page 53

46.17.47.1	-1 (2.5	127.10.17	! 4 75.02
46:17 47:1	plane 63:5	137:10,17	points 75:23
62:20 71:6	planner 179:25	180:4	152:12
77:6 91:10	planners 137:8	play 121:12	poised 52:2
161:18 172:24	137:15	122:4	police 54:11
189:11	planning 6:18	played 80:1	99:18 100:12
places 68:9	11:24 47:18	players 63:19	100:16,19
70:3 102:4	50:23 52:19	playgrounds	101:12,19,22
113:1 192:22	64:19 65:22	12:15	102:2,2,4,5,5
plan 11:16 27:7	66:1 72:25	plaza 12:18	102:10,11,14
27:7,7 45:9,12	80:24,24 81:3	please 9:12,17	102:22 103:11
46:16 47:8,10	81:14 83:3,9	99:14 128:17	103:18 104:1
47:11,16 48:3	83:18 85:8,15	138:10 139:7	105:15 106:11
81:10,11,12	90:22 92:24	139:17 140:20	106:12,19,22
84:14 89:14,18	95:3 97:25	164:25 169:19	107:1,2 109:3
90:18,21 91:3	98:23 99:1	179:10 183:4	109:7,11 110:4
91:7,9 92:10	128:25 131:11	183:15 187:21	110:5 112:2,6
92:15,22 93:19	135:4 136:10	191:20	112:22,25
93:22 94:12,18	136:14,16	pleased 59:18	113:4 114:8
94:24 95:5,11	137:2,13,19	pleasure 149:7	115:1,17 116:1
95:14,16,19	139:9 140:14	175:8	117:5 118:14
96:18,25 97:16	140:25 147:21	plentiful	118:19 119:21
98:9,15,20	149:7 150:15	162:11,12	122:20,21
99:4 134:9	154:19 157:3	plenty 72:12	policies 73:24
136:18,19	164:22 175:14	point 18:9	83:4 120:9
140:8,25 150:3	180:9,25 181:9	22:20 26:15	129:15 173:8
150:7,10,11	182:5,20,25	35:9,16 82:8	194:22
162:23,25	184:5,19 185:6	82:14 92:9	policing 118:20
163:10,12	planning's	108:7 123:19	policy 19:25
170:23 173:24	85:13	138:20 152:14	49:3,4,7 80:11
180:16 181:4,5	plannings	165:15 168:3	88:11 102:21
181:6 184:23	84:13	171:4	102:23 103:6
184:24 185:13	plans 81:2	pointed 57:1	116:2 119:5
193:11	90:12,15,23	143:8	123:17 129:10
	94:9,9 98:1		129:13 146:23

180:5,22	positive 189:10	practical	prepared 44:19
political 13:10	possess 171:8	119:17	87:11 126:7
40:13 41:18	possible 10:25	practice 36:15	202:3
42:13 44:15	84:23 88:14	89:18	preparing 34:2
59:18 82:24	102:9 120:7	practices 80:5	present 141:13
89:12 90:9	145:8 192:4	80:13 86:23	159:9 181:7
92:12 104:5,12	post 124:13	95:4 118:18	presented
108:7 110:18	potential 22:10	143:23	34:14 64:21
110:20 117:15	potentially	pratt 179:25	preservation
150:12 189:12	44:23 147:22	180:1,20	129:16 139:8
189:13,18	188:3	pre 12:23 13:22	143:15 170:20
195:1	poverty 10:9	14:6 18:22	172:3,17
politically	power 13:7	29:13 53:1	175:11 176:23
195:4	15:20 19:6	69:3,13 84:25	188:8 193:1
politicize 13:6	25:15 36:6	85:1 86:9	preserve 14:18
165:11	37:1 49:21	124:12	25:19 145:6
politics 13:7	100:15,19	precedent	171:24 192:22
41:19 148:9	101:14,24	111:14	preserved 83:3
poll 72:9	107:17 109:21	precinct 18:4	preserves
polluting 48:16	109:23 110:18	precisely	143:16
poor 59:7	111:6 113:12	132:11	preserving
86:10	113:20 114:2	precludes	88:19
popularity	116:20 117:24	113:3,11	president 44:14
159:12	146:16 158:6	predatory	51:22 56:16
population	191:1	127:8	58:11,15,23
178:15,16	powerful 48:23	predict 95:7	59:2,11,12,14
portfolios	powerless	preferences	59:19,22 83:15
115:15	59:15 103:21	146:11	85:6,9 131:14
portion 19:17	powers 4:10	prefers 146:10	131:16,21
position 10:21	13:13 29:24	pregnant 61:19	138:18 140:24
56:1 104:20	30:2,6,8 33:15	preliminarily	151:4 161:10
positions 153:8	34:24 37:8	20:16	165:6,17 166:4
191:3	39:9 123:8	preliminary	166:20,21
		81:24	177:19

president's	primarily	probably 23:1	14:6 18:21,22
151:5	78:22 79:3	34:19 49:13	18:22 20:3
presidential	primary	60:2 78:25	21:3 22:11,11
191:13	192:11 195:2,8	130:1 155:5	22:13,23 25:4
presidents 13:9	195:10	188:1	26:6,18 27:19
85:3 90:19	prime 23:8	problem 37:3	28:5,9,10,13,24
166:2,6	principle 160:6	42:9 45:11	29:6,11,15
pressing 88:18	principles	46:13 48:1,20	30:12 31:18,25
pretty 47:24	70:14	48:21 49:2,10	32:14,15,20
188:14	prior 8:21	50:1,1 64:5	33:6,9,19,22
prevalent 87:1	29:12 72:6	76:13,18	36:4 37:5
prevent 117:7	155:9 201:5	106:13,20	40:14 41:3,8
118:25 176:21	priorities 31:2	109:19,21,23	41:12 42:6
191:4	195:22	141:8 156:19	43:1,2 44:11
prevention	prioritize 35:7	176:16 190:9	44:14 49:14
118:24	98:8 180:9	193:4	52:17,20 53:4
previous 52:22	prioritized	problems 42:6	56:5 58:16
72:22 109:9	35:10	163:8	59:18 61:12
123:4	priority 72:2	procedural	63:14 64:13
previously	146:7 147:3	65:18 69:10	65:8,10,14
93:13 126:14	privacy 111:17	73:12	66:4,11 67:2
price 34:11	178:23	procedures	67:11,11,14
173:4	private 11:5,10	78:16	68:8,15,17
priced 162:15	52:5 84:17	proceed 43:21	69:3,3,15,25
prices 133:6	149:13,14	74:25	70:25 71:7,22
pride 196:15	privately 153:2	proceeding	73:14,16 74:5
primaries	privilege 61:15	200:2 202:4	74:6,20,22,23
190:2,4,6,6,12	83:2	proceedings	75:10,14,15
190:18,21,22	pro 64:1	201:3,4,6,8	78:16,20,23,23
191:9 192:4,8	145:24	202:6	83:22 84:3,11
194:24,24	proactive 80:9	proceeds 82:1	84:13,25 85:14
195:11,15,17	proactively	process 10:5,23	87:23,23 88:3
195:18 196:3,5	184:6 185:5	12:3,24 13:11	88:20 91:5,11
196:9,11,15,17		13:21,23 14:2	93:25 96:6,13

		I	
96:17 97:2,4,7	95:24 110:12	progress 10:10	96:2,3 131:19
98:19,23 102:7	124:19 149:23	15:24 83:9	131:21 143:2
104:12 108:8	160:11,13	project 11:17	153:21 154:2
110:13 111:12	168:23 181:22	11:22 19:22	163:7,23 174:5
111:15 116:9	183:9 192:24	22:17,18 25:1	176:1 181:25
119:22 121:2	193:19	25:5,21,22	182:11 193:3
122:23 123:1	produce 11:4	27:13 28:13,24	193:24 194:4,6
124:17 128:17	26:4 141:22	29:2 31:9,19	promise 105:15
130:14,15,21	produced	44:23 45:5	promote
131:8,10,18	136:20	58:25 62:7	183:22 196:5
134:8,12	producing	63:18,19,20	promotes
138:17 141:12	138:22	64:2 66:18,25	175:15
141:16 142:8	production	67:10 68:20	promoting
142:12,16,25	32:1 68:7	72:15 86:7	79:22
142:25 144:16	88:12 150:14	130:25 134:15	prone 12:14
146:4,10	productive	149:15,18	proper 49:11
147:20,24	151:15 152:22	154:17 156:1	196:3
148:6,10	products 85:21	158:19 170:16	properties 24:4
151:20 152:10	professionals	170:18	property 85:24
153:12 154:6	137:9	projects 13:1	87:17,19 88:7
154:19 157:6	professor	15:8,13 18:17	156:15 170:13
157:18 158:5	196:25	18:24 19:1	194:4
159:22,23	profit 46:14	25:8,14 31:20	proponent
160:2 161:9	156:5	31:22 32:5,9	193:18
164:5 165:6	profitable	33:24,25 34:3	proportional
166:11,13,15	173:6	34:6 35:18,21	197:20
166:20 181:15	profound 6:21	36:6,11,16,21	proposal 31:4
182:16 184:20	144:4	37:1,6,13 42:8	65:2,5,11
187:25 188:12	program 80:9	43:23 44:16	66:12,25 67:8
193:10,13	81:17 84:5	49:22 58:20,22	91:13 93:2
194:3,5 195:6	programmatic	61:17 67:9,15	97:22 108:13
196:13	66:22	67:16 68:20	165:8,10,12,13
processes 14:10	programs	70:7 85:21	166:3,19 174:6
84:18 86:9	119:2 174:17	88:1 95:15	182:25 187:13

proposals	protecting 22:6	public 1:1 5:3	punishments
31:24 64:23	32:11 43:8	5:23 6:1 7:11	119:18
65:5,17,24	protection	8:20 10:13	purposes 47:10
67:3 76:5	41:22	11:10 14:8	pursuant 81:10
84:19 88:17	protectionist	15:5 40:22	pursue 6:5
89:5,9,22	16:13	45:15 46:15,19	18:24 97:23
131:13 147:7	protections	63:7 65:20	pursuing 5:22
147:19 148:4	182:2	72:9 80:14	push 17:20
165:5 172:24	protects 48:23	90:25 98:25	18:1,9 69:12
181:13,18	protest 28:16	100:7,7 103:5	137:15 138:6
182:8,19,21	102:15	103:9 104:5	pushed 40:12
186:22 187:16	proud 102:20	112:3,10 115:1	135:16
propose 6:6	194:19	115:11,20	put 20:1,19
18:17 43:23	proudly 9:21	116:11 118:13	34:3,22 38:16
86:8 104:10	30:8	119:1,13 120:8	44:19 63:5
105:9 110:14	proves 116:16	126:4,5 144:6	77:19 91:12
173:21 174:4	provide 35:14	149:23 152:17	96:21 103:23
192:24 193:9	66:1,18 81:7	164:2 171:7,11	132:17 134:9
proposed 31:5	90:15 103:7	178:5 180:7	134:13 135:6
37:22 89:4,15	105:5 115:9	181:21 182:1,4	136:14 137:9
127:1 187:14	120:13 188:6	182:15 193:12	138:11 156:9
proposing	provided 67:19	193:13,18,22	158:13,21
111:23 126:10	providers	193:23 198:9	167:14 169:1
137:5	80:14	198:12 199:10	184:22
propublica	provides 11:15	201:19	putting 20:2
105:4	165:9,10,16	public's 105:20	42:12 133:3
protect 10:2	providing	171:18	q
42:13 53:12	15:10 66:17	publication	qualified 201:7
183:23	73:12 103:1	132:14	quality 7:2
protected	117:21	publicly 62:16	86:7 165:14
40:17 41:2	provisions	115:4	176:6
43:16 44:1,2	66:22	published	quarterly
79:6,10 171:1	proximity	64:23	152:17
	30:25		152.11

queens 30:9	114:13 121:5	rainfall 185:11	rationalizing
56:22 177:3	129:5 139:12	raise 153:2	164:5
question 7:22	145:13 149:22	165:4	reach 155:22
18:12,13 25:8	151:21 161:22	raised 39:17	155:25
25:11,17 26:9	167:7 175:1	137:1 152:11	read 57:8
26:14 33:1,16	183:11 186:12	189:8	128:19 147:1
34:21 36:2	187:19 188:21	raising 40:10	reading 9:13
37:9 44:10	192:15 194:11	166:5	ready 178:6
47:2,15 50:2	196:22	randomly 90:8	real 12:22 14:4
52:16 55:10	quick 96:7	93:10	17:14 24:2
58:2,10,19	quicker 33:11	range 81:4	27:2 30:25
59:11 65:7	quickly 53:9	153:8 189:18	85:22 88:5
68:10,11 71:11	84:21 85:22	195:19	95:3 101:22
75:17,20 78:14	quinn 51:25	ranges 180:4	103:22 107:16
101:2 107:19	quit 102:11	ranging 89:5	107:16 110:12
109:17 111:10	189:21	rapid 119:3	110:17 116:18
111:21 112:15	quite 20:15,20	rare 148:20	116:22 117:24
122:1,2 124:16	46:23 161:12	rarest 140:1	121:3 136:9
132:7 139:11	r	rate 17:6	147:13 184:20
153:4 155:4	r 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	126:24 127:2	184:22 185:6
156:2 158:7	rabinovitch 3:3	175:17 192:2,3	188:16
160:9 167:9	racial 10:9	rates 154:22	realign 104:4
question's 19:3	180:10,17	rather 32:6	realistically
questionable	rad 3:12 99:13	41:23 42:25	162:23
106:15	114:16,19,22	66:3,7 78:18	reality 26:11
questioning	115:2 121:13	78:23 105:19	36:24 70:11
133:12	122:8 123:20	117:17 170:3	199:6
questions 7:19	124:7,14 125:1	171:13 195:19	realize 27:8
16:7 24:24	125:6	196:6	really 16:11,19
32:24 43:10	radical 72:11	rational 198:20	17:25 18:8,9
55:9,12 60:23	radius 163:3	198:22	24:12 26:10
61:20 67:3,6	rail 163:4	rationality	27:1,12,18
86:17 91:23	100.1	198:19	29:9,13,14,17
105:25 109:16			33:10,19 35:16

27 2 40 5 44 7		00.47.00.04	1000
37:3 40:6 41:7	rebalance	82:17 89:21	182:9
41:13 42:19,23	142:24	100:22 101:1,3	reduced 201:6
45:1,10 51:14	rebalancing	103:19 107:16	reducing 84:23
52:24 54:8	73:13	108:12 109:18	183:9
59:5 60:3,4,5	recall 188:13	116:2,22 121:9	reengage 27:2
60:10 61:15	receive 91:18	123:3 130:18	reevaluate
62:24 69:14	184:11	130:20 149:21	143:21
79:7 84:15	received 12:3	160:10 163:1	referenced 44:1
87:6 93:12	81:23 117:4	181:2 182:20	132:8
97:8 99:10	receiving 35:15	184:3	reflect 14:15
101:2 122:22	recent 19:19	recommended	31:1 68:22
129:4 130:9	40:1 170:11	56:2	117:8 139:2
133:25,25	receptive 43:20	recommends	reflecting
134:11,12	recognize 14:9	105:14	124:17
137:14 143:1	77:17 88:10	record 20:19	reflection
148:12,17,18	recognizing	62:2 109:2	69:14
148:20,20,21	123:9	121:20 187:5	reform 14:13
148:21 150:4	recommend	193:24 201:9	56:5 119:6
151:17 154:7	19:10 59:13	202:5	120:7 121:1
158:11 182:23	104:14 106:19	recorded 201:6	171:23 186:2
183:7 184:6	108:15,19	recording	189:24
187:16 188:18	130:11 131:7	201:8 202:4	reforming
195:13 197:1,9	160:13 188:7	records 103:17	104:11 141:12
197:18	recommendat	104:23 105:6	reforms 32:19
reason 28:15	104:7 105:22	112:2,6,10	52:1 64:24
52:6 63:24	109:20 120:14	recovery 15:5	82:15 89:8
78:13 133:12	124:22,23	red 40:11	103:3 104:3
164:13 178:3	147:3 161:8,13	redeveloping	116:16 117:18
191:15,23	190:12	20:12 170:13	146:24 148:12
197:19	recommendat	redistribute	regard 109:3
reasons 41:1	6:4 13:16,20	17:7	183:2
102:16 198:7	13:25 21:8	redone 94:19	regarding
198:22	23:6 35:15	reduce 13:11	94:16 165:15
	55:13 81:5,7	85:1 162:17	

regardless 6:6	reinvention	relinquished	renovated
6:6 81:25	115:1,17	113:22,23	175:21
190:21	reiterating	rely 105:2	renovations
regime 125:5	197:10	156:17 181:18	12:14 82:12
region 80:3	reject 90:21	182:3	rent 126:20,21
141:2	92:4 95:18	relying 112:5	127:22,25
regional 140:8	related 7:7	remain 7:5	135:10,11,13
140:25 162:23	69:22 81:7	10:11,15 78:25	173:8,13,15,17
register 132:20	174:16 201:11	174:18	173:19 176:4
191:1	202:7	remains 5:9	rental 31:7
registered	relates 51:21	80:19	126:15 176:7
195:7	82:3,9 155:15	remedies	rentals 132:17
registration	relating 198:11	148:14	rents 135:11
133:3	relation 132:7	remedy 158:9	reorient 128:5
regular 85:14	relationship	188:1,6	repair 98:4
regularly	22:6 59:19	remember	126:19
127:24 143:21	151:15 152:22	140:4	repairs 98:7
168:2	relationships	reminder	152:7
regulated	16:20 97:8	146:19	repeated 106:6
126:20,21	relative 81:19	removal 145:9	repetitive 19:3
127:22,25	201:13 202:10	remove 65:12	rephrase 199:2
135:10,11	relatively 7:14	85:16 144:10	replace 127:22
136:3	release 81:23	147:16 172:12	144:25 164:14
regulation	released 146:23	178:1	replaced
132:16 178:18	relevant 112:6	removes 113:6	127:25 172:25
regulations	114:2 115:24	removing	173:3 175:18
172:12	reliable 172:21	13:10 21:2	175:24 176:6
regulatory	relief 66:19,25	30:11 43:1	replacement
67:16	96:20	49:21 173:5	70:8 173:24
reinforce	relieve 140:16	renders 103:21	176:17
117:23	religious 191:7	105:18 116:15	replacing 173:6
reintroduced	relinquish	renovate	173:18 174:7
74:19	114:5	126:19	report 13:17
			26:5 38:17

57:7 64:24	97:11 148:2	residential	respectfully
65:2,12 69:11	186:19	81:18 82:3,9	189:16 192:10
73:18 118:18	represents	87:21 171:22	respective
133:23 134:20	169:24	residents 14:8	166:9
138:21,25	reps 181:23	31:12 32:16	respects 119:11
152:16	request 117:10	47:1 83:5	respond 77:25
	require 45:7	137:11 162:19	122:8 156:21
reported 1:17 reporter	70:12 72:17	163:14 171:8	156:24 181:13
175:10	81:14 85:10	resides 122:20	197:11
reporting	91:6 128:10	resiliency 15:4 resilient 147:8	response 49:24
78:23	153:15		54:14
reports 112:5	required 81:15	resistance	responses
173:9 180:5	81:22 90:11	197:23	119:3
represent 9:22	164:13 176:18	resistant	responsibility
10:18 42:21	195:1	197:22	5:15 18:6
156:23 157:6	requirements	resisting 44:3	24:14 39:2
192:20	70:2 82:4,10	resolution	responsible
representation	162:16	137:13	45:19 65:15
48:5 88:19	requires 33:19	resolve 55:24	175:15
104:13 108:11	45:16 47:9	162:24	responsibly
108:18,23	82:22,23 98:2	resource 36:10	45:7
177:21 196:3	120:8 132:19	181:6	responsive 65:3
196:12	134:8	resourced	responsiveness
representative	requiring	40:16 147:14	180:12
14:10 22:21	90:20	181:17	rest 188:17
51:7 147:22	research 115:3	resources 25:4	rested 100:16
180:19 190:17	115:15,25	69:9 77:3,5	restore 103:5
198:9	140:25 162:4	84:2 144:18	121:2
representatives	198:10	153:24 181:15	restricted 87:5
42:22 85:8	researcher	182:4,13 194:6	182:12
represented	115:11,20	respect 21:18	restrictive 83:3
127:17 136:12	reserve 174:10	58:16 70:3	result 13:17
representing	resident 102:20	141:5	31:16 34:16
30:8 87:18			54:19 116:7

[result - room] Page 62

117:3 195:23	179:23,23	76:21,22 87:7	risky 83:22
resulted 80:16	186:3	92:16 93:12	84:9
results 11:2	revisions 75:6	95:1 97:5	rival 66:3
86:10 162:21	89:15 180:10	100:20 101:10	road 61:11
rethink 161:9	180:15	103:12 111:9	64:15
returns 75:9	revocable	114:14 117:11	roadside 53:21
reuse 193:2	53:23 131:24	125:12 130:12	roberta 3:16
revenue 54:16	ribbon 63:22	133:11 137:11	169:18 172:5
review 1:1 5:15	68:25	141:9 143:7	173:1 175:3,7
12:24 14:8	rich 147:8	146:9 148:23	robust 82:4,10
32:2,4 33:17	164:11 175:22	153:24 154:2	89:4 101:17
51:18 65:9,10	richard 1:4 2:3	154:11 157:3	107:11,15
66:2,3,6 70:14	5:4	157:12,12,13	109:18 162:19
83:10 88:3,16	richardson	158:21 161:18	180:18 183:18
88:20 90:25	2:11 6:12	162:2 167:19	196:13
91:4 93:23	75:18 86:18	168:8,12,15	rochester
100:21 103:4	106:1	169:9,12	113:18,22
105:1 118:1	rid 53:23	174:19 178:2	114:5
131:15,15,18	ride 163:18	191:17 194:11	rockaway 31:3
143:21 144:3	rider 162:8	199:21	rockaways
147:20 164:5	riders 162:7	rights 63:4,5	31:9
165:6 166:5,7	163:19	72:7 76:2	rodney 106:18
166:13,16,20	ridership	79:21 80:6	role 10:5,23
182:15 192:24	163:19	93:7 106:18,20	14:17 30:12
reviewed	rigged 62:22	106:21,22	32:16 65:8,13
101:19 193:19	right 5:3 9:7	rink 52:4	80:2 104:17
reviews 85:3,5	16:9,23,24	rise 57:16	110:8 181:21
193:7	20:15 22:16,25	176:9 185:12	182:10 183:10
revise 5:12	23:14 35:20	rising 40:15	192:23
revision 5:4	38:20 45:16	155:6,13 189:2	roles 32:12
22:14 70:21	46:10,17 57:24	189:12 194:20	58:15 101:8
89:4 125:24,25	58:17,24 60:6	risk 13:13 66:3	roof 72:10
126:3 134:8	60:25 62:23	98:17 185:6	room 73:18
162:3 163:1	63:2,3,8 67:13		93:17 99:5

[room - see] Page 63

112:17,17	safety 15:5	187:6 198:11	140:11 146:7
140:14 189:21	100:7,7,9,11,14	says 49:6 76:9	168:22 169:22
roosevelt 129:2	115:1,11,16,20	79:8 102:14	190:20 198:18
rooted 41:13	115:23 119:2	142:4 168:18	199:16,17,18
ross 3:2 145:20	sake 57:18	scale 85:20	secondly 81:14
162:1,2,4	143:24 171:3	scales 24:13	131:1 174:4
rough 59:5	samuels 2:7	scarcity 76:10	seconds 99:25
roughly 91:2	6:13	86:22	102:17 117:11
round 63:22	sandy 71:25	schedule 8:9	120:19 191:20
routinely 105:5	sanitation	scheduled 8:9	secretary 2:10
royo 2:21	97:17	school 1:9	6:10
rub 107:18	sara 3:22 79:15	27:25 28:20	sector 88:7
rude 7:15	87:10,15	54:7 61:18	115:19 185:24
rule 117:17	save 164:1	100:5 142:2	sectors 115:12
196:10	savino 2:15	164:2 196:25	secure 12:4
ruled 113:19	6:13 21:9	schools 7:1	14:8 182:4
rulemaking	24:16 26:15	12:15 15:13	secured 11:9
85:13	47:5 48:11,24	97:17 119:1	80:17 153:1
rules 61:10	50:5,12,14,16	142:5 182:1	secures 182:1
62:22 64:7,15	50:20 55:10,21	science 179:9	securing 32:10
89:6	56:10,24 57:21	scif 132:15	security 87:20
run 45:16 48:8	57:24 60:16	scope 42:8	see 10:19 15:8
48:15,15,17	68:10 70:1	85:10	23:7 34:13
126:6	71:10	script 84:7	37:16 38:4,16
running 110:8	saw 93:12	sea 185:12	40:15,23 43:4
runs 45:14	154:25	seaport 188:13	43:19 44:23
189:21	saying 43:18	seat 32:8	46:22 54:1
S	73:7 107:20	171:20,24	62:11 63:20
s 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1	113:4 123:2	seats 63:17	64:2 68:12
sacrifice 32:21	125:1 137:20	seattle 111:21	73:11 77:23,24
safe 70:19	137:21 142:3	111:24 112:1	81:13 87:3
safer 12:17	167:20 168:8	second 9:1,2	108:4,12
Saici 12.1/	168:17,19	39:20 67:7	109:10,22,23
	169:1 177:19	104:21 127:11	119:7 123:14

[see - shelter] Page 64

			I
124:14 127:24	send 107:23	service 61:7	shalt 74:13
131:13 132:3	108:5 110:16	79:3 80:9 81:6	shameful
153:12 154:4	120:16	87:17,20 88:7	195:14
154:25 171:6	senior 15:13	118:13 119:13	shams 2:9 6:11
173:1	61:18 179:24	125:21,23	shape 10:4
seeing 130:3	sense 38:12	148:25 153:6	30:15 37:1
seek 144:15	53:24 78:11	162:8 183:18	88:1 193:24
155:24 170:4	93:20 97:22	186:8 188:24	shapes 193:13
171:2	99:3 110:6,9	196:24	shaping 32:16
seeking 171:1	144:11 165:9	services 79:2	80:19
seems 197:14	185:18,21	129:4 178:2,14	share 25:25
197:19	194:22	179:4 186:5	49:3,4,7 51:22
seen 13:14	sent 22:7 35:23	serving 5:5	72:25 77:16,17
19:14 39:18,24	48:8 90:19	sessions 11:25	77:21 78:6,22
50:2 97:10	176:2	set 62:1 68:4	89:6 165:19
100:25 119:12	sentiment	70:13 89:4	167:13,17
121:21 151:16	18:13	127:13 149:15	168:3,11
161:17 177:23	separate	158:14 159:8	171:11 172:9
178:24 193:1	124:12 159:21	159:15,23	shared 14:15
193:22	159:22	settlements	30:19 84:19
sees 97:3	seqr 70:24 71:7	109:2	104:24 129:20
segregation	sequential 66:3	seven 26:19	129:22 171:19
10:10 81:19	serious 83:8	79:25 91:2	sharing 105:8
146:18	190:11	several 13:25	169:8
seiu 87:16	seriously 37:15	35:22 89:3	sharon 2:12
select 8:4,4	37:17 151:7	115:15 130:18	6:10
selected 90:8	servant 40:22	135:23 138:9	sheets 20:11
93:10	serve 9:21	170:20 182:8	shelf 92:25
selection 85:20	15:18 115:3	189:5	96:25
selvena 4:10	119:11 120:2	severe 105:7	shelter 19:23
29:24 30:7	181:24	sewer 184:15	24:11 46:8
senator 6:13	served 118:21	184:16	49:4,8,9 127:1
138:17	125:23 135:4	shack 127:1	138:12

alcaldanad 70.1	ab a mad 116.17		~ ! 17.10 26.10
sheltered 72:1	showed 116:17	similar 36:1	six 17:19 26:19
shelters 23:16	122:10 163:17	38:3 93:25	94:8 108:4
23:22 46:4	showing 120:6	176:1	126:11 135:9
48:18 129:3	129:23	similarly	175:10
138:3	shown 86:10	108:19 128:8	sixth 99:20,21
shift 158:17	97:8	160:12	100:4
shifting 85:5	shows 107:1	simple 78:5	sixty 22:25
150:18	129:25	160:4	size 22:24 37:7
shirt 167:3	shut 193:12	simply 31:16	37:13 117:20
shite 178:1	side 26:14 36:9	103:23 121:10	skeptical 63:24
179:4	50:25 127:4,5	122:3	198:6
short 32:2 42:5	138:2 176:14	single 17:15	skills 201:10
56:10 64:4	186:20	28:12,16 51:22	202:6
75:6 85:24	sided 110:24	57:5,8,9 72:15	slated 11:17
126:15 131:12	sidelined 32:13	76:17 132:9,10	slatkin 3:17
132:8,12,16,17	sidestep 104:16	sinking 38:18	60:22 64:16,18
173:25 184:20	sighting 140:2	sir 55:8	67:13,24 73:5
187:2	sign 8:5 140:12	sit 12:23 32:5	73:9 78:3
shortage	140:17,18	96:25 151:5	sledgehammer
146:12 164:12	178:18	166:21	41:24
shortening	signature	site 176:18	slice 124:4
131:8,13	201:17 202:14	sites 138:9	slightly 29:22
shorter 131:15	signed 7:11	173:3	123:14
131:17	significance	siting 46:4 49:4	small 24:10
shortfall	76:5	49:11,14	51:14 62:7
163:25	significant 14:2	sits 92:25	126:6 131:19
shoulder 83:5	34:22 42:5	sitting 149:7	131:21 175:20
shout 39:22	43:5 71:5	168:7 179:10	194:3,19
99:24	98:10	179:15	smaller 18:21
shouted 61:23	significantly	situation 16:11	19:1 83:23
show 27:6 63:9	171:3 190:23	16:12 33:7	85:20 131:23
72:8 95:4	silence 13:12	36:18 60:8	smart 10:1
124:9 130:3,7	simeon 3:15	123:2 179:19	smartly 148:18
	169:18 172:2	198:20	

[social - stably] Page 66

	I	I	
social 79:2	sort 33:5,8 68:8	194:23 197:2	180:14 189:24
society 83:16	69:16 93:9,17	speaker 9:2	specifics 64:23
sole 114:8	93:24 96:19	29:25 60:25	123:21 141:6
solely 38:21	98:15 106:17	65:25 67:22	specter 166:5
44:11	107:13,17	100:2 114:21	spectrum 5:21
solution 76:17	109:5 110:11	136:16,25	speed 13:3 33:6
167:14 168:23	110:25 111:14	139:22 140:17	33:9,22 52:17
172:11 194:7	123:9 124:17	147:12 160:14	53:5 148:5,10
solutions 10:1	130:23 131:4	160:17,19,21	165:14
14:4 20:18	160:5,6,12	160:23 167:5	spend 158:4,4
30:25 41:6	161:4 198:18	199:13,14,17	spending 57:17
42:10 88:12	198:19 199:5	199:18	199:3
102:24 137:4	sorting 61:21	speaker's 24:20	spent 146:1
solve 21:23	sounded 72:22	speakers 9:5	148:8 154:18
42:9 46:13	sounds 73:3,6	74:11 78:5	175:8
48:1 49:2,10	134:5	145:13 199:20	spoke 116:2
76:18 163:8	sources 34:15	speaking 71:16	167:11
solves 37:3	155:21 156:17	73:2 143:14	sponsored
solving 163:15	156:19	177:2	151:8
somebody	south 188:13	speaks 76:3	square 47:25
57:12	southeast 30:9	121:19	srg 54:14
somewhat	space 28:21,22	special 54:6	stability 15:10
93:20	32:11 48:21	118:14 131:24	62:15
soon 51:10	spaces 11:13	143:16 189:4	stabilization
88:13	12:18 23:11,19	specific 21:7	16:1 23:15
sooner 33:25	sparc 170:12	23:6 66:18,25	173:17
35:19 69:5	spare 102:17	74:16 75:21	stabilize 24:2
sorry 9:9 19:2	speak 5:19 11:2	86:5	stabilized
73:5 77:14	14:19 41:12	specifically	173:13,15,19
84:7 112:14,16	64:18 103:1,2	81:9 114:3	176:4
126:14 140:10	121:14 122:24	123:24 124:4	stable 63:10
140:18 160:16	143:19 153:11	131:6 143:19	163:15 183:25
171:9	154:3 168:4	150:19 155:9	stably 62:23
	187:17 194:17	155:14 174:10	

stacked 64:13	stanting 19.0	statutes 117:1	story 17:19,20
staff 35:3 58:24	starting 18:9 36:21 135:19	statutes 117.1 stay 7:3 140:16	22:25,25 57:12
59:20 60:1	starts 128:23		, and the second
		staying 188:25	57:13,14 135:9
87:21 89:1	136:6 148:11	steep 132:15	135:17,18
91:19 107:14	state 21:17	step 74:22	140:23 176:6
126:9 152:20	40:5 47:9 70:2	112:19 114:16	straight 62:2
staffing 35:6	70:12,22 80:6	139:19 150:6	strategic 42:11
69:9	98:3 112:15,21	196:9	54:14
stake 74:9	113:11 114:2	steps 23:1 29:1	strategies
196:2	129:15 145:25	80:22	180:6
stakes 148:21	158:25 192:1	stetsenko 3:19	strategy 62:13
stall 90:10	201:20	stick 177:8	97:24
stalled 15:13	state's 26:18	188:6	streamed 8:19
stand 176:22	stated 22:4	sticker 62:25	streamline 14:6
standard 88:4	121:15	sticks 45:19	90:1 163:23
standards	statement	stiff 31:4	185:16
66:17 82:11	72:21 86:24	stifle 194:7	streamlined
130:24 142:18	187:8	stock 18:7	68:8 90:24
143:23	statements	23:13,14 145:1	91:11
standpoint	144:6	173:6	streamlining
33:4	staten 56:22	stood 61:18	13:18 163:24
staring 178:12	57:2	stop 43:9 49:19	182:9 187:3,25
starkly 19:15	states 51:21	83:9 102:17	197:15
starrett 99:21	87:18 112:4	127:7 143:10	street 63:11
start 9:9,10	148:13 159:21	173:8	164:14 176:5
36:22 79:16	191:14 199:4	stoppages 20:1	197:25
82:8 91:7 92:8	statewide	stopping	streets 12:17
98:6 140:20	148:13	131:20	109:10
161:18,19	station 11:19	stops 163:5	strengthen
164:22	11:21 22:17	stores 172:21	10:3 96:12
started 22:18	163:7	stories 27:10,10	103:4 118:2
36:16 69:25	stations 11:18	27:10 48:4	120:6
122:9	163:4,6	53:9 62:17	strengthened
			32:12

strengthening	structures	subpoena	sufficient
42:24 79:23	80:25 101:7	111:6,7,13	174:21
81:9 89:5	117:15 121:16	subpoenas	suggest 5:16
116:10	193:15	105:2 111:8	16:15 132:22
strengthens	struggle 6:23	subsequently	136:9 167:12
15:18	struggles 40:24	106:4	suggested
strict 7:12	struggling 60:6	subsidize	72:12
stricter 82:4,10	student 170:21	156:18	suggestion
strictly 65:16	students 101:6	subsidized	75:24
67:14 72:7	164:2	132:19 135:24	suggestions
73:21	studios 128:5	subsidizing	33:5 77:20
strip 144:15	study 12:16	156:15	184:1
strong 120:7	102:13	subsidy 155:21	summarize
183:24	stuff 13:16	155:24	129:19 130:19
stronger 80:23	57:18 69:10	substance 79:5	summary 126:7
193:22	94:1	substantiated	summer 11:17
strongly 52:10	stupid 52:21	116:24 118:11	sunglasses
54:21 61:10	style 93:10	119:21 120:21	178:11
85:23 86:11	subject 63:6	substantiates	sunset 39:16
91:12 137:15	67:16 85:15	105:14	40:11
144:9,14	91:4 110:3	substantive	super 27:3
192:25	113:7 141:17	105:19	28:23 65:21
struck 43:12	141:17 142:3	substitute	73:8
121:6	181:11	78:19	superb 57:6
structural 64:5	subjects 104:25	suburban	supertalls
82:22 117:8	submit 8:12,13	56:22,22	176:10
structurally	8:16 21:7	subway 163:4	supplant 91:4
107:10	79:19 80:21	163:21	supply 56:11
structure	106:4 124:11	success 14:21	66:16,20 89:12
101:10 104:9	141:6 179:22	81:19 196:2	126:13 133:10
132:10,11	186:6	successful	154:13
structured	submitted 33:3	170:11 189:19	support 20:6
115:6,6	108:1 182:20	sudden 111:8	21:19 23:3
	182:22		25:2,18 35:12

53:2 62:9 78:7	121:25 129:6	162:9,20	166:13,15
80:10 81:4	133:2 134:23	163:12 184:15	168:5 191:4
83:16 84:21	135:3 138:4	184:17 194:25	taken 23:2
98:12 103:2	140:13 142:25	194:25 195:9	71:20 92:18
129:16 131:14	154:23 165:1	systemic 80:10	197:25 198:1,2
131:20 137:5	191:19,21	117:6	201:3,12 202:9
166:7 183:8	surface 98:15	systems 101:20	takes 24:21
184:17 187:24	surgical 41:25	101:21 103:6	29:2 37:15,17
188:7 192:25	surprised	119:5 120:11	70:22 92:24
194:22,23	185:22	143:22 144:2	156:1 166:11
supported	surrounding	t	181:8
27:11	12:16 79:25	tab 8:3	tale 83:2
supporting	survived 40:8	table 12:4 32:8	talk 21:11
17:23 32:11	susan 2:17	171:20,25	24:12 41:8
supportive	186:13,14	tabulation	51:15,18 100:6
61:16 62:10	sustainable	127:16	100:6,11,14
79:2	41:6 149:24	tackle 49:25	116:3 130:23
supports 6:7	180:2	50:3 148:21	168:1 172:5,6
81:1 84:21	sustained 82:23	tackling 89:9	173:1 185:22
174:15	swapped 29:8	tagged 54:2	talked 55:1
supposed 29:9	swapping	tail 69:24	76:1 146:8
54:15	53:21	take 5:7 17:9	153:22 155:4
sure 16:24 20:1	switch 191:6,8	17:13 21:1	160:25 161:14
20:19 25:5	sworn 201:5	22:19 23:6,11	185:16
36:6 39:2	symbolic	24:13 38:21	talking 16:11
44:21 45:12,14	105:19 121:3	40:19 50:23	16:12 26:21
47:2,8,14	system 14:3	56:1 63:24	33:20 38:17
48:10 61:3	19:25 20:17	66:10 70:10,15	41:9 72:22
67:24 70:18,24	24:23 52:1	75:7 80:22	86:21 100:12
79:17 92:8	76:10 79:8	92:17 93:14	100:13 122:17
96:20 97:9	103:18 104:1	110:1 128:17	132:12 133:14
98:10 99:6	104:25 117:16	138:24 140:19	136:1 137:25
107:21 110:7	119:14 120:25	150:7 159:17	157:13,15
110:12,19	121:17 126:5		158:15 162:10

tall 53:9 59:6	technical 80:11	tenure 123:25	169:21 183:20
taller 28:1,19	180:23	term 14:25,25	197:9 198:8,11
tania 3:7	technocratic	15:7,8,25,25	testifying 88:23
tana 3.7	177:25	20:11 34:1,2	91:22 165:4
179:20,24	technology	41:6 63:13,23	201:5
target 133:1	179:5	64:4,14 69:7	testimony 7:6
targeted 67:17	teeth 26:2	85:24 86:2	7:21,23 8:11
117:18	147:13 185:20	89:17 96:18	8:12,16 9:8
	tell 62:16	117:21 126:15	16:4 18:16
targets 90:13 96:21 159:23	100:24 101:6		19:14 20:19
		132:8,12,16,17 157:21,22	
184:21	139:25	′	22:10 29:18 33:2 36:1 39:7
task 6:8 13:18	telling 26:20	184:20	
115:18 151:10	temporary	terminate	43:17 50:8
151:24 152:16	89:25 94:5	106:12	52:9 64:21
152:19	ten 17:20 95:3	termination	68:12 72:22
tasse 2:16	95:5,7,8 97:24	106:19	75:19 76:8
139:17 143:12	102:17 111:5	terms 20:3	77:13 79:19
143:14	120:19 122:6	51:17 52:13	80:21 81:13
tax 126:13,17	132:23,24	53:2 72:14	86:19,21 87:8
133:3 192:1,3	178:14	76:19 94:18	89:8 91:18
199:2,4	tenant 182:2	136:7 142:8,21	99:10 106:2
taxes 199:1,2	tenants 10:21	187:1	121:7 125:13
taylor's 113:24	62:10 135:12	testified 60:24	126:8 128:18
tcc 181:1	140:4 173:2	126:3 129:20	129:18 132:2
teach 100:5	174:19,21	142:12 143:2	132:21 133:21
teacher 99:21	176:3	156:22	135:5 136:9
team 35:14	tend 187:2	testify 6:2 7:25	139:4,13 141:7
161:1 178:6	198:12	9:12,23 30:10	141:18,25
teams 27:5	tenements	32:22 61:4	154:25 155:8
tear 135:7	175:21	88:22 91:17	167:3 169:15
197:16,16	tens 72:1,4	118:8 123:6	175:2,5 179:16
tearing 197:23	87:19	129:11 140:14	179:23 181:1
tears 173:25	tension 92:7	141:3 143:13	182:22 183:13
		146:6 148:25	186:7 193:23

194:10 196:21	106:1 108:24	192:14 194:8,9	102:11 121:15
199:8	109:14 114:14	194:15,16	124:2,3 127:9
testing 80:10	114:15,23	196:18,19,20	131:25 141:16
text 83:17,17	117:11 118:5,7	196:23 199:6,7	141:17,23
164:20	121:3 124:15	thankfully 50:1	143:6 149:19
texture 74:1	125:13,14,16	thanks 35:25	151:16 152:8
78:12	125:17,20	133:20,21	154:22 163:11
thank 9:12,17	128:14 129:11	139:24 169:6	177:9 189:22
9:23 12:11	132:1,3,6,14	170:21	197:12
16:4,6 21:6	133:18 139:13	thematic	think 16:17,22
24:16,17 29:17	139:14 140:7	141:20,21	17:4,11,14,22
29:19,21 30:4	140:22 143:11	theme 126:12	19:24 20:5,8
30:9 32:22,23	143:12 145:11	127:11 128:11	20:25 21:10
33:15 34:24	145:12,14,14	themes 126:11	23:2,17,25
39:6,7,9,15	145:15,20	theory 116:12	24:3,12,24,25
43:11,11 44:9	148:22,24	117:24	25:8,17 26:1
47:6 50:5,7,9	153:5 154:24	thing 8:7 19:19	26:14 27:18
50:13,15 55:4	155:2 161:23	46:21 51:11	28:8,11 29:1,3
55:6,11,11	164:23,24,25	52:22 71:1	29:13,22,25
57:21 60:13,13	166:22,23	74:1 78:8	33:10 34:18,19
60:15,16,17	167:1,2,6,11	93:12 101:23	34:20 36:1,3
61:3,4,6 64:15	169:7,12,13,14	113:10,14,15	36:11 37:11,14
64:17 67:4,21	169:16,21	113:16 115:5	38:10,23 41:24
68:10 71:9,10	171:25 172:8	130:3,7 132:4	42:24 45:3,8,9
72:19,19 75:18	174:23,25	167:15 168:4	45:10,17,20
77:12 79:11,18	175:5 176:23	176:9 197:9	46:12 48:25
83:12,13 86:14	179:13,21	things 19:7	49:1,2,16,18,20
86:15,18 87:7	183:10,12,15	21:19 22:9	49:25 50:2,3
87:8,9 88:20	183:17 186:7	24:1 28:4	51:5,7 52:7,16
88:22,25 91:16	186:10,10	43:18 61:25	53:15 58:14,17
91:20,21 99:9	187:16,17,18	67:25 69:21	59:9,18 60:9
99:10,14	187:22 188:20	70:15 73:17,20	65:2,7 69:13
102:18,25	188:22,23,24	75:25 76:4	69:21 70:1,4
105:23,24	191:22 192:12	84:11,20 96:16	70:24 71:13,16
		1	

[think - time] Page 72

71 10 72 10	157.0.4.4.10.01	41 14 067	40.10
71:18 73:10	157:2,4,4,18,21	thoughts 26:7	throwing 42:18
75:23 76:14,15	157:24,25	36:23 69:6	tied 54:9 117:1
76:16,19,20	158:10 159:3,7	75:21 155:11	tight 182:15
77:7,10,16,16	159:10,13,15	thousand	time 7:13,17
78:1,10,12,13	159:20 160:11	126:23 129:1	8:17 12:9 16:3
78:13,15,25	161:1,3,11,15	134:23 135:15	16:4 17:16
83:25 84:12,15	161:17 167:10	135:24 189:5	18:25 21:1
85:13 86:20	167:15,17	thousands 72:1	35:8 43:25
92:23 94:25	168:4,11 179:9	72:5 80:3	44:2 51:3,9
95:19 96:5,11	183:6,7 184:5	87:19 88:13	55:16,17,19
96:15,22 97:2	184:12 185:1,4	144:22 154:18	59:3 61:10
97:7,22 98:21	185:17,19,20	threatens	63:16 70:16
98:24 99:3	186:2 187:6,12	189:21	76:8 82:5
100:7,9,12	188:8 197:13	threats 119:3	83:10,10,10,13
101:5,18 102:8	198:14,15	three 7:13,15	84:8,16 86:8
106:3 107:4	thinking 60:3	7:16,17 28:2	88:8 100:25
108:4 109:6	121:14 124:19	29:10 110:5	104:14 105:17
110:8 111:5	133:12 177:16	126:7 128:6,9	110:17 121:4
113:9 123:15	third 14:25	130:12 136:2	121:19 122:4
124:18,18	15:7 82:2	143:2 163:23	123:4 128:12
127:18,20	105:12 128:11	165:7 166:25	128:21 129:19
130:21 131:17	153:3 175:24	167:24 176:6	136:16 140:11
131:23 133:24	thirds 90:20	189:8,8 190:3	140:21,23
134:17,20,21	thirty 190:3	threshold	145:15 146:7
136:15,23	thorough	49:15 67:24	148:8,23
137:4 138:1,8	119:22,23	68:3,3,6 95:18	153:10,18
138:24 140:3	thou 74:12	158:14,16,21	158:4,16
141:11,23	thought 23:10	159:16	159:17 164:1,3
142:7,23	26:6 94:19	thriving 81:1,5	166:23 168:6
145:16,18	130:10 143:5	81:11,12 83:16	174:23 177:16
149:22 150:5	158:13,21	89:22 150:1	178:19,19
150:12,17,20	thoughtful 60:4	180:21 184:4	186:7 188:17
150:23 154:9	171:12 172:14	189:10	191:18 192:9
154:10,20			192:13 193:22

			T
193:22 194:3,6	164:18,20	topic 7:7 9:24	tracker's 130:7
196:17,18	165:4 169:22	83:21 113:6,13	tracking 86:4
199:6	175:8 176:15	topics 84:1	183:6 197:6
timeframe	together 7:4	tore 53:14	tracks 76:16
112:12	22:14 24:15	torn 53:16	trade 27:22
timeframes	141:22 154:22	127:22 175:18	train 11:18,21
98:22	177:18 179:3	total 31:20	22:17
timeline 84:23	tolbert 3:4	80:16	trained 53:4
99:4 131:17	192:15,16,17	totally 108:9	training 11:12
182:15	told 101:5	168:21	trainings 56:17
timelines 64:5	tomorrow	touch 186:9	transcriber
194:7	149:16	touched 84:1	202:1
timely 15:1	ton 46:3 164:21	touches 100:8	transcript
105:10 185:23	tonight 47:7	tourist 46:6	202:3,5
times 29:6	74:12 89:7	touro 196:25	transcriptionist
46:20 50:18	118:8 146:9	toward 67:17	201:7
55:4 61:19	148:4 167:11	196:9	transformed
62:18 154:15	175:11 183:19	towards 46:10	31:7
timing 117:1	184:1 186:8	72:23 150:4	transforming
tiny 54:8	188:25 196:18	164:6	33:20
tired 179:12,14	196:24	tower 176:5	transit 10:14
tisch 120:5	tonight's 65:6	towers 175:18	90:13 147:8
tish 51:4	tool 5:13 78:24	176:9	162:11,13,14
titled 146:23	133:25 182:6	townhouses	162:14,20,25
today 9:24	188:2 193:1	176:7	163:10,11,14
30:10 32:22	tools 10:3	toxic 131:18	163:16 164:11
53:19 61:4	41:20 42:25	track 69:1 90:2	164:15
63:22 66:5	70:6,11 120:6	130:23 147:6,7	transitional
70:4,4 80:21	160:1 164:18	147:16 158:10	23:14,22
83:20 84:1	tooth 42:20	158:15,23	transitioned
103:2 104:8	top 10:7 35:21	182:11 187:25	24:6
110:25 118:1	82:8 146:7	188:18	translated
141:3 143:19	147:3	tracker 129:25	177:5
147:2 162:10		130:8,9	

translators 112:19 12:28 twenty 190:3 15:1,6 14:6 140:12 129:18 133:4 two 7:16 46:19 17:16 18:22 transparency 161:18 49:8 58:5,6,7 20:3 22:23,24 13:12 14:16 trying 17:17 66:11 69:21 25:2,4,10,13 84:22 116:9,12 19:9 20:22 75:22 80:1 26:9 31:18,25 196:6 41:10 42:9 91:7 93:3 36:4 38:20 transparent 49:25 60:6,9 108:16 111:21 41:8 51:14 85:14 103:8 108:6 109:8 122:12 128:6,9 52:13,19 53:7 104:2 120:12 110:6 121:17 130:20 136:2 58:16 61:13 transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:520 62:17 169:4,5 134:475:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 treating 72:15 turnout 190:14 turnout 190:14		112 10 122 0	1000	10.1.6.1.1.6
transparency 161:18 49:8 58:5,6,7 20:3 22:23,24 13:12 14:16 trying 17:17 66:11 69:21 25:2,4,10,13 84:22 116:9,12 19:9 20:22 75:22 80:1 26:9 31:18,25 116:23 180:12 35:1 37:10 83:2 90:20 32:14,15 33:19 196:6 41:10 42:9 91:7 93:3 36:4 38:20 transparent 49:25 60:6,9 108:16 111:21 41:8 51:14 85:14 103:8 108:6 109:8 122:12 128:6,9 52:13,19 53:7 104:2 120:12 110:6 121:17 130:20 136:2 58:16 61:13 transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 4raumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 turn 19:22 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15	translators	112:19 122:8	twenty 190:3	13:1,6 14:6
13:12 14:16 trying 17:17 66:11 69:21 25:2,4,10,13 84:22 116:9,12 19:9 20:22 75:22 80:1 26:9 31:18,25 116:23 180:12 35:1 37:10 83:2 90:20 32:14,15 33:19 196:6 41:10 42:9 91:7 93:3 36:4 38:20 transparent 49:25 60:6,9 108:16 111:21 41:8 51:14 85:14 103:8 108:6 109:8 122:12 128:6,9 52:13,19 53:7 104:2 120:12 110:6 121:17 130:20 136:2 58:16 61:13 transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 turn 21:20 53:14 75:8 197:21 77:1 83:20 trend 193:15 turnout 190:14 turnout 190:14 tupser 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 195:1				
84:22 116:9,12 19:9 20:22 75:22 80:1 26:9 31:18,25 116:23 180:12 35:1 37:10 83:2 90:20 32:14,15 33:19 196:6 41:10 42:9 91:7 93:3 36:4 38:20 transparent 49:25 60:6,9 108:16 111:21 41:8 51:14 85:14 103:8 108:6 109:8 122:12 128:6,9 52:13,19 53:7 104:2 120:12 110:6 121:17 130:20 136:2 58:16 61:13 transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 tof:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tunn 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trigger 67:23 turnout 190:14 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 72:5 195:16 u us. 115:21 142:3 146:3			· ' '	
116:23 180:12 35:1 37:10 83:2 90:20 32:14,15 33:19 196:6 41:10 42:9 91:7 93:3 36:4 38:20 transparent 49:25 60:6,9 108:16 111:21 41:8 51:14 85:14 103:8 108:6 109:8 122:12 128:6,9 52:13,19 53:7 104:2 120:12 110:6 121:17 130:20 136:2 58:16 61:13 transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treating 72:15 turn 21:20 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 53:14 75:8 196:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 31:3 120:25 turnout 190:14 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>, , ,</td></t<>				, , ,
196:6 41:10 42:9 91:7 93:3 36:4 38:20 transparent 49:25 60:6,9 108:16 111:21 41:8 51:14 85:14 103:8 108:6 109:8 122:12 128:6,9 52:13,19 53:7 104:2 120:12 110:6 121:17 130:20 136:2 58:16 61:13 transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 tringer 67:23 turnod 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 truly 25:15 190:22 191:10 19:14 195:13 131:2,2,24 truny 25:16 turnouts 190:7 turnouts 190:7 142:3 146:3	· ·			,
transparent 49:25 60:6,9 108:16 111:21 41:8 51:14 85:14 103:8 108:6 109:8 122:12 128:6,9 52:13,19 53:7 104:2 120:12 110:6 121:17 130:20 136:2 58:16 61:13 transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typical 31:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 5	116:23 180:12			32:14,15 33:19
85:14 103:8 108:6 109:8 122:12 128:6,9 52:13,19 53:7 104:2 120:12 110:6 121:17 130:20 136:2 58:16 61:13 transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 turn 21:20 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 202:5 turnout 190:14 typicall 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 turnouts 190:7 153:15 158:1 153:15 158:1	196:6	41:10 42:9	91:7 93:3	36:4 38:20
104:2 120:12 110:6 121:17 130:20 136:2 58:16 61:13 transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 turn 21:20 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 199:1 103:5 195:16 142:3 146:3 120:3,8,25 169:17,20,22 169:17,20,22 170:18 160:2 164:5	transparent	49:25 60:6,9	108:16 111:21	41:8 51:14
transportation 123:14 133:1 138:16 149:16 63:14 64:13 97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 true 99:5 201:9 172:1 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 turnout 17:4 177:15 179:10 150:22 153:15 15:1:7 tweaks 75:24 twelve 22:19 166:4,7,11,20	85:14 103:8	108:6 109:8	122:12 128:6,9	52:13,19 53:7
97:18 172:21 133:10 138:6 163:8,9,11 65:12 67:10,11 178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 496:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 195:16 141:17,18 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 142:3 146:3 120:3,8,25 169:17,20,22 151:17 150:22 153:15 15:117 tweaks 75:24 twelve 22:19 170:18 166:4,7,11,20 170:18 11:15 12:3,21 170:8,12,19	104:2 120:12	110:6 121:17	130:20 136:2	58:16 61:13
178:9 179:4,5 148:8 153:9 167:24 198:7 67:14 68:18 184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 turn 21:20 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 turnout 177:4 177:15 179:10 153:15 158:1 120:3,8,25 169:17,20,22 tweaks 75:24 170:18 166:4,7,11,20 15:117 twelve 22:19 10:5,23 11:15 12:3,21 170:8,12,19	transportation	123:14 133:1	138:16 149:16	63:14 64:13
184:18 155:19 156:9 type 17:14 69:15,16,19,24 traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 turn 21:20 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 53:14 75:8 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 true 99:5 201:9 172:1 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 202:5 turnout 190:14 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 141:17,18 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 u.s. 115:21 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 tursouts 190:7 u.s. 115:21 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 151:17 tweaks 75:24 twelve 22:19 170:18 166:4,7,11,20 166:4,7,11,20 170:8,12,19	97:18 172:21	133:10 138:6	163:8,9,11	65:12 67:10,11
traumatic 157:5 160:4 37:21 132:9,10 73:14 74:5,20 62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 turn 21:20 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 53:14 75:8 turned 19:22 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 turned 19:22 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 86:11 87:22 trigger 67:23 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 us. 15:21 148:6 150:15 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15	178:9 179:4,5	148:8 153:9	167:24 198:7	67:14 68:18
62:17 169:4,5 132:11 161:8 75:24 76:20,25 treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 turn 21:20 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 138:16 141:16 43:2 61:24 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 turnouts 190:7 15:21 p9:1 103:5 169:17,20,22 15:12 153:15 158:1 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 151:17 tweaks 75:24 twelve 22:19 166:4,7,11,20 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3.21 170:8,12,19	184:18	155:19 156:9	type 17:14	69:15,16,19,24
treated 72:5 tune 185:25 197:21 77:1 83:20 treating 72:15 turn 21:20 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 88:17 90:25 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 true 99:5 201:9 172:1 201:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 202:5 turnout 190:14 typicall 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 us. 115:21 148:6 150:15 trust 32:19 169:17,20,22 us. 177:15 179:10 153:15 158:1 150:22 153:15 151:17 tweaks 75:24 twelve 22:19 170:18 166:4,7,11,20 170:8,12,19	traumatic	157:5 160:4	37:21 132:9,10	73:14 74:5,20
treating 72:15 turn 21:20 types 73:15 84:9 85:10,15 72:16 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 true 99:5 201:9 172:1 201:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 190:22 191:10 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 uss. 115:21 148:6 150:15 150:22 153:15 153:15 178:1 153:15 178:1 153:15 158:1 153:15 158:1 160:2 164:5 170:18 ultimately 166:4,7,11,20 170:8,12,19 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3,21 170:8,12,19	62:17	169:4,5	132:11 161:8	75:24 76:20,25
72:16 53:14 75:8 78:9 84:18 86:11 87:22 trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 true 99:5 201:9 172:1 201:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 190:22 191:10 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 141:17,18 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 142:3 146:3 142:3 146:3 148:6 150:15 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 153:15 158:1 150:22 153:15 150:22 164:5 153:15 158:1 160:2 164:5 165:6,14,16 166:4,7,11,20 166:4,7,11,20 170:8,12,19 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3.21 11:15 12:3.21 170:8,12,19	treated 72:5	tune 185:25	197:21	77:1 83:20
trend 193:15 turned 19:22 96:2,3 88:17 90:25 trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 true 99:5 201:9 172:1 201:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 190:22 191:10 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 us. 115:21 trust 32:19 169:17,20,22 us. 153:15 158:1 150:22 153:15 153:15 158:1 160:2 164:5 151:17 tweaks 75:24 twelve 170:18 166:4,7,11,20 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3.21 170:8,12,19	treating 72:15	turn 21:20	types 73:15	84:9 85:10,15
trigger 67:23 turning 52:21 typewriting 91:1,11 131:3 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 190:22 191:10 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 trust 32:19 turnover 15:22 99:1 103:5 turzo 3:9 169:17,20,22 177:15 179:10 153:15 158:1 120:3,8,25 169:17,20,22 ultimately 160:2 164:5 151:17 tweaks 75:24 170:18 165:6,14,16 try 7:13 16:15 26:15 11:15 12:3,21 170:8,12,19	72:16	53:14 75:8	78:9 84:18	86:11 87:22
true 99:5 201:9 172:1 201:7 131:5,6,8,10,13 202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 190:22 191:10 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 us. 115:21 148:6 150:15 trust 32:19 turnover 15:22 ubuntu 177:4 150:22 153:15 99:1 103:5 turzo 3:9 169:17,20,22 ultimately 160:2 164:5 151:17 tweaks 75:24 twelve 22:19 10:5,23 166:4,7,11,20 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3,21 170:8,12,19	trend 193:15	turned 19:22	96:2,3	88:17 90:25
202:5 turnout 190:14 typical 31:7 131:22,24 truly 25:15 190:22 191:10 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 uss. 115:21 148:6 150:15 trust 32:19 turnover 15:22 ubuntu 177:4 150:22 153:15 150:22 153:15 153:15 179:10 160:2 164:5 160:2 164:5 try 7:13 16:15 twelve 22:19 ulurp 10:5,23 166:4,7,11,20 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3.21 170:8,12,19	trigger 67:23	turning 52:21	typewriting	91:1,11 131:3
truly 25:15 190:22 191:10 typically 36:20 138:16 141:16 43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 trust 32:19 turnover 15:22 99:1 103:5 turzo 3:9 120:3,8,25 169:17,20,22 tweaks 75:24 try 7:13 16:15 twelve 22:19 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3.21	true 99:5 201:9	172:1	201:7	131:5,6,8,10,13
43:2 61:24 191:14 195:13 63:15 141:17,18 72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 turs. 115:21 148:6 150:15 trust 32:19 turnover 15:22 turnoutu 177:4 150:22 153:15 120:3,8,25 169:17,20,22 tweaks 75:24 170:18 160:2 164:5 try 7:13 16:15 twelve 22:19 10:5,23 166:4,7,11,20 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3,21 170:8,12,19	202:5	turnout 190:14	typical 31:7	131:22,24
72:5 195:16 u 142:3 146:3 trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 u.s. 115:21 148:6 150:15 trust 32:19 turnover 15:22 ubuntu 177:4 150:22 153:15 99:1 103:5 turzo 3:9 169:17,20,22 ultimately 160:2 164:5 151:17 tweaks 75:24 twelve 22:19 ultimately 165:6,14,16 25:18 35:12 26:15 ulurp 10:5,23 166:4,7,11,20 170:8,12,19	truly 25:15	190:22 191:10	typically 36:20	138:16 141:16
trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 trust 32:19 turnover 15:22 99:1 103:5 turzo 3:9 169:17,20,22 151:17 tweaks 75:24 ultimately 160:2 165:6,14,16 try 7:13 16:15 twelve 22:19 ulurp 10:5,23 166:4,7,11,20 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3,21 170:8,12,19	43:2 61:24	191:14 195:13	63:15	141:17,18
trump 52:4 turnouts 190:7 trust 32:19 turnover 15:22 99:1 103:5 turzo 3:9 169:17,20,22 151:17 tweaks 75:24 ultimately 160:2 165:6,14,16 try 7:13 16:15 twelve 22:19 ulurp 10:5,23 166:4,7,11,20 25:18 35:12 26:15 11:15 12:3,21 170:8,12,19	72:5	195:16	u	142:3 146:3
trust 32:19 turnover 15:22 99:1 103:5 109:17,20,22	trump 52:4	turnouts 190:7		148:6 150:15
99:1 103:5 120:3,8,25 151:17 try 7:13 16:15 25:18 35:12 turzo 3:9 169:17,20,22 tweaks 75:24 twelve 22:19 26:15 177:15 179:10 ultimately 170:18 ulurp 10:5,23 11:15 12:3,21 170:8,12,19	trust 32:19	turnover 15:22		150:22 153:15
120:3,8,25 151:17 try 7:13 16:15 25:18 35:12 169:17,20,22 tweaks 75:24 twelve 22:19 26:15 11:15 12:3,21 160:2 164:5 165:6,14,16 166:4,7,11,20 170:8,12,19	99:1 103:5	turzo 3:9		153:15 158:1
151:17	120:3,8,25	169:17,20,22		160:2 164:5
try 7:13 16:15 twelve 22:19 26:15 twelve 22:19 170:18 166:4,7,11,20 170:8,12,19	151:17			165:6,14,16
25:18 35:12 26:15 autro 10:3,23 170:8,12,19	try 7:13 16:15	twelve 22:19		
		26:15		• • • •
	74:4 84:4		11.13 12.3,21	

182:5,9 185:17	underscoring	unfortunately	127:25 128:1,4
193:10 194:3	115:8	157:18 162:14	128:9 129:1
ulurps 23:18	understand	unfounded	132:8,12,20,23
51:15	19:5,9 28:12	62:11	132:24 133:5,9
un 123:12	34:5 35:1	unidentified	134:21 135:22
unable 16:19	56:12 95:10	9:2 29:25	135:22 136:4,7
unaffordable	124:5 133:25	60:25 67:22	144:22 149:3,6
40:4 144:23	158:5 168:6	100:2 114:21	152:3 170:20
unattainable	169:2 178:10	139:22 140:17	173:3,6,10,14
34:13	193:8	160:14,17,19	173:15,16,16
uncertainty	understanding	160:21,23	173:18 174:2,5
85:2 154:11,11	18:5 19:4 38:6	167:5 199:13	174:7 175:18
154:12,15,21	56:14 62:4	199:14,17,18	175:19,23,23
154:21	181:20 185:15	union 55:2	175:24 176:4,7
uncomfortable	understands	87:16 88:3,8	176:12,13,19
82:24	6:20 88:8	97:3 101:19	177:12 197:17
uncovered	undertakings	113:1	university
80:12	143:6	unions 87:24	115:25
under 80:6	undisputed	unique 37:19	unknown 84:9
90:3 98:19	190:5	38:24 48:20,21	unlocking
109:9 121:7	unencumbered	176:20	126:22
125:4 131:16	90:9	unit 54:11	unmistakably
166:21 174:6	unenforced	118:20 126:17	115:5
181:15,17	119:15	126:23,23	unprepared
190:14 195:8	unequal 10:11	133:14 135:19	44:25
underlining	130:4,9	135:24	unrepresented
67:1	uneven 25:16	units 12:17	198:12
underlying	unfair 36:17	21:22 22:1,2	update 13:19
131:3 150:21	unfettered	27:15 31:21	82:2,8
undermined	112:2 145:4	47:18 48:12	updating 130:1
119:14	unfold 7:9	54:10 67:19	upfront 44:20
undermines	unfortunate	80:17 82:3,9	upgraded
104:10	120:1	87:6 88:13	176:4
		91:14 126:18	

		T	
upgrades 12:8	64:20,25 65:8	157:17,24	vera 115:20
12:13,15,19	65:10,23 66:7	\mathbf{v}	versions 193:25
upheld 121:9	71:22 73:15,19	v 186:17	versus 92:6
121:10	84:3 88:3 89:7	vacancies	96:6 122:6
upper 50:25	90:16 93:19	104:18	132:3 168:1
127:4,5 138:2	98:1,9 113:8	vacancy 126:13	veto 188:10
176:14 186:20	126:23 127:2	133:3	vice 2:12 6:10
urban 53:4	127:18 137:9	vacant 126:18	140:24 169:23
137:8,15	141:5,12,16		victories 80:18
urbanist 175:9	142:11,19,21	133:9,14 197:20 198:1	view 32:13 92:3
urge 14:18	146:9 147:20		189:19
32:18 80:21	149:14 153:12	vacuum 38:11 valerie 2:13	viewed 79:1
118:8 144:14	154:6 162:19	6:14	views 121:11
145:4 180:14	171:16 180:3		122:3 172:9
urgency 72:17	181:6,21	valk 2:24	189:18
88:9	192:24	186:16,16,18 186:19 187:19	village 143:14
urgent 6:19	used 25:7 36:4	valuable 10:23	143:18,18
urgently	36:6,14 92:10	171:8 187:7	violence 99:18
117:18	93:4,5,6,13	value 19:4	102:22,23
usage 124:12	106:15 126:14	159:8,12 180:6	116:1 118:25
124:13	174:12 197:14	values 6:5	virtually 6:9
use 9:24 10:6	uses 77:22,23	14:15	7:12,25
10:16 11:3,24	86:5	van 2:24 11:19	vision 125:20
13:18 14:2,6	using 142:17	186:16,16,19	visions 90:16
14:17 18:5	160:1,2 178:17	variety 41:17	vital 87:23
19:6 21:4	188:4	198:22	171:18 193:23
25:13,15 27:1	usually 44:19	vast 97:13	viverito's
29:4 30:12	utilize 70:11	144:24 190:15	136:11
35:14 37:4	163:14	vehemently	vocal 62:8
41:3 51:17	uz 4:4 139:20	47:24 48:13	voice 21:2,4
52:24 55:17	148:23,25	venue 171:18	74:21 97:4,11
56:14 57:6	152:1,25 154:9	venues 171.18	108:21 162:7
58:16,23 59:20	155:13,17	venues 13.0	165:8,20,25
60:2,11 64:7	156:6 157:2,11		171:9,16,19

[voice - we've] Page 77

190:24 196:5	votes 73:20	140:13 143:1	73:13 74:12
voices 13:12	95:14	148:7 153:16	76:20 78:6
14:9 30:13	voting 96:1	162:13 171:1	79:1,9 92:10
45:4 142:9	vulnerable	184:12,13,14	96:15 100:11
171:15	38:6,15	184:14,15,18	110:9 115:6
volume 117:6	W	187:5 192:7	123:14 126:2,5
197:21	wages 88:4	wanted 33:2	127:23 134:12
volunteer	wait 13:1 22:13	73:1 141:3	139:3 142:4
145:25 152:9	164:3	142:6 151:22	148:17 157:7
vote 29:3 51:23	waive 66:21	184:1	161:6,10 163:8
55:4 56:3	waiving 130:25	wants 53:13	164:6 176:16
59:12,16 65:21	walking 177:22	99:14	179:17 184:22
65:23 75:15	want 13:3 14:3	warmer 174:24	184:25 185:1
90:21 93:11	21:6 24:18	warrant 197:2	ways 8:11
94:13 95:11	25:19 27:24,25	washington	13:13 14:11
134:13,16	34:20 36:1	111:22 112:2	18:13 19:9
147:22 149:15	38:4 40:19	waste 43:25	20:6 25:21
149:17 191:9	44:17 45:20	watch 8:21	32:20 33:3,9
191:15,23,25	49:18 51:15,17	40:10	33:11 41:4,15
voted 95:16	52:14 53:9,12	watching 40:4	41:21 50:4
138:3	53:19 57:10,12	46:9	53:22 64:8
voter 189:25	58:4 59:7 65:5	water 12:13	71:21,23 72:12
190:7,20,22	70:17,18 75:21	42:19 184:16	73:25 101:13
191:14 195:13	75:22 76:11	197:25	141:12 142:1,6
195:15 196:11	77:23,24 81:6	waterfront	142:7,15,24
voter's 5:16	84:14 91:21	176:14	145:5 148:1,18
voters 5:17 6:4	92:4 95:22	way 16:20	158:25 185:16
48:8 104:3	96:9 99:25	17:24 21:15	we've 7:18
126:1,4 134:7	100:3 102:25	22:4 27:2 37:2	16:22 18:15,15
190:1,13,19	100.3 102.23	40:18 41:19	18:20 19:14
191:15,25	118:7 125:17	45:24 52:15	21:11 25:1
194:25 195:7,9		57:8,10 58:18	26:11 36:12
195:14,22	137:6,19,20 138:16,21	58:20 59:25	46:5 50:2
196:4,6	130.10,21	69:14,16 70:20	65:11 72:4
	I .	l .	l .

[we've - worst] Page 78

76:8 101:18,18	161:22	wield 158:6	141:22 148:19
101:20 109:8	weller 2:19	willing 36:14	151:17,25
110:15 111:4	186:15	willingness	153:5 159:3,15
111:10 121:21	went 57:5	44:6	171:10 180:3
125:25 130:3	179:8,8	win 62:18	185:10
134:15 141:24	wesslock 3:25	window 32:3	worked 11:23
153:19 155:4,8	194:12,13,16	winds 42:13	27:4 115:13
158:8 178:16	194:18	winner 195:12	118:12 119:10
185:9	west 1:10 50:25	winter 2:16	161:8
weaken 86:2	176:5,14	139:17 143:12	workers 87:17
104:16 171:3	western 164:11	143:14	87:20,20
wealth 31:16	whatsoever	wisconsin	working 13:13
wealthier 36:20	37:6 124:25	106:10,11	20:15 24:1
wealthiest	whims 45:18	wish 7:24	30:14 31:6
147:10	63:7 110:3	wishes 6:2	34:21 40:12,25
wealthy 40:16	whip 30:7	witness 201:4	63:15 69:7
193:16	whisper 112:18	wollman 52:4	88:11 114:25
wearing 178:11	white 2:13 6:14	won 88:4	159:24 170:7
website 8:2,2	132:1 133:11	wonderfully	171:21 172:4
8:13	133:17 154:24	53:3	178:3 182:15
wednesday 1:5	155:3,15 156:4	wonky 83:21	183:23 194:22
week 130:2	185:21	word 9:10	works 21:15
weigh 99:7	whiter 36:20	words 7:8	37:2 69:15
weight 98:19	whitest 147:10	170:25 177:8	92:14 99:18
weighted 51:20	who've 169:11	work 7:2 15:25	110:10 159:3
weisbrod 2:5	wholeheartedly	22:14 23:8	159:18 171:9
6:13 43:11	37:18	35:12,13 37:22	171:10 180:2
44:17,22 47:3	wholesale	45:6 67:12	world 21:20
51:6 58:1,5,7,9	101:1	76:16 80:12	36:9
58:13 67:7,21	wide 189:18	84:4 86:19	worn 105:6
77:14 121:6,25	wider 28:2	101:7,11,18	worse 64:11
welcome 5:3	198:13	103:16 105:19	145:2 164:16
7:7 55:8 62:5	widespread	108:22 109:9	worst 62:17
126:8 129:3	80:13	119:14 137:6	

wow 148:23	154:9 157:12	157:22 158:2	146:25 148:15
wrap 128:13	157:17 158:24	163:21 168:24	151:14 152:15
write 101:3	160:20,23,25	178:13,15,17	152:21 162:21
written 8:16	167:5 186:20	186:1 193:19	163:10 164:1,6
20:20 78:22	187:23 188:17	197:25 198:2	164:18,22,23
81:13 91:18	188:19 191:19	yep 183:14	171:16 172:10
141:7,7	year 20:8 38:17	york 1:9,11 5:6	180:3 181:5
wrong 165:13	52:22 55:4	5:8,10 9:21,25	183:22,24
wrote 132:15	70:5,5 95:3	14:24 21:16,24	189:9,17 190:1
132:18 198:15	97:24 121:21	24:14 30:7	190:6,13
wylde 2:14	122:16 123:23	37:23 38:17	191:10,13,15
6:14 16:9	123:23,25	39:17,22 47:13	192:10 194:21
156:20 157:9	124:4 144:22	47:16 50:17,18	195:5,7,13,25
157:15,21	149:2 164:3	53:2,10 60:11	196:8,14 197:1
X	166:14 173:15	60:19 70:6,12	201:20
x 39:1 47:18	173:19 191:13	79:25 80:20	york's 192:19
	year's 130:7,8	83:1 87:21	198:25
/II'X	,	1	
70:8	130:8	88:1,9,24	yorker 62:19
y	· ·	88:1,9,24 89:11,23 90:20	yorker 62:19 114:24 189:7
y yale 179:8	130:8	, ,	
y yale 179:8 yards 176:13	130:8 years 5:11	89:11,23 90:20	114:24 189:7
y yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18
yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's
yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24
y yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14 50:6 58:12	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19 34:2 35:22	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22 107:11 109:1	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24 yorkers 5:14,21
y yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14 50:6 58:12 69:8 71:18	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19 34:2 35:22 39:16 42:7,7	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22 107:11 109:1 113:2,17,21,23	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24 yorkers 5:14,21 6:22,25,25
yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14 50:6 58:12 69:8 71:18 73:8,9 78:3,21	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19 34:2 35:22 39:16 42:7,7 52:23 55:16,18	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22 107:11 109:1 113:2,17,21,23 113:24,25	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24 yorkers 5:14,21 6:22,25,25 24:2 30:18
yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14 50:6 58:12 69:8 71:18 73:8,9 78:3,21 82:7 92:2	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19 34:2 35:22 39:16 42:7,7 52:23 55:16,18 57:18 61:8	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22 107:11 109:1 113:2,17,21,23 113:24,25 114:3,7,10	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24 yorkers 5:14,21 6:22,25,25 24:2 30:18 31:15 40:25
yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14 50:6 58:12 69:8 71:18 73:8,9 78:3,21 82:7 92:2 94:23 96:8	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19 34:2 35:22 39:16 42:7,7 52:23 55:16,18 57:18 61:8 68:21,25 69:1	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22 107:11 109:1 113:2,17,21,23 113:24,25 114:3,7,10 115:13,16	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24 yorkers 5:14,21 6:22,25,25 24:2 30:18 31:15 40:25 61:17 62:3,14
yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14 50:6 58:12 69:8 71:18 73:8,9 78:3,21 82:7 92:2 94:23 96:8 106:8 108:13	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19 34:2 35:22 39:16 42:7,7 52:23 55:16,18 57:18 61:8 68:21,25 69:1 69:17 89:3	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22 107:11 109:1 113:2,17,21,23 113:24,25 114:3,7,10 115:13,16 118:13,23	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24 yorkers 5:14,21 6:22,25,25 24:2 30:18 31:15 40:25 61:17 62:3,14 62:23 90:8,15
yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14 50:6 58:12 69:8 71:18 73:8,9 78:3,21 82:7 92:2 94:23 96:8 106:8 108:13 111:20 113:16	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19 34:2 35:22 39:16 42:7,7 52:23 55:16,18 57:18 61:8 68:21,25 69:1 69:17 89:3 91:7 95:5,7,8,9	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22 107:11 109:1 113:2,17,21,23 113:24,25 114:3,7,10 115:13,16 118:13,23 125:9 129:10	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24 yorkers 5:14,21 6:22,25,25 24:2 30:18 31:15 40:25 61:17 62:3,14 62:23 90:8,15 91:14 103:25
yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14 50:6 58:12 69:8 71:18 73:8,9 78:3,21 82:7 92:2 94:23 96:8 106:8 108:13 111:20 113:16 122:19 123:20	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19 34:2 35:22 39:16 42:7,7 52:23 55:16,18 57:18 61:8 68:21,25 69:1 69:17 89:3 91:7 95:5,7,8,9 106:22 111:5	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22 107:11 109:1 113:2,17,21,23 113:24,25 114:3,7,10 115:13,16 118:13,23 125:9 129:10 129:12,25	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24 yorkers 5:14,21 6:22,25,25 24:2 30:18 31:15 40:25 61:17 62:3,14 62:23 90:8,15 91:14 103:25 104:13 108:18
yale 179:8 yards 176:13 yeah 12:10 19:18 26:13 34:17 48:14,14 50:6 58:12 69:8 71:18 73:8,9 78:3,21 82:7 92:2 94:23 96:8 106:8 108:13 111:20 113:16	130:8 years 5:11 12:24 13:1 22:18,19,19 25:1 26:16,19 34:2 35:22 39:16 42:7,7 52:23 55:16,18 57:18 61:8 68:21,25 69:1 69:17 89:3 91:7 95:5,7,8,9 106:22 111:5 122:6,7 124:8	89:11,23 90:20 99:21,24 100:16 102:20 103:3,22 107:11 109:1 113:2,17,21,23 113:24,25 114:3,7,10 115:13,16 118:13,23 125:9 129:10 129:12,25 133:22 140:1	114:24 189:7 192:5 194:18 yorker's 171:24 yorkers 5:14,21 6:22,25,25 24:2 30:18 31:15 40:25 61:17 62:3,14 62:23 90:8,15 91:14 103:25 104:13 108:18 118:4 120:24

[yorkers - zoom] Page 80

171:6,20 172:18 174:17 177:10 186:6 190:15 191:22 194:21 yorkville 175:23 176:1

Z

zero 49:9 99:17 102:21 115:4 **zone** 84:14 138:9,10 **zoned** 68:23 **zoning** 31:3 41:8 47:9,10 66:18,22 67:1 67:1,9 73:19 81:16 83:3 90:22 91:2 128:17 130:16 130:25 131:3 136:15,15 137:2,7,12 149:10 150:21 152:3 153:2 163:2 164:19 171:12 181:10 182:18 198:11 zonings 11:11 89:16 149:11 151:8,12 180:7 **zoom** 29:23