Hearing

	Page 1
1	Charter Review Commission Public Hearing
2	
3	
4	Moderated by Richard Buery
5	Wednesday, April 9, 2025
6	5:11 p.m.
7	
8	
9	Staten Island University Hospital North
10	475 Seaview Avenue
11	Staten Island, NY 10305
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	Reported by: Chanyri Moh
18	JOB NO: 7214997
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Hearing

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES
2	List of Attendees:
3	Richard Buery, Chair
4	Anita Laremont
5	Carl Weisbrod
6	Julie Samuels
7	Grace Bonilla
8	Shams DaBaron
9	Leila Bozorg, Secretary
10	Anthony Richardson
11	Sharon Greenberger, Vice Chair
12	Valerie White
13	Kathryn S. Wylde
14	Diane Savino
15	Clava Brodsky, General Counsel
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	

MR. BUERY: Welcome to this public hearing of the Charter Revision Commission. My name is Rich Buery. I have the honor to serve as Chair, and we are here as New York City celebrates its 400th anniversary to take this moment to take a fresh look at the governing charter for our city.

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

It's our responsibility to review the entire charter and suggest changes for the voters' consideration. Of course, only if the voters agree to those changes at an election will any changes to the charter go into effect.

I know that I speak for my fellow commissioners when I say that we are committed to hearing from a broad spectrum of New Yorkers, and to pursuing the very best ideas we can find. This is just one of many public hearings across every borough

Page	4
------	---

where we are hearing ideas from experts, from community leaders, from elected officials, and truly from any member of the public who wishes to testify and share their ideas.

I'll also note that this is an independent commission. In making our recommendations to the City's voters we are bound only by our judgment and our values. We will pursue ideas regardless of who proposed them or who supported them. Joining me in this task are 12 other commissioners, some of who are present, many of whom are attending today's hearing virtually.

And so, before we get started, I want to spend a few minutes talking about how this evening will unfold. First, we will hear from invited panelists. We will ask each panelist to testify for no longer than five minutes, and after the panelists have finished, we will have up to 10 minutes of questions for that entire panel. I'll ask commissioners to hold any questions until all the panelists on that panel have spoken, and to be mindful of the clock as we move through the hearing.

After we hear from invited panelists, we will then open up to members of the public.

Members of the public are asked to testify for no more

than three minutes; again followed by any questions from the commissioners. For members of the public who are testifying, we'll first hear from those in person, and then we will move to anyone who seeks to testify virtually.

If you wish to testify virtually, there is a signup form online. You can find it by going to nyc.gov/charter. nyc.gov/charter. Click on the meetings tab, and then select the Staten Island meeting. For those of you who are online, we will also drop a link to that page in the chat.

And we are going to do our level best to hear from everyone. We've been able to do that at all of our prior hearings. So though we are scheduled to run until 8:00 p.m., if for some reason we don't hear from you this evening, if you can't stay, please, there are many ways to submit your testimony, including by writing.

You can visit nyc.gov/charter or email your written testimony to the email address charter testimony@Citycharter.nyc.gov. That is charter testimony@Citycharter.nyc.gov. We'll review all testimony that is submitted. You can also go to that website, again nyc.gov/charter, to find information on other public hearings. And of course all of these

Page 6 1 hearings will be live streamed. With that, we will get into our 2 3 For our first panel, I would like to testimony. 4 invite up Tiya Gordon of It's Electric, and Elijah Hutchinson of the Mayor's Office of Climate 5 6 Environmental Justice. 7 Whoever would like to begin. Welcome. 8 MS. GORDON: Thank you, commissioners 9 and members of the New York City Charter Revision 10 Committee, for holding this public input session on 11 government reform. My name is Tiya Gordon, and I am the co-founder and COO of It's Electric. We are a New 12 13 York born curbside EV charging startup headquartered 14 in the Brooklyn Navy yard in District 33. 15 It's Electric is electric vehicle 16 charging specifically designed for cities, and it's 17 the lack of public charging which stands as the 18 leading barrier for the adoption of electric vehicles 19 from drivers that are looking to convert to EVs. And 20 so we were born to enable access to the choice of 21 clean vehicles for people who live in cities. 22 Charging an EV is not the same as 23 fueling your gas car. In the United States, 85

They have a garage. So at the end of the day,

percent of people who drive an EV, they charge at

home.

24

they pull in, they plug in their car, same way you plug in your phone at night, and they wake up the next morning to a full battery.

And while municipalities like leading the way in setting policy targets to mandate a transition for EVs, no scalable charging solution exists for the millions of drivers, especially here in cities like New York, that park on the street.

We have exactly -- private drivers as well as for hire vehicles, and if we want all New Yorkers to have access to electric mobility, either in the cars that they drive or in the Ubers or the Lyfts or the taxis that they hail, we need to provide them with convenient and affordable public charging options. And that's where they already park, and we need to meet them on the street, at the curb.

New York City knows this, and New York
City DOT together with ConEdison launched Plug NYC,
the City's first curbside charging pilot. The 50
chargers that New York City installed in 2021 have
exceeded expectations with really high utilization.
And while a great product was selected, it was, as all
other EV charging companies are, reliant on those
chargers receiving a direct connection to the ConEd
utility, and this creates a really expensive

permitting	timeline	and a	high	cost.
------------	----------	-------	------	-------

Those 50, five-zero, curbside chargers installed under this pilot cost ConEdison \$13.4 million, and this, at a per charger rate, would be incredibly costly to make the next 600 chargers for New York City available. That would cost the city around 160 million; or if the city hit its 10,000 target, it would put the price tag at \$2.6 billion. So it was watching this high capital cost blocker for New York and other major cities that inspired us to found It's Electric and to create a charger that does not require a utility interconnection.

What we do instead is harness spare electrical capacity in buildings. Per the Green Building Council, 46 percent of buildings in New York City have spare electrical capacity. That means if I go into the basement of this building and I open the panel and I see two slots available, that's enough to power that charger that would be out front in front of this building.

And so we install small, simple, and elegant curbside charging stations at the curb. And instead of making that costly inter-utility connection, we instead pull capacity from that closest building, run the conduit below the sidewalk, and

erect that public charger. Think of it like arthroscopic surgery as opposed to open heart, given that we're in a hospital.

So our model is free to buildings; and, of greatest importance, it's free to cities. So we are a true no cost solution for cities to reach their electrification targets. It's from this City's first approach that an early-stage company such as ours were able to beat Tesla to win the contract for the City of Boston, as we just did last year.

We separately meter these chargers and pay the energy used directly so that buildings' energy bill doesn't go up, and then we revenue share back to that building. So we're giving money to a single-family home, we're giving money to a school, we're giving money to a library, we're giving money to a commercial storefront.

And because we -- pardon me. And this allows us to launch the model in Boston, and now we have seven other cities that will follow this year.

Our hardware also allows us to make that traditional connection to the utility if that is requested by a city, so we're flexible. To implement home overnight charging for the million plus New York City drivers who park on the street, we have to work through the

And as the commission contemplates changes to the charter, we put forward for consideration the reworking of the franchise process and the waiving of revocable consent fees to help spur investment from private partners such as It's Electric that can help the City reach its strategic goals, especially around urgent and crucial environmental and human health targets.

We all know that new infrastructure is hard, but we work with cities 'cause we know that climate health is human health. And despite New York City's robust transit system, use of fossil fuel cars in the city increases citywide GHG by 20 percent every year. And these resulting climate impacts are flooding, from hurricanes, to droughts, creating, for example, the highest amount of brush fires in a two-week period, as we saw last year, in New York City's history.

So here's how the New York City Charter Revision Commission can help. We need to review the challenges and the friction around deploying innovative infrastructure in our city. Right now, the problem is that private companies that seek franchises, because they are long-term and safe, the

.1

process is burdensome to the degree that agencies are often afraid to push through franchise authorization, and therefore smaller, more innovative companies can't compete.

The revocable consent process is pretty constrained and expensive for a private company wanting to deploy infrastructure Citywide.

Concessions and pilots do not offer long-term security or guaranteed opportunity to turn a profit, so it's hard for these companies to secure financing or investment to then invest in the city.

The revocable consent process right now is really intended for one-off deployments, and not something that would be a larger or network effect.

Our proposed revisions are as follows. First, we propose a charter modification to section 363, which defines the city's current franchise process.

We propose to modify this section to make smaller deployments easier, and in our written comments we've described how such authorizations would work limited to projects that address the City's climate and social justice priorities. These flexible franchises would have longer term -- pardon me.

MR. BUERY: I'm sorry to interrupt.

We're at time.

	Page 12
1	MS. GORDON: Oh. Thank you.
2	MR. BUERY: Can you wrap up, and then
3	we'll have some time for questions?
4	MS. GORDON: Absolutely. Basically, we
5	are looking for modifications that would help and be
6	limited to the City's climate and social justice goals
7	and align with agency metrics. We know that over the
8	next 10 years, the city will need to respond to new
9	technologies and I'm grateful for the chance to be
10	able to present this to you today. Thank you.
11	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
12	Mr. Hutchinson?
13	MR. HUTCHINSON: Thank you so much for
L 4	the commission for allowing me to be here today. I
15	truly appreciate it. Good evening. My name is Elijah
16	Hutchinson, and I'm the executive director of the
17	Mayor's Office of Climate and Environmental Justice.
18	MR. BUERY: Excuse me. I'm sorry. One
19	second. I'm sorry. If you could just stay, because
20	we may have questions when the panel ends. Thank you
21	so much.
22	MR. HUTCHINSON: I reclaim my time.
23	New York City is in a climate crisis
24	now. Climate threats including stormwater, coastal,
25	and groundwater flooding continue to challenge the

T	
Page	
raye	

city,	while	sea	level	rises	making	these	types	of
flood	ing woı	rse.						

The New York City Panel on Climate
Change, or NPCC, our local body of climate scientists,
projects almost two feet of sea level rise by the
2050s and more than five feet of sea level rise by
2100. By the 2080s, the number of days per year with
rainfall that are expected to exceed two inches are
projected to double.

And heat is the deadliest threat from climate change in New York City with more than 500 heat related deaths on average each year in New York City, and we know from our environmental justice report that black New Yorkers are twice as likely to die from heat in New York City than white New Yorkers.

The NPCC projects that in the next decade we could have over 50 days a year with maximum temperatures at or above 90 degrees. Nearly two months more of very hot weather, and that's like adding an extra month of summer that we're not used to and that our city is not designed for. Delivering climate infrastructure protects New Yorkers, and modernizing our infrastructure also brings significant economic benefits.

Climate events generate annual health-

	4 4
שמאבע	. 12
- 49	

related economic costs of over 4 billion and result in
hundreds of deaths in New York City every year
according to our VIA report released in 2024. Many of
the areas of the city are vulnerable to coastal
storms, as New York City has more than 520 miles of
coastline, one sixth of which lies within the 100-year
floodplain, exposing over 400,000 residents to high
flood risks. And this area represents \$250 billion in
property value at risk and includes over 14,000
businesses that employ more than a quarter million
people in New York City.

Spending money on resilience pays off, as the US Chamber of Commerce found that for every dollar we spend on resilience, 1\$3 is saved; and New York City's own resilience financing task force found that 50 billion of resilient infrastructure projects would protect New York City and avoid over \$220 billion in physical, social, and economic losses projected through 2100, paying for itself many times over.

Over the past 15 years, New York City
has led the country in building innovated climate
infrastructure. Green infrastructure to capture our
storm water, coastal protection projects that keep
hundreds of thousands of people out of harm's way, and

P	a	a	e	1	5

energy	efficient	building	systems	that	provide	heating
and co	oling with	out pollu	ting our	neigl	borhood	s air.

We have learned and are continuing to learn how to design and build projects that bring multiple benefits to our communities, but now we need to scale in order to build climate infrastructure for all of our neighborhoods that will be impacted by extreme weather, particularly our most vulnerable communities.

So how can the Charter Revision

Commission help? First, we need to make it easier to use our streets and sidewalks, the backbone of New

York City, in new ways to prevent flooding, provide shared open space for New Yorkers, and to support new public electric infrastructure that will power our cars and replace fossil fuel powered building heating systems while also providing cooling.

Our rights of way, or our streets and our sidewalks, are climate corridors. We are redesigning them to support healthy ways to move around our city, absorb stormwater, charge electric vehicles and keep batteries for scooters out of people's homes, and provide community space that is shaded by trees.

Our current system of establishing

legal right of ways was created long before we understood the concept of climate change, and we can no longer freeze our public space in place. We must be more nimble to respond, particularly on the waterfront.

But our building in our streets is complicated. First, we often have to acquire slivers of property we can to start a project. In order to acquire that property, we have to go through ULURP. If we want to raise a road to protect against flooding, again, we have to go through ULURP. And much of our waterfront is mapped streets or paper streets extending beyond the shoreline and marginal streets, such as bulkheads.

So almost all of this work that we have to do to build on our waterfront includes public access, and includes changing streets that may not even exist in real life but are subject to ULURP.

If we can speed up this process to build in our streets, reducing requirements for small acquisitions, changing our street's street grade, work on map streets that are currently underused without going through ULURP, we'll create a pathway to build shaded flood protective corridors, public curbside EV charging, and, for the district, thermal heating and

cooling systems of the future.

Second, we also need to leverage other types of city-owned property, including looking at that we can climate infrastructure like solar panels on city-owned property. The charter requires that we go through ULURP when making changes on City property, including site selection, so it's important that we work with City facilities that are trying to install solar on their sites ULURP applies; and even when we're trying to make neighborhoods healthier, safer, and greener, like resilience project and waterfront access, that must be located on city-owned land.

The charter provides ambiguous language for the application of site selection ULURP that has been expanded upon through courts.

Finally, my office is working through dozens of stakeholders and City agencies to create a voluntary and equitable program for New Yorkers to voluntarily sell their homes when faced with insurmountable flood risks. The program is currently in development, with lessons learned from previous buyout programs and involving extensive public engagement, but of course this will involve ULURP if we need to acquire city-owned properties, we need to make any program that the city would advance

Hearing

	Page 18
1	functionally obsolete and would not allow us to use
2	those areas for better public uses.
3	And so we come to the CRC hoping that
4	we can address both the ULURP, the site grad
5	acquisition issues, and the map street issues that
6	prevent us from using our waterfront and our streets
7	for climate change.
8	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much for your
9	testimony.
10	Do we have any questions for either
11	panelist from a member of the commission, beginning in
12	the room?
13	Commissioner Laremont?
14	MS. LAREMONT: Hi. I did have a
15	question for you, and you guys were a good tag team I
16	thought. Yes. But do any of the other cities that
17	you have worked in and talked to have a better
18	construct for how they approach the, you know,
19	entitlement of a firm such as yours to do this work
20	that might be an example for the city?
21	MS. GORDON: Yes. So in Boston there
22	is a procurement process in which a contractor was
23	awarded directly with the city, and then the city
24	works to manage the permitting process through our
25	coordination. But they take on a lot of that work in

Page 19 1 sort of removing those barriers for us. I ask, you know, when 2 MS. LAREMONT: 3 you submit your written testimony, but if you can 4 provide any more sort of clarity on exactly what you 5 would be looking for, that would be helpful. 6 MS. GORDON: Yes. Of course. 7 First, thank you both for UNASSIGNED: your testimony. You stated a number for the cost of 8 9 the 50 charging stations. Now could you restate that? 10 MS. GORDON: Yes. So the current flow 11 charging pilot, which you may see those tall blue 12 chargers in certain boroughs of the city, it's 50 13 pieces of hardware, and ConEd paid \$13.4 million for 14 that pilot. That includes the hardware and the 15 installation. 16 UNASSIGNED: And, Mr. Hutchinson, I want to make sure I have this correct. So right now 17 18 ULURP is required, you said, for small lot 19 acquisition, and for the -- if you want to change the 20 grade of a street? Is that what --21 MR. HUTCHINSON: Yeah. ULURP is 22 required to give the City the authority to acquire 23 property, to change the grades on map streets that are 24 on the City map, to cite public facilities for 25 infrastructure, and solar panels will count as

infrastructure. And so our ability to do all of these things is very limited by that.

When, let's say, if we launch a housing mobility program and want to give people the option to sell their home, that person would then, as a next step, decide to go through ULURP. It's not a feasible path forward for the scale at which we need to do things.

And I'll also add on the EV charging, the city as of last year passed the green rides, which is going to require that all rideshare vehicles be electric or handicap accessible by 2030. So having EV charging in place is going to be critically important to support that.

MR. BUERY: Thank you.

MS. LAREMONT: All right. Thank you.

Just for clarity, so the two parts of the charter, or
two processes that you've called out, is the franchise
authorization and then the revocable consent process.

With both of those -- I know I'm looking forward to
reading more detail on your testimony, but is it that
these need to be simplified for smaller, you know,
companies like yours; or is it about the speed, and
what is it that is the actual barrier to the work?

MS. GORDON: Thank you. So for the

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

franchise approach, we're looking for a way for the
city to utilize a city-owned asset to provide a public
service. And right now, for example, we want to make
sure that the franchises are simplified so that
smaller companies can compete to obtain such an
opportunity.

I'm sorry, I'm just going to find some more detail for us here. And then for revocable consent, the approach would be for it to be a mass approach as opposed to a one-off. So that would be more easily repeatable across the regions that we needed to deploy in the five boroughs.

MS. LAREMONT: Okay. That's very helpful. Thanks.

And Elijah, just curious from your experience in the City on these types of projects you've called out, which are all really great examples of things that really slow down progress that needs to be made that we're behind the curve on, is some of your thinking about pulling these things out of ULURP, or having just an alternative process within ULURP? Has your office given thought to that?

MR. HUTCHINSON: Yeah. ULURP itself can be incredibly dissatisfying to the community when we go to them on coastal infrastructure projects. And

it's because, you know, it's because we will go to the community and say we're changing the elevation of a street. And that's the only thing as part of the broader coastal resilience project that is actually subject to ULURP, and so the, the public conversation gets set up to comment on specific actions that are very limited in scope to the broader project design. And that in itself creates two problems.

One, you could be designing projects that are suboptimal to avoid ULURP to deliver coastal infrastructure projects, or we have extensive public other engagement processes that exist where we are socializing neighborhood plans, we are going out for communities to get their feedback and collect and put on what's happening. Is that sufficient to inform the project design at the community level versus ULURP? I don't know, but I can say that people are satisfied with the ULURP process as the means of having conversations about what these coastal infrastructure projects mean to communities.

And that's included with, like, east side coastal resilience, for example. Lots of contention, lots of conversations, but it wasn't about the trees, it wasn't about whatever that we went through ULURP; it was about site acquisition for an

easement	with	ConEc	d. And	so	tho	se	thing	js (can	be	
it's not	the 1	right	process	s, a	and	I	think	we	can	do	
better.											

MS. SAVINO: I was -- thank you, Leila. I was going to ask a similar question. I mean, many people complain about the ULURP process being an impediment to development of any kind. And obviously it was created at a time when it was important, and it does play a vital role in planning for the future of communities in New York City and having community input, but I don't think anyone's ever really identified the ULURP process as an impediment to coastal resiliency and/or our climate goals.

So it's interesting to hear you present testimony about that, especially since we're sitting right now in a block away from the waterfront. And this entire community from the south shore of Staten Island all the way to the bridge and around were devastated by Hurricane Sandy, which is just 12 years ago. And of course the coastal communities across the way in Brooklyn, all the way out to the Rockaways.

And so I'm just wondering, have we started to take into account the impact of the ULURP process on the redevelopment of these communities?

Not just the housing that's there or the commercial

properties there, but our ability to withstand the next storms, as right here we're planning, finally after 12 years, the sea wall and the complications that go into that.

MR. HUTCHINSON: Exactly.

MS. SAVINO: So it's 12 years after Sandy, and we don't have, you know, one brick in that wall, so to speak. So can you share a little bit of how the ULURP process is actually an impediment to that kind of development? So that kind of future planning?

MR. HUTCHINSON: Yeah. The ULURP process itself, especially because it involves many cycles of review when we are thinking of these projects, and we even have a vision for what we want to do, we have to engage in a public conversation and neighborhood planning. You know, Staten Island included Red Hook, another area 12 years later, we're just breaking ground on coastal infrastructure there.

When we have to go through the ULURP process itself, we have to be very clear on what it is that we're going in for so that we don't have to redo the ULURP, and that we've met the technical requirements and done the environments reviews that support the ULURP application.

And that timeline of coming up with the
vision of project design, discussing it with the
community, designing it, then going through
environmental review, scoping out the ULURP actions
that'll go through public review, and then maybe
getting recommendations and changes and frustrations
that might change the design, just means that we're in
this constant back and forth in terms of process for
moving forward a lot of these coastal resilience
projects, because it creates an unknown timeline and
also really complex political dynamics.

We do have a Citywide waterfront plan that Department of City Planning puts out. We do have PlanYC. We have coastal plans established in Coney Island. We have coastal plans established in the South Bronx, in Hunts Point, for instance. Moving forward this portfolio has been extremely, extremely challenging. ULURP has been one of the barriers. The cost of these projects has been another barrier. But it would be really helpful if we could find ways to not have ULURP be something that takes away from what we could do on the waterfront.

Especially because much of our waterfront is mapped streets and public land that will include site selection and changing grades when we're

Page 26 1 talking about elevating streets or changing curb lines; very fundamental things that any coastal 2 project would want to do, and none of our waterfront 3 4 regulations were designed with climate change in mind. None of our regulations thought about how much we 5 6 would need to adjust the waterfront. 7 MR. BUERY: All right. If there are any commissioners online who have a question, if you 8 could raise your hand on the call, we'll know who to 9 10 call on. 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 1: -- ask that, you know, in furtherance of the points that you --12 13 possible with us about types of things that you -specific about, you know, what we would do as well as, 14 you know, targeted in sort of any little carve outs or 15 16 things that -- so to the degree that you can do that, 17 that would be helpful to us. 18 MR. HUTCHINSON: Sure. Will do. Thank 19 you for that. 20 MR. BUERY: Do any commissioners online 21 have their hands raised? I can't -- no? Okay. Any 22 other questions for the panel? 23 Thank you very much. 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 1: Thank you. 25 MR. HUTCHINSON: Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Next, I'd like to ask Steve Levin from Solar Wind to join us. Welcome. Good to see you.

MR. LEVIN: Nice to see you, everybody. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify. I want to thank the Chair and the commissioners for this opportunity to submit testimony before their Charter Revision Commission.

My name is Steve Levin, CEO of Solar One, and I'm submitting this testimony on behalf of our organization. Solar One is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to design and deliver innovative education, training, technical assistance and advocacy that fosters sustainability and resiliency in diverse urban environments. We provide comprehensive solar technical assistance to building owners, affordable housing providers, and community organizations to facilitate high impact solar projects; and we advocate for policy solutions that make solar affordable and accessible to low-income communities and affordable housing.

Making our city more sustainable, equitable, and healthy is central to our goals.

Climate change is a direct threat to residents across the city, especially frontline communities that have

been historically burdened by environmental injustices and continue to bear the brunt of climate impacts like storm surges and extreme heat.

We believe there is a unique opportunity to mitigate these threats by updating the city charter to reflect today's climate and affordability crisis, and the need to rapidly expand affordable and resilient infrastructure like solar, while still prioritizing robust community input.

First issue I'd like to talk about is expanding solar in New York City because it is critical to our city and state climate goals in improving community health. New York City has been a leader in setting ambitious climate goals. It has committed to carbon neutrality by 2050, deploying 1000 megawatts of solar power by 2030 and 500 megawatts of energy storage by 2025.

Achieving these goals advances the global fight against climate change while improving daily life for New Yorkers who are disproportionately burdened by air pollution and climate impacts. Local renewable energy within New York City's also critical to relieve a congested grid, mitigate increasing energy demand, and reduce our reliance on polluting peaker plants.

While the City has made great strides in the deployment of solar, continued progress is at risk in the face of federal attacks on clean energy programs, dwindling New York sun rebates, and the increasing cost expected from tariffs.

So this was written, you know, four hours ago. So to keep our city and state on track -- and there's still an issue with tariffs because, you know --

To keep our city and state on track, we ask the commission to seize opportunity to leverage city-owned land where feasible and beneficial to communities to continue our ambitious build out of local affordable renewable energy as well. Expanding community solar and storage in New York City is essential for equitable access to renewable energy as well. Community solar is one of the most important methods to ensure equitable access to the benefits of solar.

For rental and building owners with roofs not suitable for solar, subscribing to a community solar array provides reliable savings from fossil fuel free electricity. While ConEd's recently proposed rate hikes and the federal cuts to the LIHEAP program, energy costs are skyrocketing and resources

for low-income rate payers are insufficient to address
high energy burdens. Community solar can fill in the
void, but the lack of space for community solar
projects in New York City is a major barrier.

Leveraging City-owned land for public renewables and solar access is also a priority. Two new statewide programs recognize the importance of community solar as a tool for equitable solar expansion; Statewide Solar for All and the New York Power Authorities Reach program. Both programs redistribute bill savings from community solar and storage projects to low-income New Yorkers enrolled in the energy affordability program, EAP, and living in disadvantaged communities, but bill savings from such projects will only be meaningful if there's a massive build out of projects within New York City.

Once again, New York's lack of space is hindering beneficial savings from renewables for low-income residents. The City's real estate assets present an opportunity to leverage existing space for projects that can enroll in these affordable energy programs. We especially want to urge the charter revision process to streamline the feasibility for NYPA to work with the city on its build out of publicly owned renewables as part of the build public

Page 31 1 renewables mandate. Partnering with NYPA will increase 2 3 public ownership of energy resources, increase bill 4 discounts for low-income residents, and increase high 5 paying jobs in the clean energy sector. 6 I have a few more recommendations, but 7 I'll submit them in our written testimony. 8 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. 9 questions? 10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: When -- I 11 don't know if this is in the testimony that you 12 submitted, but it will be also good to have examples 13 because, of course, I know of a couple, right, that 14 we've worked on together, that you can add to show the 15 impact, right, of equitable access to energy if those 16 projects weren't there, how they've worked, and what 17 they've done to allow that access to the energy. 18 that could -- some of that data could be included. 19 Well, we could update our MR. LEVIN: 20 submission to include some examples, for sure. Of 21 It was great to work with you. course. 22 MS. SAVINO: On a completely different 23 topic, former Councilman, so as you know, this Charter Revision Commission has been charged with -- we're 24 25 required to look at the entire charter, but we were

asked to make a particular focus on housing and to address the housing crisis that we face in New York City. And one of the things that comes up often in these discussions is the issue of member deference by the local council member, which can, you know, approve a project or kill it.

And so I'm just curious, now that you're no longer a council member, if you could do things differently, would you have? Particularly I think the district that you represented has grown tremendously compared to other parts of the city.

Just out of curiosity, now that you no longer have to worry about going before the voters, what do you think about member deference?

MR. LEVIN: Right. I think there's a good balance to be struck. You know, it was not 100 percent rule when I was there. There were times when -- I think my second rezoning, that I had about 45 rezonings in the district when I was a council member, and the second one that we had, I, you know, I opposed up until I couldn't really oppose it anymore. You know, probably an hour before the vote was scheduled.

So, you know, within reason, I think that it's important to be able to maintain that there's one council member who's negotiating in their

district, and I think often they're very familiar with the issues at play that others might not be familiar with. But, you know, it certainly should be within reason, and if that council member's operating in good faith, I think it's important to be able to allow them to negotiate. But everything's, you know, a balance, I think.

MS. SAVINO: Yeah. No doubt. I mean, I've said to the group and to people internally that the local elected officials, the closest person to that community, the people trusted that person to help make decisions about the future of that district. But it is quite challenging when, you know, nobody likes change. Everybody wants change, but nobody wants it next to them.

MR. LEVIN: Right.

MS. SAVINO: We all want more housing, but we don't want it in our block. We all want more development, but we don't want it in our neighborhood. It should be over there, over there, or over there. But there's no doubt that, you know, the councils over the years, and it's not just this council or the one you served in where you give so much deference to that member and nothing ever gets done.

So we've seen over the past 25 years

	Page 34
1	some communities are bearing the burden of the entire
2	development of housing and others, none. And how do
3	we plan for the future of a city that continues that
4	practice?
5	MR. LEVIN: I think the City of Yes was
6	really inspiring to see. I mean, being out of
7	government and being able to see, I think in the last
8	few years, a real shift in terms of the perspective
9	that I think a lot of elected officials have
10	recognizing, you know, there's the whole YIMBY
11	movement about, you know, saying, we need the housing.
12	Everybody recognizes we need the housing. We need
13	that supply in order to continue to grow as a city.
14	And so, you know, as a council member,
15	I kind of largely made my peace with development
16	happening in my district, and needing to be there,
17	and, you know, now five years or, you know, three
18	years out, but years down the line, I'm starting to
19	see the benefits of it, and I think that those in many
20	cases outweigh the impacts.
21	MS. SAVINO: That's good to know.
22	Thank you.
23	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Any other
24	questions from
25	MR. LEVIN: Thank you.

	rage 35
1	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: I just had two
2	questions. You talked about wanting us to look at
3	streamlining the feasibility of NYCHA, and you know,
4	that's always a challenge with the charter because
5	NYCHA has its own, you know, statutory process, but
6	you are contemplating that there is a path for us to
7	do that in the charter, and if you are, what that
8	would be?
9	MR. LEVIN: I think I was referring to
10	NYPA.
11	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 3: Oh, NYPA. Oh.
12	Okay. Got it, got it. That's easier property.
13	And we can even envision it with NYPA campuses. How
14	do these structures relate in those contexts? Are
15	they rooftop structures? Are they on the blue ground?
16	How do they relate?
17	MR. LEVIN: There's different
18	modalities. So often it's a rooftop, or a canopy
19	system that's on a rooftop. So there's different kind
20	of modalities within building mounted, but then
21	there's also opportunities to have it as carports, you
22	know, so over a parking lot or in industrial spaces.
23	So it could be a large industrial lot that can serve
24	as a solar array or contain battery storage.
25	And so I think that the one

recommendation that we would put out there is to be able to streamline the process so that New York City can engage with NYPA to be able to cite specifically renewable power and renewable energy resources in communities, and not have it have to go through an extensive ULURP alert process, but be able to lease out the space specifically with, you know, to be clear, with renewable energy. So not that there would be some kind of risk of having peaker plants or polluters in the neighborhood, but ensuring that there are renewable energy resources throughout the city.

And that's the format that Community Solar really works. And Community solar is where renters are able to participate. So they don't own their rooftops, but they're able to participate in solar, get a 10 percent discount on their energy bills, and also be able to participate in renewable energy.

MR. BUERY: Councilman, one of the things that we have been talking about, just again related to housing, is potentially having processes that make it easier for certain kind of development, particularly housing that is either of limited scope or that is largely affordable. And I'm wondering if you could imagine a regime that might have similar

benefits for housing that is extremely energyaffordable or that has built in renewable energy, like
solar arrays. I'm wondering if that's something
you've thought about or looked into?

MR. LEVIN: To incorporate it into a -MR. BUERY: Another thing that might
allow you to have a more streamlined process by
providing income for the public benefit, such as
supporting renewable energy or supporting the energy
grid.

MR. HUTCHINSON: I mean, we think that that would be great. You know, part of Solar One's mission is to deploy renewable energy in a distributed way, meaning have it out there on every rooftop in the City and make it as non-centralized as possible because that's the great resource that we have in New York City is, you know, our available rooftop space.

And so where there's new development, we think that that makes a whole lot of sense. And we engage really closely with HPD on their solar reusable program, so when there's new affordable development, we engage with that and with major capital projects, major capital improvements. But yes, to answer your question, I think that that would be something we would be very supportive of, and we be super

Hearing

	Page 38
1	supportive of with affordable housing as well. Of
2	course.
3	MR. BUERY: Thank you.
4	Are there any online panelists who have
5	questions? No?
6	It's good to see you. Thank you so
7	much.
8	MR. HUTCHINSON: Likewise. It's good
9	to see you all. And thank you so much, commissioners,
10	for volunteering your services.
11	MR. BUERY: Thank you. Appreciate it.
12	Our next speaker is John Ketchum from
13	The Manhattan Institute.
14	MR. KETCHAM: Chair Buery and
15	distinguished members of the 2025 Charter Revision
16	Commission, thank you for the opportunity to testify,
17	and for performing this important civic service for
18	our city.
19	I'm John Ketchum, legal policy fellow
20	and director of cities at The Manhattan Institute. My
21	views today are my own. I also second the
22	recommendations made by my colleague, Eric Cober, at
23	the February 24th hearing.
24	Six years after adopting rank choice
25	voting for local primary and special elections, and

many of the City's electoral dynamics remain largely
unchanged. Only 23 percent of registered voters
participated in the 2021 general election for mayor.
Closed primaries still bar about a million
unaffiliated voters from having a say in any primary,
and Manhattan Institute polling, conducting this
January, has found that 44 percent of City voters
believe that local elections are effectively decided
in the Democratic Party primary, not the general
election.

To promote greater political competition, and turnout therefore, I respectfully recommend that the commission consider changes to the City's electoral structure, the details of which I will include in my extended written testimony. Today, I'd like to focus on a few caveats of nonpartisan primaries and the benefits and trade-offs of moving the City's local elections to even numbered years. MI polling shows that a 37 percent plurality of City voters supports nonpartisan primaries over open or closed alternatives. Now, by nonpartisan primary I mean an election open to all registered voters who select candidates to advance to the general election, regardless of party.

Nonpartisan does not, however, require

removing party labels from the ballot. Eliminating party labels would be problematic, as they serve as important information cues to help voters make their decisions at the ballot box. And some jurisdictions like Alaska, for example, allow candidates to choose a preferred party that appears next to the candidate's name on the ballot; but this may mislead voters if party leadership does not support these candidates, which can also occur if the label simply reflects the candidate's voter registration at the time of an election.

Instead, I suggest that party leaders select the candidates who will bear their party's endorsement, allowing parties to play a role in a nonpartisan system while opening the vote to all registered voters and still boosting political competition. For City Council elections, I also respectfully urge the commission to consider list-based proportional representation systems which can bypass the need for a primary election by likewise allowing internal party processes to nominate candidates.

Next, moving elections for New York
City local offices to even years would amplify the
participatory impact of a reformed electoral

Page	4	1
------	---	---

structure. Across the US and in New York City, odd year local elections draw far lower turnout than those held alongside federal contests in even years. This dampens political competition, contributes to less representative electorates, empowers special interests, and raises election administration costs.

Ample evidence nationwide corroborates that moving local elections to even numbered years is the single most effective way to increase voter participation. Based on the City's historical voter patterns, holding local elections on even years could potentially double or more the recent share of New Yorkers who participate in local government, particularly if those elections were held concurrently with presidential elections.

Higher turnout yields important secondary benefits. It dilutes the influence of special interest groups by raising the costs of reaching a sufficient number of voters to sway an election. As a result, even your elections encourage local elected leaders to make decisions that better reflect the preferences and concerns of a majority of their constituents, and this closer representativeness does not come at the expense of one political party over the other. Studies have found that moving to

even	year	electi	ions	has	no d	liscer	cnibl	e par	rtisa	an
impac	t.	Voters	are	not	also	more	e ign	orant	of	local
matte	rs s	imply h	oecau	se t	hey	parti	cipa	te in	a i	local
race	that	coinci	ides	with	fed	leral	or s	tate	race	es.

And finally, eliminating odd year elections could save between 30 and 60 million dollars every four years, and reduce the size of the City's Board of elections prompting long overdue reforms at that body. As you are all likely aware, there exists a major impediment to moving local elections to even years, and that is Article 13, section eight of the New York State Constitution, which would need to be amended before a new local election calendar takes effect.

But the multi-year nature of the state constitutional amendment process can allow City officials and voters to acclimate to this change and potentially align the new even year local calendar with the decennial census redistricting process. For example, allowing the first even year local races in 2032. I urge you to seize this opportunity to build a fairer and more representative local democracy.

Thank you again, and I welcome any questions.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. I'm

Hearing

	Page 43
1	going well, actually let Senator, you want to
2	start?
3	Well, maybe two questions. One is
4	and first of all, thank you so much for your
5	testimony.
6	MR. KETCHAM: My pleasure.
7	MR. BUERY: The first question is that
8	you spoke about the potential of essentially misusing
9	the ability to attach your party affiliation in open
10	primary ballot as a reason to have party leaders
11	approve that designation. In cities around the
12	country that have some form of open primary, are you
13	aware of lots of examples of candidates who have,
14	like, intentionally misled the public by adopting a
15	party affiliation? Is that a problem that has been
16	seen around the country?
17	MR. KETCHAM: Thank you for the
18	question.
19	So some jurisdictions allow for a
20	three-word descriptor of what the candidate stands
21	for. It doesn't necessarily have to be a party label
22	per se, and that has led to some confusion by, for
23	example, saying that the candidate was an independent
24	candidate, right, which does not necessarily mean in a
25	particular independent party or independents party.

I think the most important thing is
that voters should have immediate information
available to them on the ballots, that they can make
informed decisions on the spot. We would all love to
imagine that voters do ample homework before they get
to the ballot box. Many do, but some don't, and we
have to, in a sense, meet voters where they are in
those cases. And informational cues simply provide
either good or bad information, and sometimes if it's
not aligned with, for example, what party leaders
really want, then the voter may not know whether
there's a real affinity or link between the party
structure, the party leadership, and the particular
candidate who's running.
So in order to strengthen that linkage
and prevent potential misapprehensions or confusions,
I think it would be important for party leadership to
have some role in the endorsement that is included on
the ballot.
And I welcome your second question.
Thank you, Chair.
MR. BUERY: Well, actually, I'll hold
my question. We'll give a chance.
MR. KETCHAM: Thank you.
MR. BUERY: Commissioner?

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

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 4: Yes. Thank you. You mentioned increasing the cost as a benefit in terms of reaching a broader audience. I would ask in your written testimony, or you could tell me if you've thought about this, and I don't even know if this is our purview, but how does that connect or not with any -- or looking at what the campaign finance system looks like now, do you think there would need to be changes there in order to really effectuate the outcome you're talking about?

MR. KETCHAM: Well, thank you for the question.

I have not thought specifically about the interaction of the campaign finance system. I would be happy to explore that in my written testimony. My point in, you know, looking at the way that interest groups influence local election is that it's a whole lot easier for them to have influence when only 20 or 25 percent of the populace is casting the a ballot. And so it's therefore easy to get out the vote of, let's say, a membership organization.

Now, that membership organization may not be representative of a district's voters as a whole or deed of the Citywide electorate, and therefore we may have representatives that are skewed

in various ways relative to the median voter in a district. And by doubling your voter turnout, for example, it's going to be a whole lot harder for that interest group to reach enough voters to have that same level of impact.

MS. SAVINO: Thank you. So now I have a lot of questions, so I'm going to try and start from the top.

First, I think I agree with you technically on the idea that even year elections require a constitutional amendment, so we'll leave it at that. I mean, perhaps we could explore the idea of a question saying if then would we be able to move to even year elections, and that might be a question for the Charter Revision Commission to put forward to voters.

But on the bigger issue of the -- and let me just say this. 20-some-odd years ago I was involved in a campaign to kill the ballot initiative that Mike Bloomberg put forward. And I think it was -- it was more than that, 2003, to have non-partisan elections, which is not what you're suggesting. And I will publicly say he was right then, not for the right reason, and we were wrong. And the reason I say that is because in the past 20-some-odd years we have seen

Page	4	7
------	---	---

the complete deterioration of the body politic, and
largely because of the bitter partisanship that exists
between the two major parties that essentially control
our election process.

And having been a senator who ran on more than one party line over the years, I can attest to that we were all part of that because we were invested in the continuity of that. I think we have with us tonight two City Council candidates in a special election that will be appear on the ballot. And so I want to ask you a question. The New York City special election process for the council is a straight non-partisan election. While they can be supported by the party that they belong to, those ballot lines will not appear on the ballot. They have to create a ballot line.

And I should know what their ballot lines are. I don't know, but the -- and the state a vacancy in the assembly or the Senate, and they hold a special election. It is the party line that appears under because you're the party's candidate; right? So which model do you think makes more sense?

MR. KETCHAM: Well, the 2019 Charter

Amendment applies also to special elections, and
therefore you have rank choice voting in that as well.

Page	4	٤
------	---	---

Now, it's hard to every electoral system has trade-
offs; right? Rank choice voting itself has trade-
offs. And if you think about just from the voter's
perspective, for example, rank choice voting imposes a
pretty high informational burden on voters. It
requires them to know enough about it five different
candidates in a City Council election. That could be
pretty difficult if they're neighborhood figures,
right, that don't get a lot of press, especially given
the struggles that local journalism has had.

And so there, you know, rank choice voting has certain upsides for sure, but in terms of how it imposes this informational burden, this knowledge burden on voters, I think it does leave some things to be desired. And therefore, by moving to a system of proportional representation, the parties become part of the process there. And all the voter needs to know is what party do I most support; right?

And to your comment earlier about the nationalization of our local politics and how that has had deleterious effects on our local citizenry and our local solidarity, I take your point, and I concur with it. Local matters do not really align along the same ideological spectrum or access as national matters do. Right. Your view on housing may not have a whole lot

to do with your view on public safety, or on transit, or on climate policy, right, and yet we are effectively putting all of our political competition, all of our political differences, through a primary process that one party dominates.

You know, and so I would say any electoral system that moves to a more competitive general election is the one that I would favor. And there are just so many variations that, you know, that you can pick among many. And again, it's all a matter of trade-offs and preferences, but ultimately the general election is where the voters should have the, the most say.

MS. SAVINO: So you did say in your testimony that -- I think that this is your testimony, not Manhattan Institute's position?

MR. HUTCHINSON: Yes. It's mine.

MS. SAVINO: That you would prefer the model of a nonpartisan primary as opposed to an open primary. And my understanding of an open primary is -- again, we have 1.1 million unaffiliated voters in the City of New York. They are effectively disenfranchised right now because, as we all know, for the most part, the Democratic primary is the equivalent of the general election in this City.

Decisions are made in June, and everybody else is stuck with whoever the democratic candidates are that are chosen in that party's primary.

where I'm a registered non-affiliated voter, and I live in a community where it's overwhelmingly a democratic community, I want to be able to vote in that democratic primary, but I do not want to register in that party. I have no interest in becoming a Democrat. Why not that model as opposed to a non-profit, a non-partisan primary?

MR. KETCHAM: Well, the general argument against what we might call semi-open primaries or fully open primaries is that it allows for interference by bad faith actors, by people who, you know, want to just register or want to interfere with the deliberations of a particular party without committing to that party.

MS. SAVINO: That happens now because we don't have an open. So we saw it happen, you know, allegedly, in Westchester last year, where tens of thousands of people re-registered as Democrats to participate in a congressional primary. So in order to avoid that, if you don't require people to enroll in that party so that they can vote in that primary,

Page 51 1 wouldn't that solve that problem? MR. HUTCHINSON: Well, that is a good 2 3 counterargument to that. As a matter of fact, 4 Manhattan Institute polling shows that about 23 5 percent of respondees said that they're registered as Democrats because they want their vote to count for 6 7 something in the general election. 8 MS. SAVINO: Exactly. 9 MR. HUTCHINSON: There are many 10 different types of open primary, as I say, across the 11 The semi-open version just allows a country. 12 unaffiliated voter to pick one of the two parties. 13 MS. SAVINO: Right. 14 MR. HUTCHINSON: A fully open version 15 allows for anyone to participate in any -- so if I'm, 16 you know, a registered Democrat, I could participate in the Republican primary. That, some people say, is 17 18 interfering with --19 MS. SAVINO: That would be the 20 equivalent of party raiding, right, without actually 21 doing the reregistration. So I think, I mean, I can 22 speak for myself, I would not support that model. 23 I think the -- and I don't want to take up the entire

allowed to vote in that, in one party primary, I think

time -- but I think the open primary where people are

24

Hearing

	Page 52
1	might make more sense. But I'm certainly willing to
2	read the rest of your testimony to get a better
3	understanding of it. Thank you.
4	MR. KETCHAM: Thank you.
5	MS. SAVINO: And I didn't mean to put
6	you on the spot.
7	MR. KETCHAM: Oh. No. No.
8	MS. SAVINO: That is why you're here;
9	right?
10	MR. HUTCHINSON: Thank you. You bet.
11	MR. BUERY: Thank you, Commissioner.
12	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 1: I have a
13	question about something you said. You said that
14	research shows that this construct doesn't have a
15	discernible partisan impact. Could you just, you
16	know, expound on that?
17	MR. KETCHAM: Sure. Thank you for the
18	question. So research done by Professor Zan Hajnal,
19	for example, and Justin de Benedictis-Kessner, have
20	shown that even though you are in some cases doubling
21	the voter turnout, that that does not systematically
22	and consistently benefit one political party over the
23	other. So you could expect to have the same outcomes,
24	per se, but you're increasing democratic
25	participation. So this is not an attempt to help one

party	over	another.	There's	no	insidious	motive
behind	i it.					

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 1: Well, thank you. And I think that's really important because I know that as we considered this, that's one of the big issues that people raise, that we are trying to ensure that democratic candidates can't win, which I think is not true in any respect. We're just considering how more people can participate. So if you could just make sure that that is cited in your testimony to us, I think that would be helpful.

MR. KETCHAM: I will be sure to do that. Thank you, Commissioner.

MR. BUERY: Well, Mr. Ketcham, just following up on that question; just as an example, you could very easily imagine a process that would lead to a general election with two Democrats, both of whom might have had more popular support than a Democrat and a Republican who had less popular support. Just that would sort of align with the sort of idea that it doesn't necessarily benefit or harm any party. It may increase the likelihood that the two most popular candidates of any party might have an opportunity to face off in a general election. Is that right?

That is right.

MR. KETCHAM:

i	r	
	i	ir

I should say that the research on even year elections holds the other electoral structures constant, right, so they're not going to confound the variables on that. But local politics does not necessarily have to align with national political labels; right? I mean, we have many, many differences, many opinions. We all know New Yorkers have lots of opinions; right? And to think that we are making our local decisions based on whether you like Joe Biden or Kamala Harris or Donald Trump, it just defies belief in my mind.

I would much rather have a more localized politics where we might have, let's say, a pro-housing growth party, right, where you have support for these policies across the City, but not necessarily in equal measures in particular districts. So you're never really going to get representation of those citywide or borough wide interests that are really important to represent through the single district paradigm that we have now.

I should also say briefly that there exists proportional representation models that preserve the single seat district while also allowing for citywide seats, and that allow for proportionality

Page 55 1 for parties so that you have a nice balance of district level one-to-one representation between 2 constituent and council member, but also other council 3 4 members that can represent citywide needs. 5 MR. BUERY: Thank you. 6 Are there any -- I'm sorry. 7 MS. SAVINO: Sorry. Because when you mentioned the issue of 8 9 national politics filtering down to local politics and 10 primaries; and in fact, that is exactly what's 11 happening because of the small number of people who 12 participate in primaries now. You said yourself, I 13 think in 2021, 23 percent of voters voted in the 14 general election. I think a fewer percentage of voters voted in the primary in June, and you compare 15 16 that to 40 years ago when you might have 70 percent of 17 voters participating in an election. 18 So is it the -- if we were to take the 19 party label off the ballot line, in whether the 20 nonpartisan primary or the open primary, do you think 21 that might help alleviate that problem where you had 22 the far right and the far left controlling the primary 23 process? And that's my last question. I promise. 24 MR. KETCHAM: Thank you for the

question.

I would rather not remove the party
label. As I mentioned, they provide information cues
to voters to help voters decide on the spot which
candidate best aligns with the voters' values and
preferences and concerns. That said, I think that we
should have more party competition, more options for
voters to choose from, including local parties; right?
So the Democratic Party of New York City should stand
for something; right? But we don't know or the
Republican Party, I should say. They should stand for
something. But it's very difficult to have a coherent
sense of what that is because there are many factions
that make up these major parties.

And some of these factions, perhaps they're better suited as their own political party; right? And you can have a separate party label that means something significant to voters, and other party labels may represent very different policy matters, but the point is that you have clear, distinguished party brands that voters can appeal to and that voters can identify with. And it makes it a whole lot easier to know, I like the Green party, for example, and I will therefore vote for a Green candidate or the Green Party in a proportional representation system.

MR. BUERY: Are there any commissioners

Hearing

	Page 57
1	online who seek to testify? No?
2	Thank you so much. Appreciate your
3	testimony.
4	MR. KETCHAM: Thank you for the
5	opportunity, and your time.
6	MR. BUERY: All right. Thank you.
7	Now we're going to move on to public
8	testimony, and we're going to ask I'm going to call
9	three people at a time, and I'm going to hold you
10	strictly to the three minutes of testimony, if that's
11	okay.
12	We'll invite Michael Schnall, Frank
13	Morano, and Julius den to testify.
L 4	MR. SCHNALL: Evening, Chair Buery and
15	commissioners of the Charter Revision Commission.
16	Welcome to Staten Island. My name is Michael Schnall.
17	I'm a resident of the West Brighton neighborhood on
18	the north shore of Staten Island. Thank you for
19	holding this input session to hear from Staten
20	Islanders about the important work of the Commission
21	and our thoughts on government reform.
22	By way of background, I'm a non-
23	practicing lawyer who worked in the New York City
24	Council and Bloomberg administration. I've worked in
2 5	the nemprofit costor for 10 warrs leading government

affairs and community engagement. I ran for New York
City Council in 2021, and I was appointed by Speaker
Adams as the lone Staten Islander to the 2020
Redistricting Commission.

I wanted to talk about two items tonight. First, even and odd municipal elections, and then nonpartisan elections. I applaud the Commission for thinking long and hard about this issue. If voting is the most basic responsibility of each citizen participating in our democracy, our city must work to find the lowest barriers of entry. And at the time when our democracy is under assault, it's even more important for New York City to lead the way.

I split this out into pros and cons. So the pros of even year voting is that it removes the revolving door between Albany and New York City due to the logistical nature of even year state and federal elections and odd year City elections. This allows elected officials to swap seats, basically creating an incumbent protection program. Presidential election years experience higher voter turnout, and the New York City Board of Election will have much less work in odd years.

The cons of shifting from an odd year voting system is that voters are already bombarded by

print and digital television advertising causing
confusion, frustration, and anger; and having hundreds
of more candidates running for council citywide seats
just further adds to the problem. The cost of
advertising will raise higher, and the share of
campaign expenses for advertising will become larger.
The changes to political terms will impact sitting
elected officials.

What will the Board of Elections do in off years? I'm not sure. Consultants will be forced during odd years to shift to advocacy and lobbying, which will further blur the lines. The whole end of this discussion, and it was mentioned before that this is really an issue for our state elected officials. If this is the goal to increase turnout, I would suggest that we look at non-partisan elections.

I'm going to talk really fast when my time is almost over. I strongly believe that it is better to give more, better candidates to increase voter participation. The pros of a non-partisan election is that it removes political parties from the process. Why do we give insular groups of party members the decision to vote on who we should vote for? Remove political parties from primaries altogether, much like the April 29th race that Frank

and Cliff are running in.

when voters have multiple choices in a an election, rank choice voting becomes more important. RCV tends to force candidates to run more civil campaigns as they jockey for endorsement for other candidates for a number two ranking. And when general elections are no longer a choice between the lesser of two evils, voters will be motivated to turn out to vote for their favorite.

I see my time is up, but in conclusion,
I would trust the voters with the power to decide. By
providing nonpartisan elections, you're empowering
more candidates to run without political party
interference.

Thank you.

MR. MORANO: Hello, everybody. Welcome to Staten Island, Commissioners. I am Frank Morano. I happen to be a candidate for New York City Council, as Michael was kind enough to allude to, but I would be here even if I wasn't.

I have testified before every Charter Revision Commission since 2002, including you guys, and I will endeavor not to repeat anything that I've already said. I've submitted lengthier written testimony that I hope you guys will review at your

convenience. And I hope everybody's aware of that
longstanding Charter Revision Commission rule that
whatever commissioner is hosting you in their home
borough has to buy dinner that night. And fortunately
for you, Diane Savino is well versed on the best
restaurants on Staten Island, so you guys are in for a
treat. Well, you guys can split it.

So in 2000 -- so I know this isn't directly related to the evening's theme of electoral reform, but indirectly it is. I want to speak briefly about the issue of Sanctuary Cities. I think it's clear from a law enforcement perspective that the idea that New York City law enforcement agencies would be expressly forbidden from cooperating with ICE detainer requests or any federal law enforcement agency, it defies logic, and most rank and file New Yorkers, irrespective of who they voted for or what political party they're registered with, they don't think that's a good idea.

But to paraphrase Charlton Heston and Planet of the Apes, how did such a mixed-up situation get started? Well, it's because the City Council that passed those reforms, and I mean reforms in the worst possible sense, is so much more radical than the city that they govern. For instance, you had about 30

percent of New Yorkers vote for a Republican for mayor in the last two election cycles, and yet you have a situation where there's only about 10 percent representation of Republicans on the City Council.

Additionally, the Democrats that are elected, the only thing they have to do is be the most left-wing person in 45 council districts, and that creates a body that is so much more radical than the constituents they're representing. And that's where nonpartisan elections comes in. I would prefer proportional representation, which in the 12 years that New York City had it, was the golden age of our representation.

Not only were there minority parties represented, not only were the parties more representative of how people voted, but it resulted in the first black council members ever being elected, the first female council members being elected. And we have had more modern experiments with it when it comes to the community school board elections.

I realize that's a little bit of a leap, given where you guys might be now, so let's just stick with a model that we've had, which works very well, which we've had in New York City for 30-some-odd years, which is the nonpartisan special election. If

Page 63 1 you take the model in the election that Cliff Hagen and I are running in now, and just replicate that for 2 3 every council election rather than some, it is 4 something that I think would produce better results 5 for the voters and for candidates. And if you just indulge me for 40 more 6 7 seconds, one thing I have to mention is the issue of community boards. Currently, as you're aware, 8 9 community board members are all appointed by the 10 borough president. Half of them are appointed based 11 on the recommendation of a council member. I would 12 suggest that the commission put on the ballot a change 13 to this, where the council member gets to bindingly 14 appoint half of the members rather than simply 15 recommend. I'll give you case in point. 16 MR. BUERY: Can we hold it, because I 17 want to make sure everybody have a chance to testify, 18 but maybe it'll come up in our questions. 19 MR. MORANO: Very good. 20 MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. 21 Mr. Tajiddin? 22 MR. TAJIDDIN: Good evening, 23 commissioners. My name is Julius Tajiddin, and I 24 represent a movement known as Preserve Harlem's 25 Legacy.

The first issue I want to talk about is
historic preservation. A lot of our historic
resources get destroyed because developers don't
follow the National Historic Preservation Act or the
New York State Historic Preservation Act. In short,
even though a building may not be landmarked, it may
still be on the registers, national and state, of
historic places. But if we had on a DOB form, or
Department of City Planning form, a yes or no
question, is your property listed on such registers,
and they answer yes, they can be made to abide by that
law before anything else in regard to the City, you
know, what they have to do, before anything else is
done.

If they answer no, and we find out that it is, their permits and/or funding are or is revoked or withdrawn. Right now, they get away with murder. And this should also include a dismissal of any application for City property or rezoning. I will submit exactly where and how this should go in the relevant law.

Concerning the Department of City
Planning, they should have an automatic inquiry or
boilerplate assessment to be included with the
traditional noise, dust, shadows, et cetera, and

environmental assessment on liquefaction potential. Here's why. We already have earthquake building codes, but what seems to be missing is the liquefaction potential issue. We have quite a few liquefaction potential areas here in New York City next to our rivers.

Developers have to either say there's not a concern for this issue, or it is. We're not waiting for people to get killed. Akin to the historic preservation issue is that developers or someone have to notify community boards whenever permits of any kind are issued, and the community boards must post these notices on their websites. In other words, the more people know, the more we can prevent fraud problems, et cetera.

And I want to, with the remainder of my time, address the deference issue. Member deference hasn't always been the rule, I.e. the Bloomberg years, but how do you deal with that statutorily? So a City Council member, if he has a good relationship with his other council members, you know, they might just go along with him. You know, that's kind of like what's working now. They have this -- it's a in-house rule, if you will. It's not something -- but, I mean, statutorily, I don't see how we can address that

Hearing

	Page 66
1	issue. But I will submit my other concerns in
2	writing.
3	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
4	Any questions for the panel?
5	MS. SAVINO: I'll be brief, but I agree
6	with you a hundred percent. You really can't fix this
7	statutorily. On the issue that you raised, Mike,
8	about even year elections, even though we admit that
9	it would require a constitutional amendment, are you
10	at all concerned about the impact on down ballot rate
11	on down ballot candidates?
12	Because again, if it's a year where
13	it's a gubernatorial or a presidential year, all of
14	the oxygen is sucked up by the top of the ticket. And
15	I can remember clearly as a candidate trying to remind
16	people in those years when it was just the state and
17	the presidential, you know, start at the bottom and
18	work your way up so you don't leave the local
19	candidates off, or the judicial candidates, because
20	they don't have the same type of attention paid to
21	them.
22	So how could you avoid that eventuality
23	where you might have tremendous drop off from the top
24	of the ticket?
25	MR. SCHNALL: Yeah. So in my written

testimony, which I submitted, will discuss this, but
having run in an off year election, you're pretty much
the only ball game; right? So you have 200-so
candidates running, and they have unfettered access to
all different channels, print, digital, and so forth.
If you're competing in an even year with a
congressional candidate in your borough that has
exponentially more money than you do, you'll never get
a TV ad, you'll never be able to buy digital, you'll
never get print; and then forget about the fact that
the voters will never hear about you because all
they're looking at is the national issues that
just the drum beat keeps going.
So I think that there's legitimate
fall-off in communication. And then if you think
about just the format of the ballot, it could be a
really long ballot, and I think people would literally
just start checking off the names that they know
nationally and statewide, and then not vote locally.
So I think that there's a real disservice there if we
go to an even year.
MS. SAVINO: Right. And then finally,
for Frank, you started to talk about the community
board proposal. So if you want to finish?
MP MOPANO. Yeah Till he work brief

	Page 68
1	So right now you have a situation where the borough
2	president gets to make all the appointees. Now,
3	that's great if you have a situation where the borough
4	president and the council member get along. In my
5	case, I happen to be running against the borough
6	president's son. We're not just in April, but in
7	June. Now, do you think he's going to appoint anyone
8	that I recommend, or Cliff Hagen recommends, if we win
9	the election? Of course not, because he'll view these
10	people, rightly or wrongly, as doing my bidding, or
11	any council member's bidding on the community board.
12	If you made the council member
13	recommendations binding, that would diversify the pool
14	of people on the community board, and it would
15	encourage diversity not only in, you know, gender and
16	race, but in terms of opinion. And I think it would
17	be a much better, much more active community board,
18	and avoid a lot of the logistical difficulties we see
19	now if someone happens to run afoul of whomever the
20	borough president is.
21	Thank you.
22	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 1: Thank you.
23	MR. BUERY: Any other questions? Are
24	there any other questions?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 5: -- is that

1 right?

MR. BUERY: Well, we're not really responding to each other, but I'm going to see if any other questions for members the commission who are online? No? One thing --

Go ahead. You can take a --

MR. MORANO: Yeah. The way it works under the City Charter is that if the City Council member nominates, you know, that the borough president has to accept half of that nomination. So if the City Council member nominates the exact number of people, then the borough president has to take those people on. So that's how it works. So it's --

MR. BUERY: Thank you. One thing I would just add -- not a question, but I just want to -- not to debate the policy, but just to specify, you talked about Sanctuary City laws. Again, Sanctuary City laws don't prevent coordination between law enforcement and immigration. It sets the context in which that cooperation is possible. For example, people committing serious crimes when there was a warrant. So I just wanted to clarify. It's not a prevention of cooperation. I know it's not the substance of the testimony. It requires some degree of process for cooperation between local law

Hearing

	Page 70
1	enforcement and federal immigration. I just wanted to
2	clarify.
3	MR. MORANO: Not to belabor the point,
4	I would just add that I think if the voters got to
5	vote on it this year, if you put it on the ballot,
6	they would reach a different conclusion than the prior
7	City Council.
8	MR. BUERY: I understand. I again, I
9	just wanted to clarify the point of law, not the
10	substance of the testimony. Any all right. Thank
11	you all so much. I'm going to ask I'm sorry if she
12	said this before if Bernard O'Brien, Marianne Birch
13	and Alan Cox can come?
14	And thank the three of you for your
15	testimony. We appreciate it.
16	MR. COX: Thank you. Mr. Chairman,
17	members Of the Commission, my name is Alan Cox. Thank
18	you for the opportunity to testify this evening. I am
19	a community health outreach worker and have worked
20	with various organizations to promote healthy
21	lifestyles and disease prevention in poor communities.
22	I'm a long-time independent activist and organizer for
23	CICA, the Committee for Independent Community Action.
24	I also am a basketball referee for the PSAL. I just
25	wanted to throw that in there. This is March Madness.

As a registered independent voter for decades, I believe it is unjust for New York City to prevent independents from voting in the all-important City Council and mayoral and Citywide primaries.

There are over one million independents across our city and our tax dollars pay for the primaries. So essentially, it's a form of taxation without representation. No Americans should be forced to join a political party to be able -- and be able to vote.

Let me say that again. No Americans should be forced to join a political party to be able to vote in a primary.

I believe it's time for New York City to open its primaries and allow all voters to have equal voting rights, as so many other major cities do, like Chicago, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Dallas, Boston, et cetera. This is especially important as young people are registering without a political party at rate of 50 percent. We need to have a political process that welcomes their participation. I believe that our opening the primaries would force more participation and encourage our elected officials to represent all their constituents.

As a long time, New Yorker, I am here to ask you to open the primaries. I come before you

Page 72 to ask you to let me and one million other New Yorkers vote. MR. BUERY: Thank you so much. Appreciate it. And thanks for your service to the community. Appreciate it. MR. COX: You're welcome. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and MS. BIRCH: commissioners, for the opportunity to testify. long-time resident of New York City, a lifetime in New York City, and I became politically active in 1968. was 12. So I've been very engaged in politics for a long time, and I've been a community organizer on behalf of independent voters for 40 years, and I worked on the issue of opening the primaries during Mayor Bloomberg's tenure. I think we can all agree that the hyper-partisanship has created a dysfunctional electoral system. The ecosystem, if you will.

hyper-partisanship has created a dysfunctional electoral system. The ecosystem, if you will. New York City, to our great credit, has recently adopted rank choice voting. We adopted term limits and a system of public campaign financing. I think it's time we take the next step and open our primaries. Virginia has non-partisan voter registration. I don't even understand why we have to enroll in a political party. I think the parties are in the way of our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

democracy	•
-----------	---

There are 1.1 million New Yorkers who are not registered in a party and do not want to. Our primaries are taxpayer funded. I pay taxes for the primaries, and I cannot vote. It's a bit outrageous. No New Yorker should be forced to join a political party in order to vote in our often definitive primaries.

Furthermore, I don't think, contrary to what we heard tonight, that the political party leadership should be picking our candidates. I think we should, and I think voters are a lot smarter than we have been referred to this evening. Let all voters vote.

I thank you so much.

MR. O'BRIEN: Hello. My name is

Bernard O'Brien. I'm a volunteer with both Unite New

York and New York City Open Primaries. I'm sure

you're eager to hear even more about election reform.

As we all know, change in reform is often contentious. We're gathered on Staten Island. Let's recall that City leaders once thought it sensible and fair to haul most of the City's garbage every day to Staten Island and buried on Freshkills. Also, you're all probably too young to remember this,

but apparently it once made sense to charge a fair to ride the Staten Island ferry. So we did away with both those practices, so I respectfully suggest that you allow voters this coming November an opportunity to weigh in on doing away with our outmoded system of partisan enclosed primaries.

Despite the progress we made several years ago by integrating rank choice voting, at least into our primary elections, very significant problems remain, and 2025 may well be the year in which we dramatically bear witness to major flaws associated with our system, coupled with a general election which will not utilize rank choice voting. One obvious unfairness, as has been mentioned, is the fact that a million registered voters can't participate in the primaries.

We've also seen candidates choose to bypass the primaries entirely and still seek to secure a spot in the general election. My understanding is this is not the case in a great many other cities. In many other cities, a unified and open primary is held for the purpose to allow all registered voters the chance to vet and narrow down the entire field, which then moves on to general elections were typically much more competitive than most those we have here in our

city	

My understanding is that candidates seeking offices in other cities cannot bypass primary day any more than a Yankee or Met player can hope to cross home plate and score a run without first circling the bases. So also the fact that rank choice voting will not be utilized this November means that we may well be headed for an election in which a candidate may triumph with well under 50 percent of the votes cast.

opposition to any candidate, but I've read that there may be at least four mayoral candidates on the ballot who can secure significant chunks of the votes cast. With no rank choice voting we may have the real possibility that the City's next mayor may be elected with 25 to 30 percent of the votes cast, and it may be the candidate that most voters see as the most extreme and thereby least acceptable of all the candidates on offer. Does that sound like an outcome which bodes well for the governor ability of the city over the next four years?

So I realize it's too late to change the system this year, but 2029 will be here before we know it, so I therefore respectfully request that you

	Page 76
1	allow voters this year an opportunity to vote on
2	ending the partisan enclosed nature of our system
3	primaries, and also extend rank choice voting to cover
4	both primary and general elections for all City
5	offices.
6	And I landed the plane right at three
7	minutes.
8	MR. BUERY: Excellent work.
9	Before we open up to questions, I just
10	want to alert the next subgroup of panelists. Daniel
11	Batista, Jeremy Gruber, and Cliff Hagen, if you could
12	be ready?
13	Are there any questions for these
14	panelists from the commissioners?
15	MS. SAVINO: Just one. So all three of
16	you spoke about the importance of the ability to
17	participate in what has become the general election,
18	which is the primary in New York City. Do you have a
19	preference for either the straight nonpartisan
20	November race, or an open primary, or were you open to
21	any of three? Of the two. I'm sorry.
22	MR. O'BRIEN: Well, as the gentleman
23	from The Manhattan Institute was speaking, I was
24	realizing not only is he much better dressed than I
25	am, but he is much more involved or astute on the

	Page 77
1	intricacies of this. So, I mean, I assume I'm a
2	registered Democrat, so if I was running, I guess I
3	would want to have Democrat next to my name, although
4	there may be other Democrats as well.
5	I mean, you know, ironically it's my
6	understanding, and I don't want to get into partisan,
7	but my understanding is that the Democratic party has
8	always sort of favored the status quo, but this may be
9	the year where they get bit in the rear, you know,
10	with with these multiple mayoral candidates. So I
11	don't know.
12	Anybody else?
13	MS. BIRCH: Again, I just want to say
14	that notion that you have to have a party label in
15	order for a voter to figure out who to vote for is
16	relating to voters, to citizens, as idiots, and I
17	think we don't want to do that. It's our country. We
18	talk a lot about democracy. The parties get in our
19	way. And what are you going to do about all these
20	young people who don't register in a they don't
21	care what the label is. We don't need labels.
22	Anny thoughts?
23	Thank you for your question.
24	MR. BUERY: Any questions? Are there
25	any online commissioners? Okay.

	Page 78
1	Thank you so much for your testimony.
2	MS. BIRCH: Thank you all.
3	MR. BUERY: Daniel Batista, Jeremy
4	Gruber, and Cliff Hagen.
5	Why don't you start?
6	MR. GRUBER: Okay. Thank you,
7	commissioners. My name is Jeremy Gruber. I'm the
8	senior vice president of Open Primaries. Open
9	Primaries is a national nonprofit organization
10	dedicated to more open and inclusive systems. I'm
11	also a New Yorker. I've lived in this City over 30
12	years, and first and foremost I'm a registered
13	independent voter, which as we've been talking about
14	means I can't vote.
15	As New Yorkers, we see it in every
16	election season. Candidates politicking ahead of the
17	primaries and then seemingly on vacation after because
18	the primary election in this city is really the only
19	election that matters. It's taxpayer funded and
20	government administered, and yet one million
21	independent voters like me are shut out. The scale of
22	that impact cannot be overestimated.
23	There are 10 states with less than a
24	million total registered voters in their state.
25	Imagine if every registered voter in Vermont or Hawaii

or Delaware or Rhode Island was denied a meaningful
vote. That's the scale of impact of New York City's
closed primaries. We are so far behind 35 actually
36 states. New Mexico just passed open primaries two
days ago. 36 states and 85 percent of cities like
L.A. and Chicago already have open elections. It's
the standard way our cities run their elections.
Closed municipal primaries are such an aberration that
no one even studies them.

As an election law expert, I travel around the country working with cities and states that are debating how to establish equal rights for independents and passing reform. They're doing so because we're facing two hard truths as a country. First, independents are the fastest growing group of voters in our city, in our state, and in our country, and we are the largest group of voters overall in the United States. Second, for most races, the general election is so uncompetitive, oftentimes to the point of races being uncontested, that the primary election is the only election that matters.

Yet in our city and state, recalls for equality and democracy are part of everyday conversation. The silence from the political class on this issue is deafening. We bemoan why voter

participation in New York City is one of the lowest in the country, and why millions of dollars in general election get out the vote efforts consistently underperform. It's because no one wants to vote in a meaningless election. All the research shows that voter participation goes up in the primaries. The Bipartisan Policy Center, among others, issues reports that consistently find that to be the case.

What's less appreciated is how broadly voter participation goes up, because it's not just the primaries. Studies show that voter participation goes up in the general election as well. That's because once you establish a culture of voting, every election is impacted. It's no coincidence that the two fastest growing group of voters in our City, Asian Americans and Latinos, are also the two fastest growing groups of independent voters. Over half our city's millennial and Gen Z voters are independents.

When you shut out New York City independents, you aren't just shutting out people that look like me. You're shutting out the full diversity of our city. Opening the primaries will create real political opportunities. As my friend David Holt, mayor of Oklahoma City and leader of the US Conference of Mayors has said, "Open primary systems foster

	Page 81
1	collaboration and bridge building in the service of
2	finding solutions. Closes systems foster zero sum
3	game competition and partisan rival rate."
4	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
5	MR. GRUBER: Can I just make one quick
6	point?
7	MR. BUERY: If we can hold to the the
8	question and answer, I'm sure
9	MR. GRUBER: Sure.
10	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
11	MR. BATISTA: Thank you for this time.
12	My name is Danny Batista. I am a lifelong New Yorker,
13	a resident of this City for 20 years, 14 of which I've
L 4	lived right here on Staten Island.
15	The topic tonight is government reform,
16	and to quote part of the description of this hearing,
17	"After a review of the entire charter, the CRC may
18	recommend changes intended to help City government
19	work more efficiently and better serve all New
20	Yorkers." That's what brings me here this evening.
21	"Better serve all New Yorkers." I'm one of the 1.1
22	million registered voters in this City who, simply
23	because of my choice not to affiliate with a political
24	party, is completely shut out of the primary
25	elections.

This effectively omits the preferences
of voters like me throughout the city who are
otherwise ready and willing to participate
meaningfully in our ongoing process of self-
governance. This must not continue any longer. It's
an election year, and here we are in the middle of a
primary season. A couple of weeks ago I was out for a
walk in my neighborhood, and as I neared the
waterfront by the ferry, I could see someone handing
out flyers and talking to people. And a few moments
later they approached and questioned me directly, as
many of us have experienced.

"Are you a registered Democrat," they asked? "Hi. I'm not. I'm independent." "Okay." And instantly they stopped on a dime and walked away, already gone before they could even finish saying the word okay. There was no attempt or interest in introducing their candidate to me, what they stand for, why they're running, how their leadership might benefit me or our city. Perhaps this is poor electioneering, but it's deeper than that. This behavior is in fact a sad and logical result of a contorted system.

In this instance, because I'm not a registered democrat, I, like so many others in this

City, are relegated to a second-class status, or one
could even say a non-status. Not only can voters like
me not vote in our publicly funded primary elections,
but so profound and insidious is this dynamic that's
been created over decades that has normalized
excluding independent voters from the process that
even speaking with an unaffiliated voter on the street
is seen as futile.

The system we have says to independent voters, you don't matter, you don't exist, talking with you is worthless and pointless. New York City, a place I've always thought of as a beacon of possibility and progress, often referred to as the greatest city in the world, must finally join other cities and states in our country that have open primaries where people can vote without the condition of identifying themselves with the political party.

First and foremost, I am a New Yorker.

One of all New Yorkers that you are charged with recommending changes on behalf of in the name of making things better. So please make it better, make it fair, make it right. Open our primaries and let all voters vote in New York City.

Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you.

	Page 84
1	Before we open up the question, I just
2	want to alert that the next panel will be the final
3	panelist of in-person testifiers, will be Julia Richie
4	and Justin Wood. After that we'll move it on to we
5	have several people waiting to testify online. And
6	just in the interest of time, to make sure that we can
7	get to all of our speakers, I'm going to ask the
8	commissioners to try to be brief so that we can have
9	time to speak to everybody and to hear from everyone.
10	So are there any questions?
11	MR. HAGEN: I'm sure you want to hear
12	my comments first.
13	MR. BUERY: I'm sorry. Oh. I'm so
14	sorry. I apologize. I apologize.
15	MR. HAGEN: That's understood. We're
16	all in rush to get home. It's a long
17	MR. BUERY: No, no. It's not that. I
18	just my mistake. I so do apologize. Is it
19	Batista?
20	MR. HAGEN: I'm Hagan.
21	MR. BUERY: You're Hagen. Okay. I'm
22	sorry.
23	MR. HAGEN: So I'm Cliff Hagen,
24	candidate for City Council on the Common Ground party,
25	and but I'm not here to talk about rank choice

Page 85 1 voting. MR. BUERY: And please forgive me 2 3 again. I apologize. 4 MR. HAGEN: That's no problem. Don't 5 worry about it. But it is a long day, and we do have 6 to get home. And I appreciate you all being here. 7 I'm sure you have a long commute. I'm just going to share some brief comments, general comments, nothing very specific. It's unfortunate the folks who are 10 here advocating for undermining ULURP have left. 11 savs a lot. That's what I would like to address, so 12 I'll read a few brief comments here. 13 Good evening. My name is Cliff Hagen, 14 and I thank you for bringing Charter Revision 15 Commission from your distant offices in Manhattan out 16 here to Staten Island. You now know how far-removed 17 Staten Island remains from the rest of the city, City 18 government in particular, and it is this lack of 19 access to City government, which brings me here today. 20 Recently, government agencies with a city-centric view 21 of their mission have run riot, wreaking havoc across

Heavy handed change without recourse like mandated composting, the City of Yes seems to be business as usual in Manhattan, but extraordinarily

Staten Island.

22

23

24

disruptive out here in Staten Island. And now this Charter Revision Commission is seeking to undermine Staten Island's last bit of self-determination. This commission wishes to weaken and or negate ULURP, the Uniform Land Use Review Process. I have spent more than 20 years fighting against the overdevelopment of Staten Island, and it has been ULURP which has allowed me and our community to speak up and push back against unwanted, unnecessary, unchecked development in our community.

ULURP gives voice to our community.

Unfortunately, this Charter Revision Commission has been tasked with stifling our voice. I am a member of Community Board 3, and I am entrusted to represent my neighbors in matters of land use. Weakening ULURP will minimize the responsibility of community boards.

Lastly, as a candidate for City Council representing District 51, I think it an extraordinary overreach of the mayor's office to initiate this drive to end member deference. When asked to select which is more important, Staten Islanders will always select democracy over development. This Charter Revision Commission must not minimize our voice, must not minimize the responsibilities of community board, nor minimize the strength of council member

	Page 87
1	representation. Rather, this commission must
2	strengthen ULURP, not dismantle the supports within
3	ULURP which help to preserve the true nature and
4	character of our communities.
5	Of course, I shall submit more specific
6	comments online in the days to come. Again, thank you
7	for coming out to Staten Island. I know it's a long
8	trip, and I appreciate your time.
9	MR. BUERY: Thank you for testifying
10	again. Please do forgive me.
11	I was opening up for questions.
12	Of course.
13	MS. LAREMONT: Hello. Thank you for
14	your testimony, all of you.
15	My question, Frank, around ULURP
16	well, ULURP aside, I'm just given your involvement
17	in the community and in Staten Island, and given our
18	housing crisis, I'm curious kind of what types of
19	policies, what types of programs, you think the city
20	should be employing to help address the housing crisis
21	and the affordable housing crisis and the types of
22	housing that you think is appropriate for Staten
23	Island, given that it is incumbent on all boroughs to
24	be contributing to our affordable housing crisis?
25	MR. HAGEN: Sure. And I think the City

of Yes addresses that; right? We do have a transit line on Staten Island, and there will be further development along that transit line, but the people of the south shore of Staten Island, in particular in the mid island, have been fighting over development for many, many years. The housing we do have in New York City is on the backs of the people of Staten Island.

If you've ever driven through Staten -if you know of the history of Staten Island, it was
generally open space for many years. And over the
last 30 years, 40, 50 years, there've been
extraordinarily development throughout the entire
island. I think we have done our part in that regard.

MS. SAVINO: Thank you, Cliff. I think that you bring a unique perspective as you point to Staten Island as unlike the rest of the city, for many reasons, and perhaps there's a different approach that we might have here. But I wanted to talk to the two gentlemen about the open primary issue. Particularly you, Dan.

You made a point in your testimony that really made me think about one of the biggest problems I think with the closed primary process is. When you build a campaign, you buy a voter list. You know, if you're a democrat, you get the van; if you're a

Republican, you get -- I forgot what they call it.

I360, or something like that. But you build a

campaign where you only talk to people who you know

are going to vote.

You build the entire outreach to triple prime democrats in a democratic primary, or triple prime Republicans, so you're narrowing down the group of people who are eligible to vote in that primary exponentially to those you know, based on past experience, are absolutely going to vote, which means you're shutting out people who are even registered in that party.

You don't talk to those people because you don't think they're going to turn out, so you only talk to triple prime voters in a primary. So not only are we eliminating talking to people like you, but we're not even talking to everyone who's eligible to vote in that primary.

So again, I'll ask the two of you the same question I asked the other gentleman. Which of the models do you think makes the most sense for New York City? Is it the straight open primary where you get to pick whichever primary you want to vote in, or should we go to non-partisan primaries? Like, what do you think makes the most sense for someone like you?

MR. GRUBER: Well, there's a lot of
different forms of open primaries. I would say, as
you come to a debate about this, that you stay focused
on the fact that independents can't vote right now.
So whatever model you choose, I hope that you don't
get mired in models, but I would say that, all things
considered, that a nonpartisan model is the standard
model cities use. The top two system is a standard
model, and the reason why is because it keeps all
voters at equal states.

No one voter has any advantage over another voter, and every voter has the ability to vote for every candidate. You are no longer siloed into camps, democrat or republican. You get the full panoply of candidates in front of you as a voter, and you get to choose for the best candidate regardless of party. And I think that's, in all, what democracy should be.

MR. BATISTA: Thanks. I am also just personally for completely nonpartisan elections. I think all voters should get to see and consider all candidates, and I think all candidates should have to face all voters, and everyone should show up and get to vote.

MR. BUERY: Thank you.

	Page 91
1	Any other questions in the panel from
2	any of the online panelists? Sorry. Commissioners?
3	Okay. Great. Thank you so much for
4	your testimony. Deeply appreciate it.
5	Julia, Richie and Justin Wood.
6	I'm sorry. There is a question? Okay.
7	MR. WEISBROD: Yes. I have a question
8	to the two panelists that what is the advantage of
9	open primaries as opposed to nonpartisan elections?
10	MR. GRUBER: So at its very basic
11	MR. WEISBROD: Let me amend that. Non-
12	partisan elections with rank choice voting.
13	MR. GRUBER: Yeah. So at its very
14	basic, an open primary just lets every voter
15	participate. And so at its basic, that's what we
16	would need to make sure that independents can at least
17	join
18	MR. WEISBROD: They can vote in non-
19	partisan elections as well. General elections.
20	MR. GRUBER: No. And that's true. I
21	would say the advantage of non-partisan elections over
22	a plain party open primary is that every voter gets to
23	vote for every candidate, every voter is seen equally
24	at the voting box, and there's full and maximal
25	choice, particularly as they get to utilize rank

Page 92 1 choice voting as part of that process. MR. WEISBROD: And just to follow up a 2 3 bit on that, with nonpartisan elections, general 4 elections, and rank choice voting, do you think that overcomes the issue of independents feeling shut out? 5 6 MR. GRUBER: I think as long as 7 independents can participate, that absolutely nonpartisan election is an open primary form of 8 election, independents can vote, and absolutely they 10 are -- that's a very positive --11 MR. WEISBROD: Right. And I'm talking 12 about general elections now, not primaries. 13 MR. GRUBER: I think that you need to have an open system in the primary. Whether it's an 14 15 open party primary or a nonpartisan primary, 16 independents have to be able to vote in every taxpayer funded election, primaries and general, as they 17 18 already can. 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 6: Can I follow 20 up on Commissioner Weisbrod's question? So for the 21 nonpartisan single primary, would you object to that 22 nonpartisan primary where candidates are allowed to 23 affix a party label, or when you say nonpartisan 24 primary, do you mean a primary --25 MR. GRUBER: Yeah. There's different

Page 93 1 forms of nonpartisan primaries. I don't object to candidates putting their party affiliation on the 2 ballot. Every state that we've looked at, city we've 3 4 looked at, the truth is is that voters like it. see it as an indicator of what that candidate stands 5 6 for, and so I think that's perfectly appropriate. 7 Thank you. Commissioner MR. BUERY: Weisbrod, do you have another question? 8 9 MR. WEISBROD: No. 10 MR. BUERY: Any other questions from 11 the online commissioners? No? Okay. 12 Thank you. Thank you for real this 13 time. Thank you so much. Appreciate it. 14 Julia Richie and Justin All right. 15 Wood. 16 MS. RICHIE: Hello commission members. 17 My name is Julia Richie. I am 29 years old. 18 illustrator, a teaching artist, and a substitute 19 teacher for the DOE. I currently live across the 20 bridge in Bayridge, but I was born and raised here on 21 Staten Island. 22 Like 50 percent of people my age across 23 the country, I am an independent voter and have been 24 independent since I was old enough to register to 25 vote. That means I have never once been able to vote

in a primary election in this City. I am an
independent voter because I don't believe that
solutions exist exclusively behind party lines. I
believe that in order for our democracy to be strong
and self-sufficient, it needs to reflect the diversity
and nuance of its citizens.

For years I've been protesting the closed primary system in this city by refusing to join a party to be able to vote, frustratingly but emphatically casting my only permitted vote in the general election. This year I received a letter from an organization called Be Counted NYC that pleaded with me to re-register into the Democratic Party stating, "Many New Yorkers do not realize that the election that is almost certain to choose the next mayor is not the November general election, but the democratic primary on June 24th."

This manipulative line is the reason

I'm here to fight for open primary elections in New

York City today. Independents are the second largest
coalition of voters in every borough, except for here
on Staten Island where they only trail behind
republicans slightly, with independents at roughly

83,000 voters and Republicans at roughly 107,000

voters. We are 1.1 million individuals and counting

that deserve to be represented fairly in a system	that
uses our taxpayer money to function. We are not	just
a nebulous resource that parties can dip into when	a
they need to boost their numbers.	

I am not a democrat, and I am not a republican. I will not lie on a voter registration form to participate in a bad faith primary. I am an independent, and a citizen of New York City, and I am doing what I can to be a positive part of this community, even when my rights are being held just out of reach like a carrot on a stick. I would be doing a disservice by not being honest in this moment. I am angry and desperate for some kind of change that we give myself and my fellow New Yorkers the agency that we deserve. Especially at a time when our democracy is at risk of being worn down by outside interests.

The commission needs to know that this isn't just a talking point to rally around. This is affecting our ability to live our lives. It is absurd that I have to come here and ask to be granted my own right to vote. Please open the primaries and let all voters have a hand in every step of the election process.

Thank you.

MR. WOOD: Good evening, Chair Buery,

and members of the commission. Thanks for the opportunity to testify. My name is Justin Wood, and I'm the director of policy at New York Lawyers for the Public Interest. Founded in 1976, we're a civil rights community legal organization with programs in disability justice, environmental justice, and health justice.

I actually wanted to draw your attention to a different area of the charter, and that's the fair share provisions that were part of the 1989 Charter Review Commission and passed that year by the voters. The intent of the fair share provisions was to ensure that New Yorkers more equitably share in environmental burdens and environmental goods. Same with other forms of city service, access to healthcare, pretty much anything that's within the City's control.

In the decades since that reform was passed, multiple reports by the City Council in 2017, the comptroller in 2019, and again by the city comptroller recently in 2023, continue to show large disparities between community access to these goods and burdens. So we wanted to encourage the commission to look at whether there are additional changes to the charter that could be put before the voters to make

this fair share a lived reality for more New York communities.

I'll just briefly draw your attention to three examples that we're actively working on in partnership and in representation of grassroots community groups.

One is solid waste. I'm also a Staten Island resident. Solid waste comes up a lot here. In the years since this has passed, solid waste has remained one of the most unequal burdens in the city. There's still 75 percent of solid waste being processed in a few communities where private waste transfer stations dominate in North Brooklyn, South Bronx, and Southeast Queens. We've simply not seen the commitment in areas like waste, and those aspects of the transportation system that are within the City's control, to following through on legislation duly passed by the City Council and signed by the mayor to seeing that through to equitable development and equitable relief of burdens in these areas.

Another example from our disability and health justice practice would be the city's Be Heard program, the mental health crisis response. We have major issues with this program. I think it needs to be substantially reformed to be a true non-police

Page	9	8
------	---	---

mental health crisis response. But even having said
that, it's a limited program that applies to limited
parts of the city. Staten Island, where we are
tonight, is completely excluded.

We could draw your attention to many other aspects of the transportation system where we have local examples here on Staten Island; lack of access to bus rapid transit, lack of access to bus lanes which remain highly concentrated in Manhattan. We're in a borough that has zero city bike or bike share.

So I invite the commission to explore ways in which fair share can be bolstered. Couple of other areas -- actually, I'll leave it there, and we'll submit the other areas as a nonprofit contractor in our written testimony.

Thank you so much.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.

Any questions for this panel? Any questions from any of the --

MR. WEISBROD: Yes. Yes. On fair share, I can attest that it has not worked as the charter intended, and I'm just curious as to whether you have any recommendations for us about how the charter could be amended to make fair share more

Page 99 1 effective? Thank you for that question. 2 MR. WOOD: I don't know that we have specific 3 4 language suggestions for the charter. It's something 5 we and community partners we represent would love to 6 be in conversation about. We're aware that there are 7 limited types of facilities that the rules around fair share -- that I think were generated in in 1991 or so. It's a limited set of facilities and permits that they 10 apply to. So that might be an area to look at as 11 whether permit renewals could be part of that. 12 And also just ways in which the city's 13 leverage can be called upon in areas like 14 transportation or healthcare, where some of these 15 obviously large issues of access are controlled by 16 state or corporate entities, but it's which the city 17 can have a true inter-agency response with the goal 18 being lived equity and fair share in these major 19 sectors of our economy and public services. 20 MR. WEISBROD: I just think the goal is 21 commendable. The means of achieving it is extremely 22 complicated, and difficult, and any suggestions along 23 those lines via the charter would be very helpful. 24 MR. WOOD: Thank you.

Understood.

	Page 100
1	MR. BUERY: Any other questions?
2	Thank you for your testimony.
3	I do want to say, personally, your
4	former executive director, Michael Rothenberg, was a
5	dear friend and mentor of mine, so always glad to hear
6	from NYLPI.
7	Thank you both so much. I appreciate
8	it.
9	We're going to move to the online.
10	First, we'll hear from Ben Weinberg, Celia Hardy, and
11	Richard Fox, in that order. Ben Weinberg, Celia Hardy
12	and Richard Fox.
13	MR. WEINBERG: Hello. Can you hear me
L 4	and see me?
15	MR. BUERY: Yes.
16	MR. WEINBERG: Great. Can I begin?
17	MR. BUERY: Please.
18	MR. WEINBERG: Wonderful. Good
19	evening, commissioners. My name is Ben Weinberg. I'm
20	the policy director for Citizens Union. I apologize
21	for not being able to be with you in person tonight,
22	but I want to expand tonight on two key issues that
23	we've mentioned in the last government reform hearing.
24	First is moving City elections to even years, and the
25	second is creating a process for mayoral removal over

misconduct.

So on even year elections, in February we represented the benefits and merits of this proposal, but as the commission considers questions to place on the ballot, we wanted to speak about the popularity of this reform among voters. After the state moved county elections to even years in 2023, a Siena poll found that it was the most popular policy of the end of that session, supported by two to one voters statewide with the highest support coming from New York City voters. A 2024 survey of City voters on this specific question showed a nearly three to one support, and that was across age, race, and party lines, importantly. And nationally, in other states, we see the same surveys. Again, again, again.

That is the survey that shows 70 percent of Americans support aligning local and federal elections. So it's not surprising that in the last decade this question was on the ballot 37 times in different cities across the United States, and it's passed 36 of those times, and with pretty overwhelming majority. 70percent, 60-plus percent. At the state level, it passed -- it was approved, sorry -- by blue, red, and purple legislators. So the message from voters here is clear. They do approve this change.

The main thing I want to talk about today is on the mayor removal proposal. So at the last hearing, we committed to coming back to you with a more detailed proposal on how to remove a mayor in severe cases of misconduct. Today Citizens Union released a report laying out such process that we believe would ensure accountability, avoid partisan abuse, and prevent prolonged disruptions.

So our proposal is for a locally controlled hybrid two-step system. It begins with the City Council and ends with the voters. The way it works is that the council could vote to bring charges against the mayor in a 70 percent super majority vote only for misconduct. Not for political disagreements. The mayor would then have full public hearing with legal representation, evidence, and witnesses. At the end of that 30-day hearing, the council would be required to vote and get a higher super majority, 80 percent of the council, to vote to approve these charges and recommend removal.

The final decision would then go to the voters at what we call a special removal election. So this process is intended to be rare and fair. It's based on our analysis of dozens of removal systems around the country, and why they are applicable or not

	Page 103
1	to New York City. And the entire timeline would be
2	capped at 67 days to prevent extended disruption.
3	Finally, I will say, and this is beyond
4	the commission's jurisdiction, but our reports, I do
5	want to note, also recommends reforms to the
6	governor's power, kind of unchecked power today, to
7	remove mayors, and we propose limiting this authority
8	to misconduct, having due process and a specific
9	timeline.
10	Thank you.
11	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much,
12	Mr. Weinberg.
13	MR. WEINBERG: Thank you.
14	MR. BUERY: Next, we'll hear from Celia
15	Hardy. Next, Celia Hardy.
16	MS. HARDY: Hello.
17	MR. BUERY: Hello.
18	MS. HARDY: Thank you, commission
19	members, for letting me testify today. My name is
20	Celia Hardy, and I'm a New Yorker and a volunteer with
21	Unite New York, and I'm an independent voter. And I,
22	like one million other New Yorkers, am currently
23	barred from participating in our primary elections.
24	This system doesn't reflect a
25	representative democracy and leaves many voters like

me feeling disconnected from policy being created
about our community, impacting our quality of life.
If we truly want a political system that reflects the
values of all New Yorkers, we must embrace reforms
that include the voices of all New Yorkers.

The current closed primary system
limits participation to registered party members,
excluding independents like me who don't align with
the party's values or don't feel like our viewpoints
can be neatly packaged into either of the current two
parties. I believe this system is outdated and does a
disservice to our democracy.

Open primaries, however, will ensure that more independent voters aren't treated like second class citizens, that more perspectives will be considered, and elected officials will be accountable to the entire electorate, not just a select few.

Thank you.

MR. BUERY: Thank you.

And Richard Fox.

MR. FOX: Hi. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify. My name is Richard Fox.

I'm a Unite New York volunteer and Brooklyn resident testifying to suggest that New York City adopts nonpartisan primary elections to the city charter

through a ballot proposal in November.

Currently, voters are not registered party have no say in the choice of candidates that go to the general election. They are entirely blocked out of the election. A nonpartisan primary system allows all voters, regardless of party affiliation, to participate in selecting the candidates who will best represent their interests. This change will increase voter turnout and ensure a more representative and inclusive process.

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

Encouraging positive campaigning.

Candidates will be incentivized to appeal to a broader range of voters, fostering a more civil and constructive electoral environment.

Third, increased voter participation.

Nonpartisan primaries would allow all voters,

including voters not registered to a party, to have a

	Page 106
1	say in the selection of candidates, leading to greater
2	voter engagement and a broader electorate.
3	And the last point, reduction of
4	polarization. Holding nonpartisan primaries would
5	force candidates to appeal to a wide range of voters.
6	This can help reduce partisan divisions and foster
7	more collaboration, civility, and bipartisan
8	cooperation.
9	By adopting nonpartisan primaries, New
10	York City can build on the success of rank choice
11	voting and ensure that our primaries are more
12	representative of the will of the people. In
13	addition, by adopting nonpartisan primaries we can
14	foster a political environment where voters' voices
15	are heard, and the election process becomes more
16	reflective of our collective values. This legislation
17	represents a crucial step in enhancing democracy,
18	fostering voter engagement, and promoting fairer and
19	more representative elections.
20	Thank you.
21	MR. BUERY: Thank you.
22	I'm opening up for questions for
23	Mr. Weinberg, Celia Hardy, or Richard Fox. Any
24	questions from the commissioners?
25	MS. SAVINO: Ben, I just have a

Page 107
question for the proposal. I don't know where he is,
so I'll just speak to the room.
MR. WEINBERG: I'm here.
MS. SAVINO: The proposal about mayoral
removal is built on the idea that it would be a
completely apolitical process, which I don't see that
as even possible in the environment we're in. I mean,
if we just look at the abuse of the impeachment
process in Washington on both sides of the aisle,
depending on who's in charge and who the president is,
how would we be able to prevent that type of, you
know, political activity in a removal process?
Where would the fairness be if the
council becomes the prosecutor and the trial body, and
they made up their mind when they drew up the charges,
what due process does an executive in this city have?
MR. WEINBERG: Thank you, Commissioner
Savino. That's an excellent question.
The question of partisanship and
political abuse was at the heart of our considerations
here. We basically started from that concern, I
should say, and that is why we thought the regular
impeachment process would not work in this situation,

because that requires two chambers. One kind of

checks the other. A recall process also involves

problematic outside interest that do funnel, kind of, other parties' considerations.

We think that the high super majority proposal that we put forward, which is only to bring the charges would require 70 percent of the council, and then to approve the charges would require 80 percent of the council, plus the fact that the council, if it would try to abuse the process and recommend removal to a mayor that has done nothing wrong or that would not be removed by voters, eventually voters get the final say. The council itself would put itself in a political risk.

So we think we inserted several checks into this process, including the super majority, including setting specific grounds for removal. Not like, you know, there are some states and cities where you can recall an executive over any reason. This would have specific reasons.

And finally, the fact that the final vote would be in the hands of the voters. The process as we built it, the way we see it, is pretty hard to achieve and complete, as we think it should be. This should be a very, very rare situation that only happens in the most extreme situations.

MS. SAVINO: I have tremendous respect

Hearing

	Page 109
1	for you, Ben, and for the work of your organization,
2	but I think you're assuming that there are honor among
3	thieves. And I use that term lightly, but the idea
4	that there would be a completely objective process
5	where the chief executive was in an adversarial
6	relationship 90 percent of the time with his or her
7	local council body, I think is naive. And then this
8	would become terribly abusive, in my opinion. So
9	but I do appreciate the work and the effort that you
10	put into it.
11	MR. WEINBERG: I appreciate it. I will
12	just say one thing. New York is an outlier in that it
13	doesn't have these removal processes. There are
14	several cities that do have only even one chamber
15	impeachment, and that is not abused over there. And
16	there are also many recall systems that are not
17	normally abused. That is to say I concur with the
18	risk, but I think the fact that the system is there
19	does not mean it will be abused at the first moment it
20	is available.
21	MR. BUERY: Any other questions?
22	All right. Commissioner DaBaron?
23	MR. DABARON: I was going to follow up
24	on the question, but I think that my fellow
25	commissioner basically articulated her concerns very

Hearing

	Page 110
1	well, and I echo that as well.
2	MR. BUERY: All right. Thank you so
3	much.
4	Any other questions?
5	All right. I want to thank the panel.
6	The next panel will be, and please forgive me if I'm
7	mispronounce your name, Thales Protopapas, Linda
8	DiGusta, and Kimberly Cruz, in that order. Thales
9	Protopapas, Linda DiGusta and Kimberly Cruz.
10	MS. PROTOPAPAS: Hello. My name is
11	Thales, and I'm a senior at Brooklyn Tech. As an 18-
12	year-old who's lived in the United States my whole
13	life, I have an appreciation for the value of
14	democracy. As I've learned more about how our process
15	works in New York City though, I've become
16	disappointed by the way it unfairly values certain
17	votes over others.
18	With the current closed primary system,
19	only registered democrats can vote in the democratic
20	primary, and only registered republicans can vote in
21	the republican primary. However, in New York City,
22	republican nominees win the general elections so
23	rarely, in some cases there is no republican
24	challenger at all, that the democratic primary often
25	decides the overall election

Pac	*^	1	1	1
Fa	ィモ	ㅗ	_	ㅗ

This essentially disenfranchises any
voters who are not registered as democrats, which, as
you've heard many times, is something that not every
voter necessarily wants to do, and it's not something
they should be required to do in order to have their
voice heard. There's a with open primaries, voters
can participate in the primary election, and a few top
candidates move on to the general election. This is
both more fair to have all voters voices heard, and it
leads to more competitive elections in the general.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.

Next, Linda DiGusta.

MS. DIGUSTA: Can you hear me now?

MR. BUERY: Yes. We can.

MS. DIGUSTA: Thank you. I'm having some technical problems tonight. My apologies.

Anyway, my name is Linda. I live in Manhattan. I participate in the activities of Unite New York. I register as a democrat just to vote in the primary. I have to be honest about it. I'm not as principled as a lot of people who spoke here tonight. I would love to see open primaries on the ballot, and of course the docket.

Being the only rank choice voting jurisdiction that does not hold open primaries, as New

Page 112 1 York City is, this doesn't make sense to me. more people to vote rather than to fall into what has 2 3 been called the enthusiasm gap, and I think we're 4 getting some of that now. Unfortunately, the most far 5 out things have the most engagement, it seems, and we 6 have to find a way to engage more voters with an 7 inclusive dynamic process, beginning with the open primary and carrying through to a general election. 8 Hopefully, we'll get rank choice voting in those 9 10 pretty soon too. That would be fantastic. 11 Also, I just want to throw in it was 12 only a couple of hours ago that I found out about the 13 removal elections initiative, and I think it's a great idea 'cause, frankly, we need all the tools we can get 14 15 when the information that just goes flying around 16 these days requires action. 17 And just following up, listening to the 18 testimony this evening, I am struck by how important 19 it's to act quickly to accomplish the role of the 20 largely independent younger voters in these critical 21 times. 22 Thank you. 23 MR. BUERY: Thank you. 24 Next, we'd love to hear from Kimberly

Cruz.

MS. CRUZ: Hi. My name is Kimberly Cruz, and I'm the author of Hindsight is 2020: The Tree and Key to Democracy, and I am talking about things outside of open primaries because voters do not know what actually goes on in front of the Board of Elections. They do not allow new candidates to justify their signatures in front of the board, especially in this technological age.

There were many new candidates last year who received important documents that were straight to their spam box, and when it was stated in front of the board, they did not care. So there are barriers outside of just the labels that we have that voters should know about. So this is a problem about civics, really, and in a civil war that we're in where our federal representatives, our state representatives and our local city councilmen are creating their own propaganda, their own agendas for their own labels, we have to put civics at the center of it.

So I'm going to focus on housing and the new developments in our boroughs. Housing and the lack of oversight of the professionals making repairs in housing developments in apartments and houses of the people of New York, of natives who are here, that lacks oversight. So if the commission actually wants

to change the quality of life outside of this Charles
Dickens era, post these pandemics, post measles now
that it's out in the world, we have to think about
housing court.

Does it actually have support? Does the Housing Preservation and Development Agency actually have oversight, or are they creating their own agenda as well? Is the code enforcement of every borough actually following the code in the maintenance That's legal code. Because there are a lot of professionals that are making corrections that are leading to collapse buildings, that are leading to So in the Bronx, nearly a year after a partial fires. building collapse in the Morris Heights section of the Bronx displaced dozens of families, and the New York City Department of Buildings released its findings that the report points to negligence by the engineer in charge, identifying a failure to recognize critical masonry as structural.

So you have families just the day before Christmas going to homeless shelters, and they're still in homeless shelters. In Queens, you have a contractor who attempted to remove lead paint with a blow torch. And we have people that are homeless. Our New Yorkers. So when we think about

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the problems, we have to really think about the structures we have as well as the new developments.

We have three casinos that they're trying to add to our city. Think about that. One in where Bailey Lynx is, which is where the bridge is; one that's creating a red-light district in Flushing, Queens where they're trying to take away our Flushing Meadows parkland, our public land; and one in Brooklyn and Coney Island. So they're displacing native New Yorkers in front of our eyes, and the commission has to create amendments that actually put these professionals in their place 'cause there's legal code in our city to regulate our homes as native New Yorkers.

have to think about the mail theft that's going around in our city. That's a federal crime. If our commission actually thinks about government structure, it's the amendments of our life. So if mail theft that's happening, all our elderly people, our children, the people that want to get higher education, they're the ones that are getting targeted. We are doing a disservice to our population if we are just talking about open primaries and our civil war that we have right now.

	Page 116
1	So really take your power. I
2	understand that my time is up, but there's local laws
3	that are coming up May 1, 2025. Local law 157. It
4	mandates the installation of natural gas detectors.
5	And right now the governor is dealing with hydro
6	fracking policies that will affect New York City
7	people.
8	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
9	Are there any questions for the
10	panelists? Any questions?
11	Thank you so much for your testimony.
12	We appreciate it.
13	Finally, love to hear from Michael
14	Niamehr, Reverend Conrad B. Tillard, Sr., and Jenny
15	Radke. And again, I apologize if I have mispronounced
16	your names. Michael Niamehr, Reverend Conrad Tilled
17	and Jenny Radke in that order.
18	MR. NIAMEHR: Hi. Hello. Thank you
19	for your time. I just want to share my support along
20	with the others for open primaries. It's very
21	critical to be able to offer everyone visibility into
22	primary, even when they're not registered to that
23	party. Others have echoed the same wishes, and I just
24	want to echo that as well.
25	Thank you.

	Page 117
1	MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.
2	Reverend Tillard?
3	MR. TILLARD: Thank you, Commissioners.
4	Thank you for allowing me to have a few moments to
5	speak enthusiastically on behalf of open primaries.
6	I am a clergyman in New York City that
7	has served congregations in Harlem, Bedford
8	Stuyvesant, and Flatbush. I'm also an adjunct at City
9	College, and I have also run for office. And it has
10	become evident to me in talking to my young students
11	and also voters in my last election that there is an
12	increasing movement towards people becoming registered
13	independents.
14	I have often said in our country we are
15	becoming increasingly religiously tolerant and
16	politically intolerant. But what I've noticed from my
17	last race, as we were running against a particular
18	organization and I was advised to tell my constituents
19	that I am a real democrat, and because I am not as
20	good as some of those other democratic activists that
21	don't talk to democrats, I spent a lot of time talking
22	to people who told me in no uncertain terms that there
23	was frustration with both parties, and they were
24	registered independents.

And I began to tell them that I

understood their desire to be independents, but I encouraged them to register democrat because it was very clear to me that they were disenfranchising themselves. And then I thought about it, and I realized I was contributing to the problem because people have the right to be political independents, and they should not be coerced to join a party.

As a registered democrat, my party has talked frequently throughout the country about voter access, and we make the argument very persuasively that the more access, the more days for voting, the more options for voting, is actually good for democracy.

And so I realize now that I shall no longer ever encourage anyone to become a democrat just to be able to vote, but I will recognize their right as citizens and taxpayers, who incidentally contribute to the matching funds program, I will recognize their right to be independent voters, and I will strongly advocate, and I've been working with clergy and we'll be submitting letters, to say that New York City should have an open primary system as to ensure maximum voter participation.

Thank you so much.

MR. BUERY: Thank you so much.

Hearing

	Page 119
1	Jenny Radke? Okay.
2	Any questions for Mr. Niamehr or
3	Reverend Tillard?
4	MR. WEISBROD: No.
5	MR. BUERY: Any other testifiers?
6	Anyone else signed up?
7	If that is the case, I want to thank
8	you all for being here. Thank you for your testimony.
9	Thank you for welcoming us to Staten Island.
10	The next public hearing of the
11	commission will be held in Manhattan on April 23rd at
12	5:00 p.m. at New York Law School in Tribeca. 185 West
13	Broadway.
14	Thank you so much. Have a wonderful
15	evening.
16	(Whereupon, the meeting concluded at
17	7:39 p.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

•	1			
	J	L		

CERTIFICATE

_	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	

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

CHANYRI MOH

Notary Public in and for the State of New York

1	
_	

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, JILLIAN KAPOTSY, 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.

for Kaptery

JILLIAN KAPOTSY

[1 - 7214997] Page 1

1	2	220 14:17	400th 3:5
1 14:14 26:11	2 31:10	23 39:2 51:4	44 39:7
26:24 52:12	2.6 8:8	55:13	45 32:18 62:7
53:3 68:22	20 10:14 45:19	23rd 119:11	46 8:15
116:3	46:18,25 81:13	24th 38:23	475 1:10
1.1 49:21 73:2	86:6	94:17	5
81:21 94:25	200 67:3	25 33:25 45:19	5 68:25
10 4:18 12:8	2000 61:8	75:17	50 7:19 8:2
36:16 57:25	2000 61.8 2002 60:22	250 14:8	13:17 14:16
62:3 78:23	2002 00.22 2003 46:21	25639 120:16	
10,000 8:7	2003 40.21 2017 96:19	27137 121:14	19:9,12 71:19
10,000 8.7 100 14:6 32:16	2017 90.19 2019 47:23	29 93:17	75:9 88:11
100 14.0 32.10 1000 28:15		29th 59:25	93:22
1000 28.13 10305 1:11	96:20	3	500 13:11
	2020 58:3 113:2		28:16
107,000 94:24		3 14:14 35:1,11	51 86:18
12 4:10 23:19	2021 7:20 39:3	86:14	520 14:5
24:3,6,18	55:13 58:2	30 42:6 61:25	5:00 119:12
62:11 72:11	2023 96:21	62:24 75:17	5:11 1:6
13 42:11	101:7	78:11 88:11	6
13.4 8:3 19:13	2024 14:3	102:17	6 92:19
14 81:13	101:11	33 6:14	60 3:11 42:6
14,000 14:9	2025 1:5 28:17	35 79:3	101:22
15 14:21	38:15 74:10	36 79:4,5	600 8:5
157 116:3	116:3	101:21	67 103:2
160 8:7	2029 75:24	363 11:16	7
18 110:11	2030 20:12	37 39:19	-
185 119:12	28:16	101:19	70 55:16
1968 72:10	2032 42:21	4	101:16 102:13
1976 96:4	2050 28:15	4 14:1 45:1	108:5
1989 96:11	2050s 13:6	40 55:16 63:6	70percent
1991 99:8	2080s 13:7	72:13 88:11	101:22
	2100 13:7	400,000 14:7	7214997 1:18
	14:19	100,000 11.7	

[**75 - adopts**] Page 2

75 07.11	absolutales 12.4	achierina	110.12
75 97:11	absolutely 12:4	achieving	118:12
7:39 119:17	89:10 92:7,9	28:18 99:21	ad 67:9
8	absorb 15:21	acquire 16:7,9	adams 58:3
80 102:18	absurd 95:19	17:24 19:22	add 20:9 31:14
108:6	abuse 102:8	acquisition	69:15 70:4
83,000 94:24	107:8,20 108:8	18:5 19:19	115:4
85 6:23 79:5	abused 109:15	22:25	adding 13:20
8:00 5:15	109:17,19	acquisitions	addition
9	abusive 109:8	16:21	106:13
	accept 69:10	act 64:4,5	additional
9 1:5	acceptable	112:19	96:24 105:11
90 13:18 109:6	75:19	action 70:23	additionally
a	access 6:20	112:16 120:12	62:5
aberration	7:11 16:17	120:16 121:8	address 5:20
79:8	17:12 29:16,18	121:12	11:21 18:4
abide 64:11	30:6 31:15,17	actions 22:6	30:1 32:2
ability 20:1	48:24 67:4	25:4	65:17,25 85:11
24:1 43:9	85:19 96:15,22	active 68:17	87:20
75:21 76:16	98:8,8 99:15	72:10	addresses 88:1
90:12 95:19	118:10,11	actively 97:4	adds 59:4
120:10 121:7	accessible	activist 70:22	adjunct 117:8
able 5:13 9:9	20:12 27:20	activists 117:20	adjust 26:6
12:10 32:24	acclimate 42:17	activities	administered
33:5 34:7 36:2	accomplish	111:18	78:20
36:3,6,14,15,17	112:19	activity 107:12	administration
46:13 50:7	account 23:23	actors 50:15	41:6 57:24
67:9 71:9,9,11	accountability	actual 20:24	admit 66:8
92:16 93:25	102:7	actually 22:4	adopted 72:19
94:9 100:21	accountable	24:9 43:1	72:20
107:11 116:21	104:16	44:22 51:20	adopting 38:24
118:16	accurate 120:9	79:3 96:8	43:14 106:9,13
above 13:18	121:5	98:14 113:5,25	adoption 6:18
abuve 13.10	achieve 108:22	114:5,7,9	adopts 104:24
	100.22	115:11,18	101.21
		110.11,10	

1	a 1 10 10	T 1110	7 04 44
advance 17:25	afoul 68:19	aligned 44:10	amend 91:11
39:23	afraid 11:2	aligning 101:17	amended 42:13
advances 28:18	age 62:12 93:22	aligns 56:4	98:25
advantage	101:13 113:8	allegedly 50:21	amendment
90:11 91:8,21	agencies 11:1	alleviate 55:21	42:16 46:11
adversarial	17:17 61:13	allow 18:1	47:24 66:9
109:5	85:20	31:17 33:5	amendments
advertising	agency 12:7	37:7 40:5	115:11,19
59:1,5,6	61:15 95:14	42:16 43:19	americans 71:8
advised 117:18	99:17 114:6	54:25 71:14	71:10 80:15
advocacy 27:14	agenda 114:8	74:4,22 76:1	101:17
59:11	agendas 113:18	105:13,24	amount 10:17
advocate 27:19	ago 3:12 23:20	113:6	ample 41:7
118:20	29:7 46:18	allowed 51:25	44:5
advocating	55:16 74:8	86:7 92:22	amplify 40:24
85:10	79:5 82:7	allowing 12:14	analysis 102:24
affairs 58:1	112:12	40:14,21 42:20	angeles 71:16
affect 116:6	agree 3:18 46:9	54:24 117:4	anger 59:2
affecting 95:19	66:5 72:16	allows 9:19,21	angry 95:13
affiliate 81:23	ahead 69:6	50:14 51:11,15	anita 2:4
affiliated 50:5	78:16	58:18 105:6	anniversary
affiliation 43:9	air 15:2 28:21	allude 60:19	3:6
43:15 93:2	aisle 107:9	alongside 41:3	annual 13:25
105:6	akin 65:9	alternative	anny 77:22
affinity 44:12	alan 70:13,17	21:21	answer 37:23
affix 92:23	alaska 40:5	alternatives	64:11,15 81:8
affordability	albany 58:16	39:21	anthony 2:10
28:7 30:13	alert 36:6 76:10	altogether	anybody 77:12
affordable 3:14	84:2	59:25	anymore 32:21
7:14 27:17,20	align 12:7	ambiguous	anyone's 23:11
27:21 28:8	42:18 48:23	17:13	anyway 111:17
29:14 30:21	53:20 54:6	ambitious	apartments
36:24 37:2,21	104:8	28:14 29:13	113:23
38:1 87:21,24			

[apes - aware] Page 4

amag (1.01	57.0.70.15	27.2	-44 J
apes 61:21	57:2 70:15	arrays 37:3	attendees 2:2
apolitical 107:6	72:4,5 85:6	arthroscopic	attending 4:11
apologies	87:8 91:4	9:2	attention 66:20
111:16	93:13 100:7	article 42:11	96:9 97:3 98:5
apologize 84:14	109:9,11	articulated	attest 47:6
84:14,18 85:3	116:12	109:25	98:22
100:20 116:15	appreciated	artist 93:18	attorney
apparently	80:9	asian 80:15	120:14 121:10
74:1	appreciation	aside 87:16	audience 45:3
appeal 56:20	110:13	asked 4:25 32:1	audio 120:8
105:20 106:5	approach 9:8	82:14 86:20	121:3
appealing	18:18 21:1,9	89:20	author 113:2
105:15	21:10 88:17	aspects 97:15	authorities
appear 47:10	approached	98:6	30:10
47:15	82:11	assault 58:12	authority 19:22
appears 40:6	appropriate	assembly 47:19	103:7
47:20	87:22 93:6	assessment	authorization
applaud 58:7	approve 32:5	64:24 65:1	11:2 20:19
applicable	43:11 101:25	asset 21:2	authorizations
102:25	102:19 108:6	assets 30:19	11:20
application	approved	assistance	automatic
17:14 24:25	101:23	27:13,16	64:23
64:19	april 1:5 59:25	associated	available 8:6
applies 17:9	68:6 119:11	74:11	8:18 37:17
47:24 98:2	area 14:8 24:18	assume 77:1	44:3 109:20
apply 99:10	96:9 99:10	assuming 109:2	avenue 1:10
appoint 63:14	areas 14:4 18:2	astute 76:25	average 13:12
68:7	65:5 97:15,20	attach 43:9	avoid 14:17
appointed 58:2	98:14,15 99:13	attacks 29:3	22:10 50:24
63:9,10	argument	attempt 52:25	66:22 68:18
appointees	50:13 118:10	82:17	102:7
68:2	array 29:22	attempted	awarded 18:23
appreciate	35:24	114:23	aware 42:9
12:15 38:11			43:13 61:1

[aware - bit] Page 5

63:8 99:6	barriers 19:1	begins 102:10	120:9 121:6
b	25:18 58:11	behalf 27:10	bet 52:10
	113:13	72:13 83:20	better 18:2,17
b 116:14	based 40:19	117:5	23:3 41:21
back 9:13 25:8	41:10 54:10	behavior 82:22	52:2 56:15
86:8 102:3	63:10 89:9	belabor 70:3	59:19,19 63:4
backbone	102:24	belief 54:12	68:17 76:24
15:12	basement 8:17	believe 28:4	81:19,21 83:21
background 57.22	bases 75:6	39:8 59:18	83:21
57:22	basic 58:9	71:2,13,20	beyond 16:13
backs 88:7	91:10,14,15	94:2,4 102:7	103:3
bad 44:9 50:15	basically 12:4	104:11	bidding 68:10
95:7	58:19 107:21	belong 47:14	68:11
bailey 115:5	109:25	bemoan 79:25	biden 54:11
balance 32:16	basketball	ben 100:10,11	big 53:5
33:6 55:1 ball 67:3	70:24	100:19 106:25	bigger 46:17
	batista 76:11	109:1	biggest 88:22
ballot 40:1,4,7 43:10 44:6,19	78:3 81:11,12	benedictis	bike 98:10,10
45:20 46:19	84:19 90:19	52:19	bill 9:13 30:11
47:10,15,15,16	batteries 15:22	beneficial	30:14 31:3
47:17 55:19	battery 7:3	29:12 30:18	billion 8:8 14:1
63:12 66:10,11	35:24	benefit 37:8	14:8,16,18
67:16,17 70:5	bayridge 93:20	45:2 52:22	bills 36:17
75:13 93:3	beacon 83:12	53:21 82:20	binding 68:13
101:5,19 105:1	bear 28:2 40:13	benefits 13:24	bindingly
111:23	74:11	15:5 29:18	63:13
ballots 44:3	bearing 34:1	34:19 37:1	bipartisan 80:7
banots 44.3 bar 39:4	beat 9:9 67:13	39:17 41:17	106:7
barred 103:23	becoming 50:9	101:3	birch 70:12
barrier 6:18	117:12,15	bernard 70:12	72:7 77:13
20:24 25:19	bedford 117:7	73:17	78:2
30:4	began 117:25	best 3:24 5:12	bit 24:8 62:21
JU.T	beginning	56:4 61:5	73:5 77:9 86:3
	18:11 112:7	90:16 105:7	92:3

1.344 47.0	1	15.4	56.05.57.6.14
bitter 47:2	bonilla 2:7	bring 15:4	56:25 57:6,14
black 13:14	boost 95:4	88:15 102:12	63:16,20 66:3
62:17	boosting 40:16	108:4	68:23 69:2,14
block 23:16	born 6:13,20	bringing 85:14	70:8 72:3 76:8
33:18	93:20	brings 13:23	77:24 78:3
blocked 105:4	borough 3:25	81:20 85:19	81:4,7,10
blocker 8:9	54:19 61:4	broad 3:23	83:25 84:13,17
bloomberg	63:10 67:7	broader 22:4,7	84:21 85:2
46:20 57:24	68:1,3,5,20	45:3 105:14,20	87:9 90:25
65:18	69:9,12 94:21	106:2	93:7,10 95:25
bloomberg's	98:10 114:9	broadly 80:9	98:18 100:1,15
72:15	boroughs 19:12	broadway	100:17 103:11
blow 114:24	21:12 87:23	119:13	103:14,17
blue 19:11	113:21	brodsky 2:15	104:19 106:21
35:15 101:23	boston 9:10,19	bronx 25:16	109:21 110:2
blur 59:12	18:21 71:16	97:14 114:13	111:11,14
board 42:8	bottom 66:17	114:15	112:23 116:8
58:22 59:9	bound 4:7	brooklyn 6:14	117:1 118:25
62:20 63:9	box 40:4 44:6	23:21 97:13	119:5
67:24 68:11,14	91:24 113:11	104:23 110:11	build 15:4,6
68:17 86:14,24	bozorg 2:9	115:8	16:16,20,23
113:5,7,12	brands 56:20	brunt 28:2	29:13 30:16,24
boards 63:8	breaking 24:19	brush 10:17	30:25 42:21
65:11,13 86:16	brick 24:7	buery 1:4 2:3	88:24 89:2,5
bodes 75:20	bridge 23:18	3:2,4 11:24	106:10
body 13:4 42:9	81:1 93:20	12:2,11,18	building 3:13
47:1 62:8	115:5	18:8 20:15	8:15,17,20,25
107:14 109:7	brief 66:5	26:7,20 27:1	9:14 14:22
boilerplate	67:25 84:8	31:8 34:23	15:1,16 16:6
64:24	85:8,12	36:19 37:6	27:16 29:20
bolstered 98:13	briefly 54:22	38:3,11,14	35:20 64:6
bombarded	61:10 97:3	42:25 43:7	65:2 81:1
58:25	brighton 57:17	44:22,25 52:11	114:14
	_	53:14 55:5	

buildings 8:14	called 20:18	67:4 73:11	casinos 115:3
8:15 9:4,12	21:17 94:12		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		74:17 75:2,13	cast 75:10,14
114:12,16	99:13 112:3	75:19 77:10	75:17
built 37:2	campaign 45:7	78:16 90:15,22	casting 45:19
107:5 108:21	45:14 46:19	90:22 92:22	94:10
bulkheads	59:6 72:21	93:2 105:3,7	cause 10:11
16:14	88:24 89:3	105:13,13,20	112:14 115:12
burden 34:1	campaigning	106:1,5 111:8	causing 59:1
48:5,13,14	105:19	113:6,9	caveats 39:16
burdened 28:1	campaigns	canopy 35:18	celebrates 3:5
28:21	60:5	capacity 8:14	celia 100:10,11
burdens 30:2	camps 90:14	8:16,24	103:14,15,20
96:14,23 97:10	campuses	capital 8:9	106:23
97:20	35:13	37:22,23	census 42:19
burdensome	candidate	capped 103:2	center 80:7
11:1	43:20,23,24	capture 14:23	113:19
buried 73:24	44:14 47:21	car 6:23 7:1	central 27:23
bus 98:8,8	56:4,23 60:18	carbon 28:15	centralized
business 85:25	66:15 67:7	care 77:21	37:15
businesses	75:9,12,18	113:12	centric 85:20
14:10	82:18 84:24	carl 2:5	ceo 27:9
buy 61:4 67:9	86:17 90:13,16	carports 35:21	certain 19:12
88:24	91:23 93:5	carrot 95:11	36:22 48:12
buyout 17:22	105:17,18	carrying 112:8	94:15 110:16
bypass 40:20	candidate's	cars 7:12 10:13	certainly 33:3
74:18 75:3	40:6,10	15:16	52:1
c	candidates	carve 26:15	certificate
c 2:1 3:1	39:23 40:5,8	case 63:15 68:5	120:1 121:1
calendar 42:13	40:13,22 43:13	74:20 80:8	certify 120:3
42:18	47:9 48:7 50:2	119:7	121:2
call 26:9,10	53:7,23 59:3	cases 34:20	cetera 64:25
50:13 57:8	59:19 60:4,6	44:8 52:20	65:15 71:17
89:1 102:22	60:13 63:5	102:5 110:23	chair 2:3,11 3:4
07.1 102.22	66:11,19,19		27:6 38:14

[chair - city] Page 8

		1	
44:21 54:1	83:20 96:24	15:10 17:5,13	choices 60:2
57:14 95:25	changing 16:17	20:17 27:7	choose 40:5
chairman	16:21 22:2	28:6 30:22	56:7 74:17
70:16 72:7	25:25 26:1	31:23,25 35:4	90:5,16 94:15
challenge 12:25	channels 67:5	35:7 38:15	chosen 50:3
35:4	chanyri 1:17	46:15 47:23	christmas
challenger	120:2,17	57:15 60:21	114:21
110:24	character 87:4	61:2 69:8	chunks 75:14
challenges	charge 6:24	81:17 85:14	cica 70:23
10:22	15:21 74:1	86:2,12,22	circling 75:6
challenging	107:10 114:18	96:9,11,25	cite 19:24 36:3
25:18 33:13	charged 31:24	98:23,25 99:4	cited 53:10
chamber 14:13	83:19	99:23 104:25	cities 6:16,21
109:14	charger 8:4,11	chat 5:11	7:8 8:10 9:5,6
chambers	8:19 9:1	checking 67:18	9:20 10:11
107:24	chargers 7:20	checks 107:25	18:16 38:20
chance 12:9	7:24 8:2,5 9:11	108:13	43:11 61:11
44:23 63:17	19:12	chicago 71:16	71:15 74:20,21
74:23	charges 102:12	79:6	75:3 79:5,7,11
change 13:4,11	102:20 107:15	chief 109:5	83:15 90:8
16:2 18:7	108:5,6	children	101:20 108:16
19:19,23 25:7	charging 6:13	115:21	109:14
26:4 27:24	6:16,17,22 7:6	choice 6:20	citizen 58:10
28:19 33:14,14	7:14,19,23	38:24 47:25	95:8
42:17 63:12	8:22 9:24	48:2,4,11 60:3	citizenry 48:21
73:20 75:23	16:25 19:9,11	60:7 72:20	citizens 77:16
85:23 95:13	20:9,13	74:8,13 75:6	94:6 100:20
101:25 105:8	charles 114:1	75:15 76:3	102:5 104:15
114:1	charlton 61:20	81:23 84:25	118:17
changes 3:17	charter 1:1 3:3	91:12,25 92:1	city 3:5,7,9,11
3:19,19 10:3	3:7,12,17,20	92:4 105:3	3:14 6:9 7:17
17:6 25:6	5:8,8,19,20,21	106:10 111:24	7:18,20 8:6,6,7
39:13 45:9	5:24 6:9 10:3	112:9	8:16 9:9,23,24
59:7 81:18	10:20 11:16		10:7,14,20,23

[city - code] Page 9

11:11 12:8,23	75:1,21 76:4	97:17,22 99:12	78:4 84:23
13:1,3,11,13,15	76:18 78:11,18	citycharter.n	85:13 88:14
13:21 14:2,4,5	79:16,22 80:1	5:21,22	climate 6:5
14:11,17,21	80:15,19,22,24	citywide 10:14	10:12,15 11:22
15:13,21 17:3	81:13,18,22	11:7 25:12	12:6,17,23,24
17:5,6,8,12,17	82:2,20 83:1	45:24 54:19,25	13:3,4,11,22,25
17:24,25 18:20	83:11,14,23	55:4 59:3 71:4	14:22 15:6,19
18:23,23 19:12	84:24 85:17,17	civic 38:17	16:2 17:4 18:7
19:22,24 20:10	85:19,20,24	civics 113:15	23:13 26:4
21:2,2,16	86:17 87:19,25	113:19	27:24 28:2,6
23:10 25:13	88:7,16 89:22	civil 60:5 96:4	28:12,14,19,21
27:22,25 28:6	93:3 94:1,8,20	105:21 113:15	49:2
28:11,12,13	95:8 96:15,19	115:24	clock 4:22
29:1,7,10,12,15	96:20 97:10,18	civility 106:7	closed 39:4,21
30:4,5,16,24	98:3,10 99:16	clarify 69:22	79:3,8 88:23
32:3,11 34:3,5	100:24 101:11	70:2,9	94:8 104:6
34:13 36:2,11	101:11 102:11	clarity 19:4	110:18
37:15,17 38:18	103:1 104:24	20:17	closely 37:20
39:7,19 40:17	104:25 106:10	class 79:24	closer 41:23
40:24 41:1	107:16 110:15	83:1 104:15	closes 81:2
42:16 47:9,12	110:21 112:1	clava 2:15	closest 8:24
48:7 49:22,25	113:17 114:16	clean 6:21 29:3	33:10
54:16 56:8	115:4,13,17	31:5	coalition 94:21
57:23 58:2,10	116:6 117:6,8	clear 24:21	coastal 12:24
58:13,16,18,22	118:21	36:8 56:19	14:4,24 21:25
60:18 61:13,22	city's 4:7 7:19	61:12 101:25	22:4,10,19,22
61:24 62:4,12	9:7 10:13,18	118:3	23:13,20 24:19
62:24 64:9,12	11:17,21 12:6	clearly 66:15	25:9,14,15
64:19,22 65:5	14:15 28:22	clergy 118:20	26:2
65:19 69:8,8	30:19 39:1,14	clergyman	coastline 14:6
69:10,17,18	39:18 41:10	117:6	cober 38:22
70:7 71:2,4,6	42:7 73:23	click 5:8	code 114:8,9,10
71:13 72:9,10	75:16 79:2	cliff 60:1 63:1	114:10 115:12
72:19 73:18,22	80:17 96:17	68:8 76:11	

codes 65:3	85:8,8,12 87:6	5:2 6:8 26:8,20	30:2,3,8,11
coerced 118:7	commerce	27:6 38:9	33:11 36:12,13
coherent 56:11	14:13	56:25 57:15	50:6,7 58:1
coincidence	commercial	60:17 63:23	62:20 63:8,9
80:14	9:17 23:25	72:8 76:14	65:11,12 67:23
coincides 42:4	commission 1:1	77:25 78:7	68:11,14,17
collaboration	3:3 4:6 10:2,21	84:8 91:2	70:19,23 72:5
81:1 106:7	12:14 15:11	93:11 100:19	72:12 86:8,10
collapse 114:12	18:11 27:8	106:24 117:3	86:11,14,16,24
114:14	29:11 31:24	commitment	87:17 95:10
colleague 38:22	38:16 39:13	97:15	96:5,22 97:6
collect 22:14	40:18 46:15	committed 3:22	99:5 104:2
collective	57:15,20 58:4	28:15 102:3	commute 85:7
106:16	58:7 60:22	committee 6:10	companies 7:23
college 117:9	61:2 63:12	70:23	10:24 11:3,10
combats	69:4 70:17	committing	20:23 21:5
105:17	85:15 86:2,4	50:18 69:21	company 9:8
come 18:3	86:12,23 87:1	common 84:24	11:6
41:24 63:18	93:16 95:17	communication	compare 55:15
70:13 71:25	96:1,11,23	67:15	compared
87:6 90:3	98:12 101:4	communities	32:11
95:20	103:18 113:25	15:5,9 22:14	compete 11:4
comes 32:3	115:10,18	22:20 23:10,20	21:5
62:10,20 97:8	119:11	23:24 27:21,25	competing 67:6
coming 25:1	commission's	29:13 30:14	competition
74:4 87:7	103:4	34:1 36:5	39:12 40:17
101:10 102:3	commissioner	70:21 87:4	41:4 49:3 56:6
116:3	18:13 44:25	97:2,12	81:3
commendable	52:11 53:13	community 4:2	competitive
99:21	61:3 92:20	15:23 21:24	49:7 74:25
comment 22:6	93:7 107:17	22:2,16 23:10	111:10
48:19	109:22,25	23:17 25:3	complain 23:6
comments	commissioners	27:17 28:9,13	complete 47:1
11:20 84:12	3:22 4:10,20	29:15,17,22	108:22

aammlataly	00mour 49.22	oong 59.14.24	constructive
completely	concur 48:22	cons 58:14,24	constructive
31:22 81:24	109:17	consent 10:1,5	105:22
90:20 98:4	concurrently	11:5,12 20:19	consultants
107:6 109:4	41:14	21:9	59:10
complex 25:11	condition 83:16	consider 39:13	contain 35:24
complicated	conducting	40:18 90:21	contemplates
16:7 99:22	39:6	consideration	10:2
complications	conduit 8:25	3:18 10:4	contemplating
24:3	coned 7:24	considerations	35:6
composting	19:13 23:1	107:20 108:2	contention
85:24	coned's 29:23	considered	22:23
comprehensive	conedison 7:18	53:5 90:7	contentious
27:16	8:3	104:16	73:21
comptroller	coney 25:14	considering	contests 41:3
96:20,21	115:9	53:8	context 69:19
concentrated	conference	considers 101:4	contexts 35:14
98:9	80:24	consistently	continue 12:25
concept 16:2	confound 54:4	52:22 80:3,8	28:2 29:13
concern 65:8	confusion	constant 25:8	34:13 82:5
107:21	43:22 59:2	54:4	96:21
concerned	confusions	constituent	continued 29:2
66:10	44:16	55:3	continues 34:3
concerning	congested	constituents	continuing
64:22	28:23	41:23 62:9	15:3
concerns 41:22	congregations	71:23 117:18	continuity 47:8
56:5 66:1	117:7	constitution	contorted
109:25	congressional	42:12	82:23
concessions	50:23 67:7	constitutional	contract 9:9
11:8	connect 45:6	42:16 46:11	contractor
concluded	connection	66:9	18:22 98:15
119:16	7:24 8:24 9:22	constrained	114:23
conclusion	conrad 116:14	11:6	contrary 73:9
60:10 70:6	116:16	construct 18:18	contribute
		52:14	118:17
		J 2.1 1	110.17

contributes	corrections	councilmen	cox 70:13,16,17
41:4	114:11	113:17	72:6
contributing	corridors 15:19	councils 33:21	cradle 3:9
87:24 118:5	16:24	counsel 2:15	crc 18:3 81:17
control 47:3	corroborates	120:10,13	create 8:11
96:17 97:17	41:7	121:7,10	16:23 17:17
controlled	cost 8:1,3,6,9	count 19:25	47:16 80:22
99:15 102:10	9:6 19:8 25:19	51:6	115:11
controlling	29:5 45:2 59:4	counted 94:12	created 16:1
55:22	costly 8:5,23	counterargu	23:8 72:17
convenience	costs 14:1	51:3	83:5 104:1
61:1	29:25 41:6,18	counting 94:25	creates 7:25
convenient	council 8:15	country 14:22	22:8 25:10
7:14	32:5,8,19,25	43:12,16 51:11	62:8
conversation	33:4,22 34:14	77:17 79:11,14	creating 10:16
22:5 24:16	40:17 47:9,12	79:16 80:2	58:19 100:25
79:24 99:6	48:7 55:3,3	83:15 93:23	113:17 114:7
conversations	57:24 58:2	102:25 117:14	115:6
22:19,23	59:3 60:18	118:9	credit 72:19
convert 6:19	61:22 62:4,7	county 101:7	crime 115:17
coo 6:12	62:17,18 63:3	couple 31:13	crimes 69:21
cooling 15:2,17	63:11,13 65:20	82:7 98:13	crisis 12:23
17:1	65:21 68:4,11	112:12	28:7 32:2
cooperating	68:12 69:8,11	coupled 74:12	87:18,20,21,24
61:14	70:7 71:4	course 3:18	97:23 98:1
cooperation	84:24 86:17,25	5:25 17:23	critical 28:12
69:20,23,25	96:19 97:18	19:6 23:20	28:22 112:20
106:8	102:11,12,17	31:13,21 38:2	114:18 116:21
coordination	102:19 107:14	68:9 87:5,12	critically 20:13
18:25 69:18	108:5,7,8,11	111:23	cross 75:5
corporate	109:7	court 114:4	crucial 10:8
99:16	councilman	courts 17:15	106:17
correct 19:17	31:23 36:19	cover 76:3	cruz 110:8,9
			112:25 113:1,2

cues 40:3 44:8	daniel 76:10	decides 110:25	73:1 77:18
56:2	78:3	decision 59:23	79:23 86:22
culture 80:13		102:21	90:17 94:4
	danny 81:12		
curb 7:16 8:22	data 31:18	decisions 33:12	95:15 103:25
26:1	david 80:23	40:4 41:21	104:12 106:17
curbside 6:13	day 6:25 73:24	44:4 50:1	110:14 113:3
7:19 8:2,22	75:4 85:5	54:10	118:13
16:24	102:17 114:20	dedicated	democrat 50:10
curiosity 32:12	days 13:7,17	78:10	51:16 53:18
curious 21:15	79:5 87:6	deed 45:24	77:2,3 82:13
32:7 87:18	103:2 112:16	deeper 82:21	82:25 88:25
98:23	118:11	deeply 91:4	90:14 95:5
current 11:17	de 52:19	deference 32:4	111:19 117:19
15:25 19:10	deadliest 13:10	32:14 33:23	118:2,8,15
104:6,10	deafening	65:17,17 86:20	democratic
110:18	79:25	defies 54:12	39:9 49:24
currently 16:22	deal 65:19	61:16	50:2,7,8 52:24
17:20 63:8	dealing 116:5	defines 11:17	53:7 56:8 77:7
93:19 103:22	dear 100:5	definitive 73:7	89:6 94:13,17
105:2	deaths 13:12	degree 11:1	110:19,24
curve 21:19	14:2	26:16 69:24	117:20
cuts 29:24	debate 69:16	degrees 13:18	democrats
cycles 24:14	90:3	delaware 79:1	50:22 51:6
62:2	debating 79:12	deleterious	53:17 62:5
d	decade 13:17	48:21	77:4 89:6
d 3:1	101:19	deliberations	110:19 111:2
dabaron 2:8	decades 71:2	50:17	117:21
	83:5 96:18	deliver 22:10	den 57:13
109:22,23	decennial	27:12	denied 79:1
daily 28:20	42:19	delivering	department
dallas 71:16	decide 20:6	13:21	25:13 64:9,22
dampens 41:4	56:3 60:11	demand 28:24	114:16
dan 88:20	decided 39:8	democracy	depending
		42:22 58:10,12	107:10
			_

deploy 11:7	detailed 102:4	101:20	disconnected
21:12 37:13	details 39:14	differently 32:9	104:1
deploying	detainer 61:14	difficult 48:8	discount 36:16
10:22 28:15	detectors 116:4	56:11 99:22	discounts 31:4
deployment	deterioration	difficulties	discuss 67:1
29:2	47:1	68:18	discussing 25:2
deployments	determination	digital 59:1	discussion
11:13,19	86:3	67:5,9 120:8	59:13
described	devastated	121:3	discussions
11:20	23:19	digusta 110:8,9	32:4
description	developers	111:12,13,15	disease 70:21
81:16	64:3 65:7,10	dilutes 41:17	disenfranchis
descriptor	development	dime 82:15	49:23
43:20	17:21 23:7	dinner 61:4	disenfranchises
deserve 3:15	24:10 33:19	dip 95:3	111:1
95:1,15	34:2,15 36:22	direct 7:24	disenfranchis
design 15:4	37:18,21 86:9	27:24	118:3
22:7,16 25:2,7	86:22 88:3,5	directly 9:12	dismantle 87:2
27:12	88:12 97:19	18:23 61:9	dismissal 64:18
designation	114:6	82:11	disparities
43:11	developments	director 12:16	96:22
designed 6:16	113:21,23	38:20 96:3	displaced
13:21 26:4	115:2	100:4,20	114:15
designing 22:9	diane 2:14 61:5	disability 96:6	displacing
25:3	dickens 114:2	97:21	115:9
desire 118:1	die 13:15	disadvantaged	disproportion
desired 48:15	differences	30:14	28:20
desperate	49:4 54:8	disagreements	disruption
95:13	different 31:22	102:14	103:2
despite 10:12	35:17,19 48:6	disappointed	disruptions
74:7	51:10 56:18	110:16	102:8
destroyed 64:3	67:5 70:6	discernible	disruptive 86:1
detail 20:21	88:17 90:2	42:1 52:15	dissatisfying
21:8	92:25 96:9		21:24

disservice	dollars 42:6	dust 64:25	education
67:20 95:12	71:6 80:2	dwindling 29:4	27:13 115:22
104:12 115:23	dominate 97:13	dynamic 83:4	effect 3:20
		112:7	
distant 85:15	dominates 49:5		11:14 42:14
distinguished	donald 54:11	dynamics	effective 3:13
38:15 56:19	door 58:16	25:11 39:1	41:9 99:1
distributed	dot 7:18	dysfunctional	effectively 39:8
37:13	double 13:9	72:17	49:3,22 82:1
district 6:14	41:12	e	effects 48:21
16:25 32:10,19	doubling 46:2	e 2:1,1 3:1,1	effectuate 45:9
33:1,12 34:16	52:20	eager 73:19	efficient 15:1
46:2 54:21,24	doubt 33:8,21	eap 30:13	efficiently
55:2 86:18	dozens 17:17	earlier 48:19	81:19
115:6	102:24 114:15	early 9:8	effort 109:9
district's 45:23	dramatically	earthquake	efforts 80:3
districts 54:17	74:11	65:2	eight 42:11
62:7	draw 41:2 96:8	easement 23:1	either 7:11
diverse 27:15	97:3 98:5	easier 11:19	18:10 36:23
105:16	dressed 76:24	15:11 35:12	44:9 65:7
diversify 68:13	drew 107:15	36:22 45:18	76:19 104:10
diversity 68:15	drive 6:24 7:12	56:21	elderly 115:20
80:21 94:5	86:19	easily 21:11	elected 4:2
divisions 106:6	driven 88:8	53:16	33:10 34:9
dob 64:8	drivers 6:19	east 22:21	41:21 58:19
docket 111:23	7:7,9 9:24		59:8,14 62:6
documents	drop 5:11	easy 45:20 echo 110:1	62:17,18 71:22
113:10	66:23		75:16 104:16
doe 93:19	droughts 10:16	116:24	election 3:19
doing 51:21	drum 67:13	echoed 116:23	39:3,10,22,23
68:10 74:5	due 58:16	economic 13:24	40:11,20 41:6
79:13 95:9,11	103:8 107:16	14:1,18	41:20 42:13
115:23	duly 97:18	economy 99:19	45:17 47:4,10
dollar 14:14	120:5	ecosystem	47:12,13,20
		72:18	48:7 49:8,12
			1017 1910,12

49:25 51:7	92:3,4,12	eliminating	ends 12:20
53:17,24 55:14	94:19 100:24	40:1 42:5	102:11
55:17 58:20,22	101:2,7,18	89:16	energy 9:12,12
59:21 60:3	103:23 104:25	email 5:19,20	15:1 28:17,22
62:2,25 63:1,3	106:19 110:22	embrace 104:4	28:24 29:3,14
67:2 68:9	111:10 112:13	emphatically	29:16,25 30:2
73:19 74:12,19	113:6	94:10	30:13,21 31:3
75:8 76:17	electoral 39:1	employ 14:10	31:5,15,17
78:16,18,19	39:14 40:25	employed	36:4,8,11,16,18
79:10,19,20,21	48:1 49:7 54:3	120:11,14	37:1,2,9,9,13
80:3,5,12,13	61:9 72:18	121:8,11	enforcement
82:6 92:8,9,17	105:22	employee	61:12,13,15
94:1,11,15,16	electorate	120:13 121:10	69:19 70:1
95:22 102:22	45:24 104:17	employing	114:8
105:4,5 106:15	105:14 106:2	87:20	engage 24:16
110:25 111:7,8	electorates	empowering	36:3 37:20,22
112:8 117:11	41:5	60:12	112:6
electioneering	electric 6:4,12	empowers 41:5	engaged 72:11
82:21	6:15,15,18	enable 6:20	engagement
elections 38:25	7:11 8:11 10:6	enclosed 74:6	17:23 22:12
39:8,18 40:17	15:15,21 20:12	76:2	58:1 106:2,18
40:23 41:2,8	electrical 8:14	encourage	112:5
41:11,14,15,20	8:16	41:20 68:15	engineer
42:1,6,8,10	electricity	71:22 96:23	114:17
46:10,14,22	29:23	118:15	enhancing
47:24 54:3	electrification	encouraged	106:17
58:6,7,18,18	9:7	118:2	enroll 30:21
59:9,16 60:7	elegant 8:22	encouraging	50:24 72:24
60:12 62:10,20	elevating 26:1	105:19	enrolled 30:12
66:8 74:9,24	elevation 22:2	endeavor 60:23	ensure 3:9
76:4 79:6,7	eligible 89:8,17	endorsement	29:18 53:6
81:25 83:3	elijah 6:4 12:15	40:14 44:18	96:13 102:7
90:20 91:9,12	21:15	60:5	104:13 105:9
91:19,19,21			106:11 118:22

ensures 105:18	equality 79:23	ev 6:13,22,24	example 10:17
ensuring 36:10	equally 91:23	7:23 16:24	18:20 21:3
enthusiasm	equitable 17:18	20:9,12	22:22 40:5
112:3	27:23 29:16,18	evening 4:14	42:20 43:23
enthusiastical	30:8 31:15	5:16 12:15	44:10 46:3
117:5	97:19,20	57:14 63:22	48:4 52:19
entire 3:17 4:19	equitably 96:13	70:18 73:13	53:15 56:22
23:17 31:25	equity 99:18	81:20 85:13	69:20 97:21
34:1 51:23	equivalent	95:25 100:19	examples 21:17
74:23 81:17	49:25 51:20	112:18 119:15	31:12,20 43:13
88:12 89:5	era 114:2	evening's 61:9	97:4 98:7
103:1 104:17	erect 9:1	events 13:25	exceed 13:8
entirely 74:18	eric 38:22	eventuality	exceeded 7:21
105:4	es 120:4	66:22	excellent 76:8
entities 99:16	especially 7:7	eventually	107:18
entitlement	10:8 23:15	108:11	except 94:21
18:19	24:13 25:23	everybody 27:4	excluded 98:4
entrusted	27:25 30:22	33:14 34:12	excluding 83:6
86:14	48:9 71:17	50:1 60:16	104:8
entry 58:11	95:15 113:8	63:17 84:9	exclusively
environment	essential 29:16	everybody's	94:3
105:22 106:14	essentially 43:8	61:1	excuse 12:18
107:7	47:3 71:7	everyday 79:23	executive 12:16
environmental	111:1	everything's	100:4 107:16
6:6 10:8 12:17	establish 79:12	33:6	108:17 109:5
13:13 25:4	80:13	evidence 41:7	exist 16:18
28:1 65:1 96:6	established	102:16	22:12 83:10
96:14,14	25:14,15	evident 117:10	94:3
environments	establishing	evils 60:8	existing 30:20
24:24 27:15	15:25	evs 6:19 7:6	exists 7:7 42:9
envision 35:13	estate 30:19	exact 69:11	47:2 54:23
equal 54:17	et 64:25 65:15	exactly 7:9 19:4	expand 28:7
71:15 79:12	71:16	24:5 51:8	100:22
90:10		55:10 64:20	

expanded	extending	fair 73:23 74:1	federal 29:3,24
17:15	16:13	83:22 96:10,12	41:3 42:4
expanding	extensive 17:22	97:1 98:13,21	58:17 61:15
28:11 29:14	22:11 36:6	98:25 99:7,18	70:1 101:18
		102:23 111:9	113:16 115:17
expansion 30:9	extra 13:20		
expect 52:23	extraordinarily	fairer 42:22	feedback 22:14
expectations	85:25 88:12	106:18	feel 104:9
7:21	extraordinary	fairly 95:1	feeling 92:5
expected 13:8	86:18	fairness 107:13	104:1
29:5	extreme 15:8	faith 33:5	fees 10:5
expense 41:24	28:3 75:18	50:15 95:7	feet 13:5,6
expenses 59:6	108:24	fall 67:15 112:2	fellow 3:21
expensive 7:25	extremely	familiar 33:1,2	38:19 95:14
11:6	25:17,17 37:1	families 114:15	109:24
experience	99:21	114:20	female 62:18
21:16 58:21	eyes 115:10	family 9:15	ferry 74:2 82:9
89:10	\mathbf{f}	fantastic	fewer 55:14
experienced	face 29:3 32:2	112:10	field 74:23
82:12	53:24 90:23	far 41:2 55:22	fight 28:19
experiments	faced 17:19	55:22 79:3	94:19
62:19	facilitate 27:18	85:16 112:4	fighting 86:6
expert 79:10	facilities 17:8	fast 59:17	88:5
experts 4:1	19:24 99:7,9	fastest 79:15	figure 77:15
explore 3:8	facing 79:14	80:14,16	figures 48:8
45:15 46:12	fact 51:3 55:10	favor 49:8	file 61:16
98:12	67:10 74:14	favored 77:8	fill 30:2
exponentially	75:6 82:22	favorite 60:9	filtering 55:9
67:8 89:9		feasibility	final 84:2
exposing 14:7	90:4 108:7,19	30:23 35:3	102:21 108:11
expound 52:16	109:18 factions 56:12	feasible 20:6	108:19
expressly 61:14		29:12	finally 17:16
extend 76:3	56:14	february 38:23	24:2 42:5
extended 39:15	failure 114:18	101:2	67:22 83:14
103:2			103:3 108:19

[finally - front] Page 19

116.12	fix 66:6	formed 50.10	found 8:11
116:13		forced 59:10	
finance 45:7,14	flatbush 117:8	71:8,10 73:6	14:13,15 39:7
financially		foregoing	41:25 101:8
120:15 121:11		120:3,4 121:4	112:12
financing 11:10	11:22	foremost 78:12	founded 96:4
14:15 72:21	flood 14:8	83:18	founder 6:12
find 3:24 5:7,24	16:24 17:20	forget 67:10	four 29:6 42:7
21:7 25:20	flooding 10:16	forgive 85:2	75:13,22
58:11 64:15	12:25 13:2	87:10 110:6	fox 100:11,12
80:8 112:6	15:13 16:11	forgot 89:1	104:20,21,22
finding 81:2	floodplain 14:7	form 5:7 43:12	106:23
findings 114:16	flow 19:10	64:8,9 71:7	fracking 116:6
finish 67:24	flushing 115:6	92:8 95:7	franchise 10:4
82:16	115:7	format 36:12	11:2,17 20:18
finished 4:18	flyers 82:10	67:16	21:1
fires 10:17	flying 112:15	former 31:23	franchises
114:13	focus 32:1	100:4	10:25 11:23
firm 18:19	39:16 113:20	forms 90:2 93:1	21:4
first 4:15 5:3	focused 90:3	96:15	frank 57:12
6:3 7:19 9:7	folks 85:9	forth 25:8 67:5	59:25 60:17
11:15 15:11	follow 9:20	fortunately	67:23 87:15
16:7 19:7	64:4 92:2,19	61:4	frankly 112:14
28:10 42:20	109:23	forward 10:3	fraud 65:15
43:4,7 46:9	followed 5:1	20:7,20 25:9	free 9:4,5 29:23
58:6 62:17,18	following 53:15	25:17 46:15,20	freeze 16:3
64:1 75:5	97:17 112:17	108:4	frequently
78:12 79:15	114:9	fossil 10:13	118:9
83:18 84:12	follows 11:15	15:16 29:23	fresh 3:6
100:10,24	forbidden	foster 80:25	freshkills 73:24
109:19	61:14	81:2 106:6,14	friction 10:22
five 4:17 8:2	force 14:15	fostering	friend 80:23
13:6 21:12	60:4 71:21	105:21 106:18	100:5
34:17 48:6	106:5	fosters 27:14	front 8:19,19
			90:15 113:5,7
			70.13 113.3,1

113:12 115:10	futile 83:8	getting 25:6	21:7 22:13
frontline 27:25	future 17:1	112:4 115:22	23:5 24:22
	23:9 24:10	ghg 10:14	25:3 32:13
frustratingly 94:9	33:12 34:3	give 19:22 20:4	43:1 46:3,7
	33.12 34.3	33:23 44:23	,
frustration	g		54:4,18 57:7,8
59:2 117:23	g 3:1	59:19,22 63:15	57:8,9 59:17
frustrations	game 67:3 81:3	95:14	67:13 68:7
25:6	gap 112:3	given 9:2 21:22	69:3 70:11
fuel 10:13	garage 6:25	48:9 62:22	77:19 84:7
15:16 29:23	garbage 73:23	87:16,17,23	85:7 89:4,10
fueling 6:23	gas 6:23 116:4	gives 86:11	89:14 100:9
full 7:3 80:21	gathered 73:21	giving 9:14,15	109:23 113:20
90:14 91:24	gen 80:18	9:16,16 104:21	114:21 115:16
102:15	gender 68:15	glad 100:5	golden 62:12
fully 50:14	general 2:15	global 28:19	good 12:15
51:14	39:3,9,23 49:8	go 3:20 5:23	18:15 27:2
function 95:2	49:12,25 50:12	8:17 9:13 16:9	31:12 32:16
functionally	51:7 53:17,24	16:11 17:6	33:4 34:21
18:1	55:14 60:7	20:6 21:25	38:6,8 44:9
fundamental	74:12,19,24	22:1 24:4,20	51:2 61:19
26:2	76:4,17 79:18	25:5 36:5	63:19,22 65:20
funded 73:4	80:2,12 85:8	64:20 65:21	85:13 95:25
78:19 83:3	91:19 92:3,12	67:21 69:6	100:18 117:20
92:17	92:17 94:11,16	89:24 102:21	118:12
funding 64:16	105:4 110:22	105:3	goods 96:14,22
funds 118:18	111:8,10 112:8	goal 3:8 59:15	gordon 6:4,8
funnel 108:1	generally 88:10	99:17,20	6:11 12:1,4
further 59:4,12	generate 13:25	goals 10:7 12:6	18:21 19:6,10
88:2 120:12		23:13 27:23	20:25
121:9	generated 99:8	28:12,14,18	govern 61:25
furtherance	gentleman	goes 80:6,10,11	governance
26:12	76:22 89:20	112:15 113:5	82:5
furthermore	gentlemen	going 5:7,12	governing 3:7
73:9	88:19	16:23 20:11,13	

GOVONNMON4	gnoonen 17.11	1	handy 100.10
government	greener 17:11	h	hardy 100:10
6:11 34:7	grid 28:23	hagan 84:20	100:11 103:15
41:13 57:21,25	37:10	hagen 63:1	103:15,16,18
78:20 81:15,18	ground 24:19	68:8 76:11	103:20 106:23
85:18,19,20	35:15 84:24	78:4 84:11,15	harlem 117:7
100:23 115:18	grounds 108:15	84:20,21,23,23	harlem's 63:24
governor 75:21	groundwater	85:4,13 87:25	harm 53:21
116:5	12:25	hail 7:13	harm's 14:25
governor's	group 33:9	hajnal 52:18	harness 8:13
103:6	46:4 79:15,17	half 63:10,14	harris 54:11
grace 2:7	80:15 89:7	69:10 80:17	haul 73:23
grad 18:4	groups 41:18	hand 26:9	havoc 85:21
grade 16:21	45:17 59:22	95:22	hawaii 78:25
19:20	80:16 97:6	handed 85:23	he'll 68:9
grades 19:23	grow 34:13	handicap 20:12	headed 75:8
25:25	growing 79:15	handing 82:9	headquartered
granted 95:20	80:15,16	hands 26:21	6:13
grassroots 97:5	grown 32:10	108:20	health 10:9,12
grateful 12:9	growth 54:15	happen 50:20	10:12 13:25
great 7:22	gruber 76:11	60:18 68:5	28:13 70:19
21:17 29:1	78:4,6,7 81:5,9	happening	96:6 97:22,23
31:21 37:12,16	90:1 91:10,13	22:15 34:16	98:1
68:3 72:19	91:20 92:6,13	55:11 115:20	healthcare
74:20 91:3	92:25	happens 50:19	96:16 99:14
100:16 112:13	guaranteed	68:19 108:24	healthier 17:10
greater 39:11	11:9	happy 45:15	healthy 15:20
106:1	gubernatorial	hard 10:11	27:23 70:20
greatest 9:5	66:13	11:10 48:1	hear 4:15,23
83:14	guess 77:2	58:8 79:14	5:3,13,16
green 8:14	guys 18:15	108:21	23:14 57:19
14:23 20:10	60:22,25 61:6	harder 46:3	67:11 73:19
56:22,23,23	61:7 62:22	hardware 9:21	84:9,11 100:5
greenberger		19:13,14	100:10,13
2:11		17.13,14	103:14 111:13

[hear - hyper] Page 22

112:24 116:13	holmful 10.5	hold 4:20 44:22	house 65:23
heard 73:10	helpful 19:5 21:14 25:20	47:19 57:9	houses 113:23
97:22 106:15	26:17 53:11	63:16 81:7	housing 20:3
111:3,6,9	99:23	111:25	23:25 27:17,21
hearing 1:1 3:3	hereto 120:14	holding 6:10	32:1,2 33:17
3:23 4:1,12,22	121:11	41:11 57:19	34:2,11,12
38:23 81:16	heston 61:20	106:4	36:21,23 37:1
100:23 102:3	hi 18:14 82:14	holds 54:3	38:1 48:25
102:15,17	104:21 113:1	holt 80:23	54:15 87:18,20
119:10	116:18	home 6:25 9:15	87:21,22,24
hearings 3:25	high 7:21 8:1,9	9:23 20:5 61:3	88:6 113:20,21
5:14,25 6:1	14:7 27:18	75:5 84:16	113:23 114:4,6
heart 9:2	30:2 31:4 48:5	85:6	hpd 37:20
107:20	108:3	homeless	human 10:9,12
heat 13:10,12	higher 41:16	114:21,22,25	hundred 66:6
13:15 28:3	58:21 59:5	homes 15:23	hundreds 14:2
heating 15:1,16	102:18 115:21	17:19 115:13	14:25 59:2
16:25	highest 10:17	homework 44:5	hunts 25:16
heavy 85:23	101:10	honest 95:12	hurricane
heights 114:14	highly 98:9	111:20	23:19
held 41:3,14	hikes 29:24	honor 3:4	hurricanes
74:21 95:10	hindering	109:2	10:16
119:11	30:18	hook 24:18	hutchinson 6:5
hello 60:16	hindsight 113:2	hope 60:25	12:12,13,16,22
73:16 87:13	hire 7:10	61:1 75:4 90:5	19:16,21 21:23
93:16 100:13	historic 64:2,2	hopefully 112:9	24:5,12 26:18
103:16,17	64:4,5,8 65:10	hoping 18:3	26:25 37:11
110:10 116:18	historical 41:10	hospital 1:9 9:3	38:8 49:17
help 10:5,7,21	historically	hosting 61:3	51:2,9,14
12:5 15:11	28:1	hot 13:19	52:10
33:11 40:3	history 10:19	hour 32:22	hybrid 102:10
52:25 55:21	88:9	hours 29:7	hydro 116:5
56:3 81:18	hit 8:7	112:12	hyper 72:17
87:3,20 106:6			V I

i	59:7 66:10	improving	increases 10:14
	78:22 79:2	28:13,19	increasing
i.e. 65:18	impacted 15:7	incentivized	28:23 29:5
i360 89:2	80:14	105:20	45:2 52:24
ice 61:14	impacting	inches 13:8	117:12
idea 46:10,12	104:2	incidentally	increasingly
50:4 53:20	impacts 10:15	118:17	117:15
61:12,19 107:5	28:2,21 34:20	include 25:25	incredibly 8:5
109:3 112:14	impeachment	31:20 39:15	21:24
ideas 3:24 4:1,4	107:8,23	64:18 104:5	incumbent
4:8	109:15	included 22:21	58:20 87:23
identified	impediment	24:18 31:18	independent
23:12	23:7,12 24:9	44:18 64:24	4:6 43:23,25
identify 56:21	42:10	includes 14:9	70:22,23 71:1
identifying	implement 9:23	16:16,17 19:14	72:13 78:13,21
83:17 114:18	importance 9:5	including 5:18	80:17 82:14
ideological	30:7 76:16	12:24 17:3,7	83:6,9 93:23
48:24	important 17:7	56:7 60:22	93:24 94:2
idiots 77:16	20:13 23:8	105:25 108:14	95:8 103:21
ignorant 42:2	29:17 32:24	108:15	104:14 112:20
illustrator	33:5 38:17	inclusive 3:14	118:19
93:18	40:3 41:16	78:10 105:10	independents
imagine 36:25	44:1,17 53:4	112:7	43:25 71:3,5
44:5 53:16	54:20 57:20	income 27:20	79:13,15 80:18
78:25	58:13 60:4	30:1,12,19	80:20 90:4
immediate 44:2	71:3,17 86:21	31:4 37:8	91:16 92:5,7,9
immigrated	112:18 113:10	incorporate	92:16 94:20,23
3:11	importantly	37:5	104:8 117:13
immigration	101:14	increase 31:2,3	117:24 118:1,6
69:19 70:1	imposes 48:4	31:4 41:9	indicator 93:5
impact 23:23	48:13	53:22 59:15,19	indirectly
27:18 31:15	improvements	105:8	61:10
40:25 42:2	37:23	increased	individuals
46:5 52:15	31.23	105:23	94:25
		105.25	7 1.23

indulge 63:6	inquiry 64:23	inter 8:23	investment
industrial	inserted 108:13	99:17	10:6 11:11
35:22,23	insidious 53:1	interaction	invite 6:4 57:12
influence 41:17	83:4	45:14	98:12
45:17,18	inspired 8:10	interconnecti	invited 4:15,23
inform 22:15	inspiring 34:6	8:12	involve 17:23
information	install 8:21	interest 41:18	involved 46:19
5:24 40:3 44:2	17:8	45:17 46:4	76:25
44:9 56:2	installation	50:9 82:17	involvement
112:15	19:15 116:4	84:6 96:4	87:16
informational	installed 7:20	108:1	involves 24:13
44:8 48:5,13	8:3	interested	107:25
informed 44:4	instance 25:16	120:15 121:12	involving 17:22
infrastructure	61:25 82:24	interesting	ironically 77:5
10:10,23 11:7	instantly 82:15	23:14	irrespective
13:22,23 14:16	institute 38:13	interests 41:6	61:17
14:23,23 15:6	38:20 39:6	54:19 95:16	island 1:9,11
15:15 17:4	51:4 76:23	105:8	5:9 23:18
19:25 20:1	institute's	interfere 50:16	24:17 25:15
21:25 22:11,19	49:16	interference	57:16,18 60:17
24:19 28:8	insufficient	50:15 60:14	61:6 73:21,24
initiate 86:19	30:1	interfering	74:2 79:1
initiative 46:19	insular 59:22	51:18	81:14 85:16,17
112:13	insurmounta	internal 40:21	85:22 86:1,7
injustices 28:1	17:20	internally 33:9	87:7,17,23
innovated	integrating	interrupt 11:24	88:2,4,5,7,9,13
14:22	74:8	intolerant	88:16 93:21
innovative	intended 11:13	117:16	94:22 97:8
10:23 11:3	81:18 98:23	intricacies 77:1	98:3,7 115:9
27:13	102:23	introducing	119:9
input 6:10	intent 96:12	82:18	island's 86:3
23:11 28:9	intentionally	invest 11:11	islander 58:3
57:19	43:14	invested 47:8	islanders 57:20
			86:21

[issue - l.a.] Page 25

• 20.10	04.0.110.7	1 (7.10	01 00 00 7 1 6
issue 28:10	94:8 118:7	keeps 67:13	31:23 32:5,16
29:8 32:4	joining 4:9	90:9	32:20,22,23
46:17 55:8	journalism	kessner 52:19	33:3,6,13,21
58:8 59:14	48:10	ketcham 38:14	34:10,11,14,17
61:11 63:7	judgment 4:7	43:6,17 44:24	34:17,21 35:3
64:1 65:4,8,10	judicial 66:19	45:11 47:23	35:5,22 36:7
65:17 66:1,7	julia 84:3 91:5	50:12 52:4,7	37:12,17 44:11
72:14 79:25	93:14,17	52:17 53:12,14	45:5,16 47:17
88:19 92:5	julie 2:6	53:25 55:24	47:18 48:6,11
105:17	julius 57:13	57:4	48:18 49:6,9
issued 65:12	63:23	ketchum 38:12	49:23 50:16,20
issues 18:5,5	june 50:1 55:15	38:19	51:16 52:16
33:2 53:6	68:7 94:17	key 100:22	53:5 54:8 56:9
67:12 80:7	jurisdiction	113:3	56:22 61:8
97:24 99:15	103:4 111:25	kill 32:6 46:19	64:13 65:14,21
100:22	jurisdictions	killed 65:9	65:22 66:17
it'll 63:18	40:4 43:19	kimberly 110:8	67:18 68:15
items 58:5	justice 6:6	110:9 112:24	69:9,23 73:20
j	11:22 12:6,17	113:1	75:25 77:5,9
january 39:7	13:13 96:6,6,7	kind 23:7 24:10	77:11 85:16
jenny 116:14	97:22	24:10 34:15	87:7 88:9,24
116:17 119:1	justify 113:7	35:19 36:9,22	89:3,9 95:17
jeremy 76:11	justin 52:19	60:19 65:12,22	99:3 107:1,12
78:3,7	84:4 91:5	87:18 95:13	108:16 113:5
jillian 121:2,15	93:14 96:2	103:6 107:24	113:14
job 1:18	k	108:1	knowledge
jobs 31:5	kamala 54:11	know 3:21	48:14 120:9
jockey 60:5	kapotsy 121:2	10:10,11 12:7	121:6
joe 54:11	121:15	13:13 18:18	known 63:24
john 38:12,19	kathryn 2:13	19:2 20:20,22	knows 7:17
join 27:2 71:8	keep 14:24	22:1,17 24:7	1
71:11 73:6	15:22 29:7,10	24:17 26:9,12	l.a. 79:6
83:14 91:17	13.44 49.1,10	26:14,15 29:6	1.a. 17.U
03.14 71.17		29:9 31:11,13	
		1	I

label 40:9	largest 79:17	leads 111:10	101:23
43:21 55:19	94:20	leap 62:22	leverage 17:2
56:2,16 77:14	lastly 86:17	learn 15:4	29:11 30:20
77:21 92:23	late 75:23	learned 15:3	99:13
labels 40:1,2	latinos 80:16	17:21 110:14	leveraging 30:5
54:7 56:18	launch 9:19	lease 36:6	levin 27:2,4,9
77:21 113:13	20:3	leave 46:11	31:19 32:15
113:18	launched 7:18	48:14 66:18	33:16 34:5,25
lack 6:17 30:3	law 61:12,13,15	98:14	35:9,17 37:5
30:17 85:18	64:12,21 69:19	leaves 103:25	library 9:16
98:7,8 113:22	69:25 70:9	led 14:22 43:22	lie 95:6
lacks 113:25	79:10 116:3	left 55:22 62:7	lies 14:6
land 17:12	119:12	85:10	life 16:18 28:20
25:24 29:12	laws 69:17,18	legacy 63:25	104:2 110:13
30:5 86:5,15	116:2	legal 16:1	114:1 115:19
115:8	lawyer 57:23	38:19 96:5	lifelong 81:12
landed 76:6	lawyers 96:3	102:16 114:10	lifestyles 70:21
landmarked	laying 102:6	115:12	lifetime 72:9
64:6	lead 53:16	legislation	light 115:6
lanes 98:9	58:13 114:23	97:17 106:16	lightly 109:3
language 17:13	leader 28:14	legislators	liheap 29:24
99:4	80:24	101:24	likelihood
laremont 2:4	leaders 4:2	legitimate	53:22
18:13,14 19:2	40:12 41:21	67:14	likely 13:14
20:16 21:13	43:10 44:10	leila 2:9 23:4	42:9
87:13	73:22	lengthier 60:24	likes 33:13
large 35:23	leadership 40:8	lesser 60:8	likewise 38:8
96:21 99:15	44:13,17 73:11	lessons 17:21	40:20
largely 34:15	82:19	letter 94:11	limited 11:21
36:24 39:1	leading 6:18	letters 118:21	12:6 20:2 22:7
47:2 112:20	7:4 57:25	letting 103:19	36:23 98:2,2
larger 11:14	105:16 106:1	level 5:12 13:1	99:7,9
59:6	114:12,12	13:5,6 22:16	limiting 103:7
		46:5 55:2	

[limits - make] Page 27

11 14 72 20	22 5 22 10		11.0
limits 72:20	32:5 33:10	longstanding	lower 41:2
104:7	38:25 39:8,18	61:2	lowest 58:11
linda 110:7,9	40:24 41:2,8	look 3:6,12	80:1
111:12,17	41:11,13,21	31:25 35:2	lyfts 7:12
line 34:18 47:6	42:2,3,10,13,18	59:16 80:21	lynx 115:5
47:16,20 55:19	42:20,22 45:17	96:24 99:10	m
88:2,3 94:18	48:10,20,21,22	107:8	made 21:19
lines 26:2 47:15	48:23 54:5,10	looked 37:4	29:1 34:15
47:18 59:12	55:9 56:7	93:3,4	38:22 50:1
94:3 99:23	66:18 69:25	looking 6:19	64:11 68:12
101:14	98:7 101:17	12:5 17:3 19:5	74:1,7 88:21
link 5:11 44:12	109:7 113:17	20:20 21:1	88:22 107:15
linkage 44:15	116:2,3	45:7,16 67:12	madness 70:25
liquefaction	localized 54:14	looks 45:8	mail 115:16,19
65:1,4,5	locally 67:19	los 71:16	main 102:1
list 2:2 40:18	102:9	losses 14:18	maintain 32:24
88:24	located 17:12	lot 18:25 19:18	
listed 64:10	logic 61:16	25:9 34:9	maintenance
listening	logical 82:22	35:22,23 37:19	114:9
112:17	logistical 58:17	45:18 46:3,7	major 8:10
literally 67:17	68:18	48:9,25 56:21	30:4 37:22,23
little 24:8 26:15	lone 58:3	64:2 68:18	42:10 47:3
62:21	long 10:25 11:8	73:12 77:18	56:13 71:15
live 6:1,21 50:6	16:1 42:8 58:8	85:11 90:1	74:11 97:24
93:19 95:19	67:17 70:22	97:8 111:21	99:18
111:17	71:24 72:9,12	114:10 117:21	majority 41:22
lived 78:11	84:16 85:5,7	lots 22:22,23	101:22 102:13
81:14 97:1	87:7 92:6	43:13 54:9	102:18 105:12
99:18 110:12	longer 4:17	love 44:4 99:5	108:3,14
lives 95:19	11:23 16:3	111:22 112:24	make 3:13 8:5
living 30:13	32:8,12 60:7	116:13	9:21 11:19
lobbying 59:11	82:5 90:13	low 27:20 30:1	15:11 17:10,25
local 13:4	118:15	30:12,18 31:4	19:17 21:3
28:21 29:14		23.12,13.21.1	27:20 32:1

[make - meter] Page 28

22.12.26.22	16 22 10 5	00.25	1 4.2
33:12 36:22	map 16:22 18:5	mayors 80:25	member 4:3
37:15 40:3	19:23,24	103:7	18:11 32:4,5,8
41:21 44:3	mapped 16:12	meadows 115:8	32:14,19,25
52:1 53:10	25:24	mean 22:20	33:24 34:14
56:13 63:17	march 70:25	23:5 33:8 34:6	55:3 63:11,13
68:2 81:5	marginal 16:13	37:11 39:22	65:17,20 68:4
83:21,21,22	marianne	43:24 46:12	68:12 69:9,11
84:6 91:16	70:12	51:21 52:5	86:13,20,25
96:25 98:25	masonry	54:7 61:23	member's 33:4
112:1 118:10	114:19	65:24 77:1,5	68:11
makes 37:19	mass 21:9	92:24 107:7	members 4:24
47:22 56:21	massive 30:15	109:19	4:25 5:2 6:9
89:21,25	matching	meaning 37:14	38:15 55:4
making 4:6	118:18	meaningful	59:23 62:17,18
8:23 13:1 17:6	matter 49:10	30:15 79:1	63:9,14 65:21
27:22 54:10	51:3 83:10	meaningfully	69:4 70:17
83:21 113:22	matters 42:3	82:4	93:16 96:1
114:11	48:23,24 56:18	meaningless	103:19 104:7
manage 18:24	78:19 79:21	80:5	105:15
mandate 7:5	86:15	means 8:16	membership
31:1	maximal 91:24	22:18 25:7	45:21,22
mandated	maximum	56:17 75:7	mental 97:23
85:24	13:17 118:23	78:14 89:10	98:1
mandates	mayor 39:3	93:25 99:21	mention 63:7
116:4	62:1 72:15	measles 114:2	mentioned 45:2
manhattan	75:16 80:24	measures 54:17	55:8 56:2
38:13,20 39:6	94:16 97:19	median 46:1	59:13 74:14
49:16 51:4	102:2,4,13,15	meet 7:16 44:7	100:23
76:23 85:15,25	108:9	meeting 5:10	mentor 100:5
98:9 111:18	mayor's 6:5	119:16	merits 101:3
119:11	12:17 86:19	meetings 5:9	message 101:24
manipulative	mayoral 71:4	megawatts	met 24:23 75:4
94:18	75:13 77:10	28:16,16	meter 9:11
	100:25 107:4		

	I .		T
methods 29:18	minutes 4:14	moderated 1:4	moved 101:7
metrics 12:7	4:17,18 5:1	modern 62:19	movement
mexico 79:4	57:10 76:7	modernizing	34:11 63:24
mi 39:18	mired 90:6	13:23	117:12
michael 57:12	misapprehen	modification	moves 49:7
57:16 60:19	44:16	11:16	74:24
100:4 116:13	misconduct	modifications	moving 25:9,16
116:16	101:1 102:5,14	12:5	39:17 40:23
mid 88:5	103:8	modify 11:18	41:8,25 42:10
middle 82:6	mislead 40:7	moh 1:17 120:2	48:15 100:24
mike 46:20	misled 43:14	120:17	multi 42:15
66:7	mispronounce	moment 3:6	multiple 15:5
miles 14:5	110:7	95:12 109:19	60:2 77:10
millennial	mispronounced	moments 82:10	96:19
80:18	116:15	117:4	municipal 58:6
million 8:4,7	missing 65:3	money 9:14,15	79:8
9:24 14:10	mission 27:12	9:16,16 14:12	municipalities
19:13 39:4	37:13 85:21	67:8 95:2	7:4
42:6 49:21	mistake 84:18	month 13:20	murder 64:17
71:5 72:1 73:2	misusing 43:8	months 13:19	n
74:15 78:20,24	mitigate 28:5	morano 57:13	n 2:1 3:1
81:22 94:25	28:23	60:16,17 63:19	naive 109:7
103:22	mixed 61:21	67:25 69:7	name 3:3 6:11
millions 7:7	mobility 7:11	70:3	12:15 27:9
80:2	20:4	morning 7:3	40:7 57:16
mind 26:4	modalities	morris 114:14	63:23 70:17
54:12 107:15	35:18,20	motivated 60:8	73:16 77:3
mindful 4:21	model 9:4,19	motive 53:1	78:7 81:12
mine 49:17	47:22 49:19	mounted 35:20	83:20 85:13
100:5	50:10 51:22	move 4:22 5:4	93:17 96:2
minimize 86:16	62:23 63:1	15:20 46:13	100:19 103:19
86:23,24,25	90:5,7,8,9	57:7 84:4	100.19 103.19
minority 62:14	models 54:23	100:9 111:8	110:10 111:17
	89:21 90:6		110.10 111.17

		1	
113:1	15:5,11 17:2	network 11:14	73:17,18 76:18
names 67:18	17:24,24 20:7	neutrality	78:11,15 79:2
116:16	20:22 26:6	28:15	79:4 80:1,19
narrow 74:23	28:7 34:11,12	never 54:18	81:12,19,21
narrowing 89:7	34:12 40:20	67:8,9,10,11	83:11,18,19,23
national 48:24	42:12 45:8	93:25	88:6 89:21
54:6 55:9 64:4	71:19 77:21	new 3:5,9,11,14	94:14,19 95:8
64:7 67:12	91:16 92:13	3:23 6:9,12 7:8	95:14 96:3,13
78:9	95:4 112:1,14	7:10,17,17,20	97:1 101:11
nationalization	needed 21:12	8:6,10,15 9:24	103:1,20,21,22
48:20	needing 34:16	10:10,12,18,20	104:4,5,23,24
nationally	needs 21:18	12:8,23 13:3	106:9 109:12
67:19 101:14	48:18 55:4	13:11,12,14,15	110:15,21
nationwide	94:5 95:17	13:15,22 14:2	111:19,25
41:7	97:24	14:5,11,14,17	113:6,9,21,24
native 115:9,13	negate 86:4	14:21 15:12,13	114:15,25
natives 113:24	negligence	15:14,14 17:18	115:2,9,13
natural 116:4	114:17	23:10 28:11,13	116:6 117:6
nature 42:15	negotiate 33:6	28:20,22 29:4	118:21 119:12
58:17 76:2	negotiating	29:15 30:4,7,9	120:19
87:3	32:25	30:12,16,17	niamehr
navy 6:14	neighborhood	32:2 36:2	116:14,16,18
neared 82:8	22:13 24:17	37:16,18,21	119:2
nearly 13:18	33:19 36:10	40:23 41:1,12	nice 27:4 55:1
101:12 114:13	48:8 57:17	42:12,13,18	night 7:2 61:4
neatly 104:10	82:8	47:11 49:22	nimble 16:4
nebulous 95:3	neighborhood's	54:8 56:8	noise 64:25
necessarily	15:2	57:23 58:1,13	nominate 40:21
43:21,24 53:21	neighborhoods	58:16,21 60:18	nominates 69:9
54:6,17 111:4	15:7 17:10	61:13,16 62:1	69:11
necessary	neighbors	62:12,24 64:5	nomination
105:12	86:15	65:5 71:2,13	69:10
need 7:13,16	neither 120:10	71:24 72:1,9,9	nominees
10:21 12:8	121:7	72:18 73:2,6	110:22

[non - open] Page 31

non 37:15	november 74:4	occur 40:9	old 93:17,24
46:21 47:13	75:7 76:20	odd 41:1 42:5	110:12
50:5,10,11	94:16 105:1	46:18,25 58:6	omits 82:1
57:22 59:16,20	npcc 13:4,16	· ·	once 30:17
72:23 83:2	nuance 94:6	58:18,23,24 59:11 62:24	73:22 74:1
89:24 91:11,18	number 13:7	offer 11:8	80:13 93:25
91:21 97:25	19:8 41:19	75:20 116:21	one's 37:12
nonpartisan	55:11 60:6	office 6:5 12:17	ones 115:22
39:16,20,21,25	69:11	17:16 21:22	ongoing 82:4
40:15 49:19	numbered	86:19 117:9	online 5:7,10
55:20 58:7	39:18 41:8	officer 120:2	26:8,20 38:4
60:12 62:10,25	numbers 95:4	offices 40:24	57:1 69:5
76:19 90:7,20	ny 1:11	75:3 76:5	77:25 84:5
91:9 92:3,8,15	nyc 7:18 94:12	85:15	87:6 91:2
92:21,22,23	nyc.gov 5:8,8	officials 4:2	93:11 100:9
93:1 104:25	5:19,24	33:10 34:9	open 4:24 8:17
105:5,11,13,24	nycha 35:3,5	42:17 58:19	9:2 15:14
106:4,9,13	nylpi 100:6	59:8,14 71:22	39:20,22 43:9
nonprofit	nypa 30:24	104:16	43:12 49:19,20
27:11 57:25	31:2 35:10,11	offs 39:17 48:2	50:4,13,14,20
78:9 98:15	35:13 36:3	48:3 49:11	51:10,11,14,24
normalized	0	oftentimes	55:20 71:14,25
83:5	o 3:1	79:19	72:22 73:18
normally	o'brien 70:12	oh 12:1 35:11	74:21 76:9,20
109:17		35:11 52:7	76:20 78:8,8
north 1:9 57:18	73:16,17 76:22	84:13	78:10 79:4,6
97:13	object 92:21	okay 21:13	80:25 83:15,22
notary 120:18	93:1	26:21 35:12	84:1 88:10,19
note 4:5 103:5	objective 109:4	57:11 77:25	89:22 90:2
noticed 117:16	obsolete 18:1	78:6 82:14,17	91:9,14,22
notices 65:13	obtain 21:5	84:21 91:3,6	92:8,14,15
notify 65:11	obvious 74:13	93:11 119:1	94:19 95:21
notion 77:14	obviously 23:7	oklahoma	104:13 111:6
	99:15	80:24	111:22,25

[open - park] Page 32

112:7 113:4	45:9 50:23	overcomes 92:5	packaged
115:24 116:20	73:7 77:15	overdevelop	104:10
117:5 118:22	94:4 100:11	86:6	page 5:11
opening 40:15	110:8 111:5	overdue 42:8	paid 19:13
71:21 72:14	116:17	overestimated	66:20
80:22 87:11	organization	78:22	paint 114:23
106:22	27:11,12 45:21	overnight 9:23	panama 3:11
operating 33:4	45:22 78:9	overreach	pandemics
opinion 68:16	94:12 96:5	86:19	114:2
109:8	109:1 117:18	oversight	panel 4:19,21
opinions 54:8,9	organizations	113:22,25	6:3 8:18 12:20
opportunities	27:18 70:20	114:7	13:3 26:22
35:21 80:23	organizer	overwhelming	66:4 84:2 91:1
opportunity	70:22 72:12	101:21	98:19 110:5,6
3:10 11:9 21:6	outcome 45:10	overwhelmin	panelist 4:16
27:5,7 28:5	75:20 120:15	50:6	18:11 84:3
29:11 30:20	121:12	own 14:15 35:5	panelists 4:16
38:16 42:21	outcomes 52:23	36:14 38:21	4:17,21,23
53:23 57:5	outdated	56:15 95:20	38:4 76:10,14
70:18 72:8	104:11	113:17,18,18	91:2,8 116:10
74:4 76:1 96:2	outlier 109:12	114:8	panels 17:4
104:22	outmoded 74:5	owned 17:3,5	19:25
oppose 32:21	outrageous	17:12,24 21:2	panoply 90:15
opposed 9:2	73:5	29:12 30:5,25	paper 16:12
21:10 32:20	outreach 70:19	owners 27:17	paradigm
49:19 50:10	89:5	29:20	54:21
91:9	outs 26:15	ownership 31:3	paraphrase
opposition	outside 95:16	oxygen 66:14	61:20
75:12	108:1 113:4,13	р	pardon 9:18
option 20:4	114:1		11:23
options 7:15	outweigh 34:20	p 2:1,1 3:1 p.m. 1:6 5:15	parents 3:10
56:6 118:12	overall 79:17	_	park 7:8,15
order 15:6 16:8	110:25	119:12,17	9:25
34:13 44:15			

parking 35:22	50:17 54:17	parts 20:17	96:11,19 97:9
parkland 115:8	85:18 88:4	32:11 98:3	97:18 101:21
part 22:3 30:25	117:17	party 39:9,24	101:23
37:12 47:7	particularly	40:1,2,6,8,12	passing 79:13
48:17 49:24	15:8 16:4 32:9	40:21 41:24	past 14:21
79:23 81:16	36:23 41:14	43:9,10,15,21	33:25 46:25
88:13 92:1	88:19 91:25	43:25,25 44:10	89:9
95:9 96:10	parties 40:14	44:12,13,17	path 20:7 35:6
99:11	47:3 48:16	47:6,14,20	pathway 16:23
partial 114:13	51:12 55:1	48:18 49:5	patterns 41:11
participate	56:7,13 59:21	50:9,17,18,25	pay 9:12 71:6
36:14,15,17	59:24 62:14,15	51:20,25 52:22	73:4
41:13 42:3	72:25 77:18	53:1,21,23	payers 30:1
50:23 51:15,16	95:3 104:11	54:15 55:19	paying 14:19
53:9 55:12	108:2 117:23	56:1,6,8,10,15	31:5
74:15 76:17	120:11,14	56:16,17,20,22	pays 14:12
82:3 91:15	121:8,11	56:24 59:22	peace 34:15
92:7 95:7	partisan 42:1	60:13 61:18	peaker 28:25
105:7 111:7,18	46:21 47:13	71:9,11,18	36:9
participated	50:11 52:15	72:25 73:3,7	people 6:21,24
39:3	59:16,20 72:23	73:10 77:7,14	14:11,25 20:4
participating	74:6 76:2 77:6	81:24 83:17	22:17 23:6
55:17 58:10	81:3 89:24	84:24 89:12	33:9,11 50:15
103:23	91:12,19,21	90:17 91:22	50:22,24 51:17
participation	102:7 106:6	92:15,23 93:2	51:24 53:6,9
41:10 52:25	partisanship	94:3,9,13	55:11 57:9
59:20 71:20,21	47:2 72:17	101:13 104:7	62:16 65:9,14
80:1,6,10,11	107:19	105:3,6,15,25	66:16 67:17
104:7 105:23	partnering	116:23 118:7,8	68:10,14 69:11
118:23	31:2	party's 40:13	69:12,21 71:17
participatory	partners 10:6	47:21 50:3	77:20 80:20
40:25	99:5	104:9	82:10 83:16
particular 32:1	partnership	passed 20:10	84:5 88:3,7
43:25 44:13	97:5	61:23 79:4	89:3,8,11,13,16

	T	1	1
93:22 106:12	person 5:3 20:5	plans 22:13	policy 7:5
111:21 112:2	33:10,11 62:7	25:14,15	27:19 38:19
113:24 114:24	84:3 100:21	plants 28:25	49:2 56:18
115:20,21	personally	36:9	69:16 80:7
116:7 117:12	90:20 100:3	planyc 25:14	96:3 100:20
117:22 118:6	perspective	plate 75:5	101:8 104:1
people's 15:23	34:8 48:4	play 23:9 33:2	politic 47:1
percent 6:24	61:12 88:15	40:14	political 25:11
8:15 10:14	perspectives	player 75:4	39:11 40:16
32:17 36:16	104:15	pleaded 94:12	41:4,24 49:3,4
39:2,7,19	persuasively	please 5:16	52:22 54:6
45:19 51:5	118:10	83:21 85:2	56:15 59:7,21
55:13,16 62:1	phoenix 71:16	87:10 95:21	59:24 60:13
62:3 66:6	phone 7:2	100:17 110:6	61:17 71:9,11
71:19 75:9,17	physical 14:18	pleasure 43:6	71:18,19 72:24
79:5 93:22	pick 49:10	plug 7:1,2,18	73:6,10 79:24
97:11 101:17	51:12 89:23	plurality 39:19	80:23 81:23
101:22 102:13	picking 73:11	plus 9:24	83:17 102:14
102:19 108:5,7	pieces 19:13	101:22 108:7	104:3 106:14
109:6	pilot 7:19 8:3	point 25:16	107:12,20
percentage	19:11,14	45:16 48:22	108:12 118:6
55:14	pilots 11:8	56:19 63:15	politically
perfectly 93:6	place 16:3	70:3,9 79:19	72:10 117:16
performing	20:13 83:12	81:6 88:15,21	politicking
38:17	101:5 115:12	95:18 106:3	78:16
period 10:18	places 64:8	pointless 83:11	politics 48:20
permit 99:11	plain 91:22	points 26:12	54:5,14 55:9,9
permits 64:16	plan 25:12 34:3	114:17	72:11
65:12 99:9	plane 76:6	polarization	poll 101:8
permitted	planet 61:21	106:4	polling 39:6,19
94:10	planning 23:9	police 97:25	51:4
permitting 8:1	24:2,11,17	policies 54:16	polluters 36:10
18:24	25:13 64:9,23	87:19 116:6	polluting 15:2
			28:24

pollution 28:21	practice 34:4	pretty 11:5	primary 38:25
pool 68:13	97:22	48:5,8 67:2	39:5,9,21
poor 70:21	practices 74:3	96:16 101:21	40:20 43:10,12
82:20	practicing	108:21 112:10	49:4,19,20,20
populace 45:19	57:23	prevent 15:13	49:24 50:3,4,8
popular 53:18	prefer 49:18	18:6 44:16	50:11,23,25
53:19,22 101:8	62:10	65:15 69:18	51:10,17,24,25
popularity	preference	71:3 102:8	55:15,20,20,22
101:6	76:19	103:2 107:11	71:12 74:9,21
population	preferences	prevention	75:3 76:4,18
115:23	41:22 49:11	69:23 70:21	76:20 78:18
portfolio 25:17	56:5 82:1	previous 17:21	79:20 80:25
position 49:16	105:14	price 8:8	81:24 82:7
positive 92:10	preferred 40:6	primaries 39:4	83:3 88:19,23
95:9 105:19	prepared 121:3	39:17,20 50:14	89:6,8,15,18,22
possibility	present 4:11	50:14 55:10,12	89:23 91:14,22
75:16 83:13	12:10 23:14	59:24 71:4,6	92:8,14,15,15
possible 26:13	30:20	71:14,21,25	92:21,22,24,24
37:15 61:24	preservation	72:14,22 73:4	94:1,8,17,19
69:20 107:7	64:2,4,5 65:10	73:5,8,18 74:6	95:7 103:23
post 65:13	114:6	74:16,18 76:3	104:6,25 105:5
114:2,2	preserve 54:24	78:8,9,17 79:3	110:18,20,21
potential 43:8	63:24 87:3	79:4,8 80:6,11	110:24 111:7
44:16 65:1,4,5	president 63:10	80:22 83:16,22	111:20 112:8
potentially	68:2,4,20 69:9	89:24 90:2	116:22 118:22
36:21 41:12	69:12 78:8	91:9 92:12,17	prime 89:6,7,15
42:18	107:10	93:1 95:21	principled
power 8:19	president's	104:13 105:12	111:21
15:15 28:16	68:6	105:13,24	print 59:1 67:5
30:10 36:4	presidential	106:4,9,11,13	67:10
60:11 103:6,6	41:15 58:20	111:6,22,25	prior 5:14 70:6
116:1	66:13,17	113:4 115:24	120:5
powered 15:16	press 48:9	116:20 117:5	priorities 11:22

prioritizing	42:16,19 47:4	37:21 58:20	propaganda
28:9	47:12 48:17	97:23,24 98:2	113:18
priority 30:6	49:5 53:16	118:18	properties
private 7:9	55:23 59:22	programs	17:24 24:1
10:6,24 11:6	69:25 71:19	17:22 29:4	property 14:9
97:12	82:4 83:6 86:5	30:7,10,22	16:8,9 17:3,5,6
pro 54:15	88:23 92:1	87:19 96:5	19:23 35:12
probably 32:22	95:23 100:25	progress 21:18	64:10,19
73:25	102:6,23 103:8	29:2 74:7	proportional
problem 10:24	105:10 106:15	83:13	40:19 48:16
43:15 51:1	107:6,9,12,16	project 16:8	54:23 56:24
55:21 59:4	107:23,25	17:11 22:4,7	62:11
85:4 113:14	108:8,14,20	22:16 25:2	proportionality
118:5	109:4 110:14	26:3 32:6	54:25
problematic	112:7	projected 13:9	proposal 67:24
40:2 108:1	processed	14:19	101:4 102:2,4
problems 22:8	97:12	projects 11:21	102:9 105:1
65:15 74:9	processes 20:18	13:5,16 14:16	107:1,4 108:4
88:22 111:16	22:12 36:21	14:24 15:4	propose 11:16
115:1	40:21 109:13	21:16,25 22:9	11:18 103:7
proceeding	procurement	22:11,20 24:15	proposed 4:9
121:4	18:22	25:10,19 27:19	11:15 29:24
proceedings	produce 63:4	30:4,12,15,16	pros 58:14,15
120:3,4,6,8	product 7:22	30:21 31:16	59:20
121:6	professionals	37:22	prosecutor
process 10:1,4	113:22 114:11	prolonged	107:14
11:1,5,12,17	115:12	102:8	protect 14:17
16:19 18:22,24	professor 52:18	promise 55:23	16:10
20:19 21:21	profit 11:9	promote 39:11	protection
22:18 23:2,6	50:11	70:20	14:24 58:20
23:12,24 24:9	profound 83:4	promoting	protective
24:13,21 25:8	program 17:18	106:18	16:24
30:23 35:5	17:20,25 20:4	prompting	protects 13:22
36:2,6 37:7	29:25 30:10,13	42:8	

	1	1	1
protesting 94:7	publicly 30:25	55:23,25 64:10	quote 81:16
protopapas	46:23 83:3	69:15 77:23	r
110:7,9,10	pull 7:1 8:24	81:8 84:1	r 2:1 3:1
provide 7:13	pulling 21:20	87:15 89:20	race 42:4 59:25
15:1,13,23	purple 101:24	91:6,7 92:20	68:16 76:20
19:4 21:2	purpose 74:22	93:8 99:2	101:13 117:17
27:15 44:8	pursue 4:8	101:12,19	races 42:4,20
56:2	pursuing 3:24	107:1,18,19	79:18,20
providers	purview 45:6	109:24	radical 61:24
27:17	push 11:2 86:8	questioned	62:8
provides 17:13	put 8:8 10:3	82:11	radke 116:15
29:22	22:14 36:1	questions 4:19	116:17 119:1
providing	46:15,20 52:5	4:20 5:1 12:3	raiding 51:20
15:17 37:8	63:12 70:5	12:20 18:10	rainfall 13:8
60:12	96:25 108:4,12	26:22 31:9	raise 16:10
provisions	109:10 113:19	34:24 35:2	26:9 53:6 59:5
96:10,12	115:11	38:5 42:24	raised 26:21
psal 70:24	puts 25:13	43:3 46:7	66:7 93:20
public 1:1 3:2	putting 49:3	63:18 66:4	raises 41:6
3:25 4:3,24,25	93:2	68:23,24 69:4	raising 41:18
5:2,25 6:10,17	q	76:9,13 77:24	rally 95:18
7:14 9:1 15:15	qualified 120:7	84:10 87:11	ran 47:5 58:1
16:3,16,24	quality 104:2	91:1 93:10	range 105:21
17:22 18:2	114:1	98:19,20 100:1	106:5
19:24 21:2	quarter 14:10	101:4 106:22	rank 38:24
22:5,11 24:16	queens 97:14	106:24 109:21	47:25 48:2,4
25:5,24 30:5	114:22 115:7	110:4 116:9,10	48:11 60:3
30:25 31:3	question 18:15	119:2	61:16 72:20
37:8 43:14	23:5 26:8	quick 81:5	74:8,13 75:6
49:1 57:7	37:24 43:7,18	quickly 112:19	75:15 76:3
72:21 96:4	44:20,23 45:12	quite 33:13	84:25 91:12,25
99:19 102:15	46:13,14 47:11	65:4	92:4 106:10
115:8 119:10	52:13,18 53:15	quo 77:8	111:24 112:9
120:18	52.13,10 33.13		111,47 114,7

ranking 60:6	realized 118:5	96:21	redevelopment
rapid 98:8	realizing 76:24	reclaim 12:22	23:24
rapidly 28:7	really 7:21,25	recognize 30:7	redistribute
rare 102:23	11:13 21:17,18	114:18 118:16	30:11
108:23	23:11 25:11,20	118:18	redistricting
rarely 110:23	32:21 34:6	recognizes	42:19 58:4
rate 8:4 29:24	36:13 37:20	34:12	redo 24:22
30:1 66:10	44:11 45:9	recognizing	reduce 28:24
71:18 81:3	48:23 53:4	34:10	42:7 106:6
rather 54:13	54:18,20 59:14	recommend	reduced 120:6
56:1 63:3,14	59:17 66:6	39:13 63:15	reducing 16:20
87:1 105:15	67:17 69:2	68:8 81:18	reduction
112:2	78:18 88:22	102:20 108:9	106:3
rcv 60:4	113:15 115:1	recommendat	referee 70:24
reach 9:6 10:7	116:1	36:1 63:11	referred 73:13
30:10 46:4	rear 77:9	recommendat	83:13
70:6 95:11	reason 5:15	4:6 25:6 31:6	referring 35:9
reaching 41:19	32:23 33:4	38:22 68:13	reflect 28:6
45:3	43:10 46:24,24	98:24	41:22 94:5
read 52:2 75:12	90:9 94:18	recommending	103:24 105:14
85:12	108:17	83:20	reflective
reading 20:21	reasons 88:17	recommends	106:16
ready 76:12	105:11 108:18	68:8 103:5	reflects 40:9
82:3	rebates 29:4	record 120:9	104:3
real 16:18	recall 73:22	121:5	reform 6:11
30:19 34:8	107:25 108:17	recorded 120:6	57:21 61:10
44:12 67:20	109:16	recording	73:19,20 79:13
75:15 80:22	recalls 79:22	120:8 121:4	81:15 96:18
93:12 117:19	received 94:11	recourse 85:23	100:23 101:6
reality 97:1	113:10	red 24:18	reformed 40:25
realize 62:21	receiving 7:24	101:24 115:6	97:25
75:23 94:14	recent 41:12	redesigning	reforms 42:8
118:14	recently 29:23	15:20	61:23,23 103:5
	72:19 85:20		104:4

refusing 94:8	regular 107:22	remind 66:15	reported 1:17
regard 64:12	regulate 115:13	removal 100:25	reports 80:7
88:13	regulations	102:2,20,22,24	96:19 103:4
regardless 4:8	26:4,5	107:5,12 108:9	represent
39:24 90:16	relate 35:14,16	108:15 109:13	54:20 55:4
105:6	related 13:12	112:13	56:18 63:24
regime 36:25	14:1 36:21	remove 56:1	71:22 86:14
regions 21:11	61:9 120:11	59:24 102:4	99:5 105:8
register 50:8,16	121:7	103:7 114:23	representation
77:20 93:24	relating 77:16	removed 85:16	40:19 48:16
94:13 111:19	relationship	108:10	54:18,23 55:2
118:2	65:20 109:6	removes 58:15	56:24 62:4,11
registered 39:2	relative 46:1	59:21	62:13 71:8
39:22 40:16	120:13 121:10	removing 19:1	87:1 97:5
50:5,22 51:5	released 14:3	40:1	102:16
51:16 61:18	102:6 114:16	renewable	representative
71:1 73:3	relegated 83:1	28:22 29:14,16	41:5 42:22
74:15,22 77:2	relevant 64:21	36:4,4,8,11,17	45:23 62:16
78:12,24,25	reliable 29:22	37:2,9,13	103:25 105:9
81:22 82:13,25	reliance 28:24	renewables	106:12,19
89:11 104:7	reliant 7:23	30:6,18,25	representativ
105:2,25	relief 97:20	31:1	41:23
110:19,20	relieve 28:23	renewals 99:11	representatives
111:2 116:22	religiously	rental 29:20	45:25 113:16
117:12,24	117:15	renters 36:14	113:16
118:8	remain 39:1	repairs 113:22	represented
registering	74:10 98:9	repeat 60:23	32:10 62:15
71:18	remainder	repeatable	95:1 101:3
registers 64:7	65:16	21:11	representing
64:10	remained 97:10	replace 15:16	62:9 86:18
registration	remains 3:9	replicate 63:2	represents 14:8
40:10 72:23	85:17	report 13:14	106:17
95:6	remember	14:3 102:6	republican
	66:15 73:25	114:17	51:17 53:19

56:10 62:1	resilience 14:12	restaurants	reworking 10:4
89:1 90:14	14:14,15 17:11	61:6	rezoning 32:18
95:6 110:21,22	22:4,22 25:9	result 14:1	64:19
110:23	resiliency	41:20 82:22	rezonings
republicans	23:13 27:15	resulted 62:16	32:19
62:4 89:7	resilient 14:16	resulting 10:15	rhode 79:1
94:23,24	28:8	results 63:4	rich 3:4
110:20	resource 37:16	reusable 37:20	richard 1:4 2:3
request 75:25	95:3	revenue 9:13	100:11,12
requested 9:22	resources	reverend	104:20,22
requests 61:15	29:25 31:3	116:14,16	106:23
require 8:12	36:4,11 64:3	117:2 119:3	richardson
20:11 39:25	respect 53:8	review 1:1 3:16	2:10
46:11 50:24	108:25	5:22 10:21	richie 84:3 91:5
66:9 108:5,6	respectfully	24:14 25:4,5	93:14,16,17
required 19:18	39:12 40:18	60:25 81:17	ride 74:2
19:22 31:25	74:3 75:25	86:5 96:11	rides 20:10
102:18 111:5	respond 12:8	reviews 24:24	rideshare
requirements	16:4	revision 3:3 6:9	20:11
1 equil cilicitis			
16:20 24:24	respondees	10:21 15:10	right 10:23
_	respondees 51:5	10:21 15:10 27:8 30:23	right 10:23 11:12 16:1
16:20 24:24	_		
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5	51:5	27:8 30:23	11:12 16:1
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24	51:5 responding 69:3 response 97:23	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15 60:22 61:2	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16 24:2 26:7
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24 107:24 112:16	51:5 responding 69:3	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24 107:24 112:16 reregistration	51:5 responding 69:3 response 97:23	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15 60:22 61:2	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16 24:2 26:7
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24 107:24 112:16 reregistration 51:21	51:5 responding 69:3 response 97:23 98:1 99:17 responsibilities 86:24	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15 60:22 61:2 85:14 86:2,12	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16 24:2 26:7 31:13,15 32:15
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24 107:24 112:16 reregistration 51:21 research 52:14 52:18 54:2 80:5	51:5 responding 69:3 response 97:23 98:1 99:17 responsibilities 86:24 responsibility	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15 60:22 61:2 85:14 86:2,12 86:22 revisions 11:15 revived 3:13	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16 24:2 26:7 31:13,15 32:15 33:16 43:24 46:23,23 47:21 48:2,9,18,25
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24 107:24 112:16 reregistration 51:21 research 52:14 52:18 54:2 80:5 resident 57:17	51:5 responding 69:3 response 97:23 98:1 99:17 responsibilities 86:24 responsibility 3:16 58:9	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15 60:22 61:2 85:14 86:2,12 86:22 revisions 11:15 revived 3:13 revocable 10:1	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16 24:2 26:7 31:13,15 32:15 33:16 43:24 46:23,23 47:21 48:2,9,18,25 49:2,23 51:13
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24 107:24 112:16 reregistration 51:21 research 52:14 52:18 54:2 80:5 resident 57:17 72:9 81:13	51:5 responding 69:3 response 97:23 98:1 99:17 responsibilities 86:24 responsibility 3:16 58:9 86:16	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15 60:22 61:2 85:14 86:2,12 86:22 revisions 11:15 revived 3:13 revocable 10:1 10:5 11:5,12	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16 24:2 26:7 31:13,15 32:15 33:16 43:24 46:23,23 47:21 48:2,9,18,25 49:2,23 51:13 51:20 52:9
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24 107:24 112:16 reregistration 51:21 research 52:14 52:18 54:2 80:5 resident 57:17 72:9 81:13 97:8 104:23	51:5 responding 69:3 response 97:23 98:1 99:17 responsibilities 86:24 responsibility 3:16 58:9 86:16 rest 52:2 85:17	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15 60:22 61:2 85:14 86:2,12 86:22 revisions 11:15 revived 3:13 revocable 10:1 10:5 11:5,12 20:19 21:8	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16 24:2 26:7 31:13,15 32:15 33:16 43:24 46:23,23 47:21 48:2,9,18,25 49:2,23 51:13 51:20 52:9 53:24,25 54:4
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24 107:24 112:16 reregistration 51:21 research 52:14 52:18 54:2 80:5 resident 57:17 72:9 81:13 97:8 104:23 residents 14:7	51:5 responding 69:3 response 97:23 98:1 99:17 responsibilities 86:24 responsibility 3:16 58:9 86:16 rest 52:2 85:17 88:16	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15 60:22 61:2 85:14 86:2,12 86:22 revisions 11:15 revived 3:13 revocable 10:1 10:5 11:5,12 20:19 21:8 revoked 64:16	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16 24:2 26:7 31:13,15 32:15 33:16 43:24 46:23,23 47:21 48:2,9,18,25 49:2,23 51:13 51:20 52:9 53:24,25 54:4 54:7,9,15
16:20 24:24 requires 17:5 48:6 69:24 107:24 112:16 reregistration 51:21 research 52:14 52:18 54:2 80:5 resident 57:17 72:9 81:13 97:8 104:23	51:5 responding 69:3 response 97:23 98:1 99:17 responsibilities 86:24 responsibility 3:16 58:9 86:16 rest 52:2 85:17	27:8 30:23 31:24 38:15 46:15 57:15 60:22 61:2 85:14 86:2,12 86:22 revisions 11:15 revived 3:13 revocable 10:1 10:5 11:5,12 20:19 21:8	11:12 16:1 19:17 20:16 21:3 23:2,16 24:2 26:7 31:13,15 32:15 33:16 43:24 46:23,23 47:21 48:2,9,18,25 49:2,23 51:13 51:20 52:9 53:24,25 54:4

[right - secure] Page 41

64:17 67:3,22	37:17	sandy 23:19	scientists 13:4
68:1 69:1	rooftops 36:15	24:7	scooters 15:22
70:10 76:6	room 18:12	satisfied 22:17	scope 22:7
81:14 83:22	107:2	save 42:6	36:23
88:1 90:4	rothenberg	saved 14:14	scoping 25:4
92:11 93:14	100:4	savings 29:22	score 75:5
95:21 109:22	roughly 94:23	30:11,14,18	se 43:22 52:24
110:2,5 115:25	94:24	savino 2:14	sea 13:1,5,6
116:5 118:6,16	rounded	23:4 24:6	24:3
118:19	105:16	31:22 33:8,17	season 78:16
rightly 68:10	rule 32:17 61:2	34:21 46:6	82:7
rights 15:18	65:18,23	49:14,18 50:19	seat 54:24
71:15 79:12	rules 99:7	51:8,13,19	seats 54:25
95:10 96:5	run 5:15 8:25	52:5,8 55:7	58:19 59:3
riot 85:21	60:4,13 67:2	61:5 66:5	seaview 1:10
rise 13:5,6	68:19 75:5	67:22 76:15	second 12:19
rises 13:1	79:7 85:21	88:14 106:25	17:2 32:18,20
risk 14:9 29:3	117:9	107:4,18	38:21 44:20
36:9 95:16	running 44:14	108:25	79:18 83:1
108:12 109:18	59:3 60:1 63:2	saw 10:18	94:20 100:25
risks 14:8	67:4 68:5 77:2	50:20	104:15
17:20	82:19 117:17	saying 34:11	secondary
rival 81:3	rush 84:16	43:23 46:13	41:17
rivers 65:6	S	82:16	seconds 63:7
road 16:10	s 2:1,13 3:1	says 83:9 85:11	secretary 2:9
robust 10:13	sad 82:22	scalable 7:6	section 11:16
28:9	safe 10:25	scale 15:6 20:7	11:18 42:11
rockaways	safer 17:10	78:21 79:2	114:14
23:21	safety 49:1	scheduled 5:14	sector 31:5
role 23:9 40:14	samuels 2:6	32:22	57:25
44:18 112:19	sanders 2.0	schnall 57:12	sectors 99:19
roofs 29:21	61:11 69:17,18	57:14,16 66:25	secure 11:10
rooftop 35:15	01.11 07.17,10	school 9:15	74:18 75:14
35:18,19 37:14		62:20 119:12	

gggywitz, 11.0	106:1	gotting 7.5	shows 39:19
security 11:8 see 8:18 19:11	self 82:4 86:3	setting 7:5 28:14 108:15	51:4 52:14
27:3,4 34:6,7	94:5	seven 9:20	80:5 101:16
34:19 38:6,9	sell 17:19 20:5	several 74:7	shut 78:21
60:10 65:25	semi 50:13	84:5 108:13	80:19 81:24
68:18 69:3	51:11	109:14	92:5
75:18 78:15	senate 47:19	severe 102:5	shutting 80:20
82:9 90:21	senator 43:1	shaded 15:24	80:21 89:11
93:5 100:14	47:5	16:24	side 22:22
101:15 107:6	senior 78:8	shadows 64:25	sides 107:9
108:21 111:22	110:11	shams 2:8	sidewalk 8:25
seeing 97:19	sense 37:19	share 4:4 9:13	sidewalks
seek 10:24 57:1	44:7 47:22	24:8 41:12	15:12,19
74:18	52:1 56:12	59:5 85:8	siena 101:8
seeking 75:3	61:24 74:1	96:10,12,13	signature
86:2	89:21,25 112:1	97:1 98:11,13	120:16 121:14
seeks 5:4	sensible 73:23	98:22,25 99:8	signatures
seemingly	separate 56:16	99:18 116:19	113:7
78:17	separately 9:11	shared 15:14	signed 97:18
seems 65:3	serious 69:21	sharon 2:11	119:6
85:24 112:5	serve 3:4 35:23	shelters 114:21	significant
seen 33:25	40:2 81:19,21	114:22	13:23 56:17
43:16 46:25	served 33:23	shift 34:8 59:11	74:9 75:14
74:17 83:8	117:7	shifting 58:24	signup 5:7
91:23 97:14	service 21:3	shore 23:17	silence 79:24
seize 29:11	38:17 72:4	57:18 88:4	siloed 90:13
42:21	81:1 96:15	shoreline 16:13	similar 23:5
select 5:9 39:23	services 38:10	short 64:5	36:25
40:13 86:20,21	99:19	show 31:14	simple 8:21
104:17	session 6:10	80:11 90:23	simplified
selected 7:22	57:19 101:9	96:21	20:22 21:4
selecting 105:7	set 22:6 99:9	showed 101:12	simply 40:9
selection 17:7	sets 69:19	shown 52:20	42:3 44:8
17:14 25:25			63:14 81:22

[simply - start] Page 43

07.14		17 22 17	• 60 11
97:14	socializing	south 23:17	specifically
single 9:14 41:9	22:13	25:16 88:4	6:16 36:3,7
54:20,24 92:21	solar 17:4,9	97:13	45:13
site 17:7,14	19:25 27:2,9	southeast 97:14	specify 69:16
18:4 22:25	27:11,16,18,20	space 15:14,23	spectrum 3:23
25:25	28:8,11,16	16:3 30:3,17	48:24
sites 17:9	29:2,15,17,19	30:20 36:7	speed 16:19
sitting 23:15	29:21,22 30:2	37:17 88:10	20:23
59:7	30:3,6,8,8,9,11	spaces 35:22	spend 4:14
situation 61:21	35:24 36:13,13	spam 113:11	14:14
62:3 68:1,3	36:16 37:3,12	spare 8:13,16	spending 14:12
107:23 108:23	37:20	speak 3:21 24:8	spent 86:5
situations	solely 105:15	51:22 61:10	117:21
108:24	solid 97:7,8,9	84:9 86:8	split 58:14 61:7
six 38:24	97:11	101:5 107:2	spoiler 105:17
sixth 14:6	solidarity	117:5	spoke 43:8
size 42:7	48:22	speaker 26:11	76:16 111:21
skewed 45:25	solution 7:6 9:6	26:24 31:10	spoken 4:21
skills 120:10	solutions 27:19	35:1,11 38:12	spot 44:4 52:6
121:6	81:2 94:3	45:1 52:12	56:3 74:19
skyrocketing	solve 51:1	53:3 58:2	spur 10:5
29:25	son 68:6	68:22,25 92:19	sr 116:14
slightly 94:23	soon 112:10	speakers 84:7	stage 9:8
slivers 16:7	sorry 11:24	speaking 76:23	stakeholders
slots 8:18	12:18,19 21:7	83:7	17:17
slow 21:18	55:6,7 70:11	special 38:25	stand 56:8,10
small 8:21	76:21 84:13,14	41:5,18 47:10	82:18
16:20 19:18	84:22 91:2,6	47:12,20,24	standard 79:7
55:11	101:23	62:25 102:22	90:7,8
smaller 11:3,19	sort 19:1,4	specific 22:6	stands 6:17
20:22 21:5	26:15 53:20,20	26:14 85:9	43:20 93:5
smarter 73:12	77:8	87:5 99:3	start 16:8 43:2
social 11:22	sound 75:20	101:12 103:8	46:7 66:17
12:6 14:18		108:15,18	67:18 78:5

	I	I	
started 4:13	101:20 108:16	straight 47:13	structure 39:14
23:23 61:22	110:12	76:19 89:22	41:1 44:13
67:23 107:21	statewide 30:7	113:11	115:18
starting 34:18	30:9 67:19	strategic 10:7	structures
startup 6:13	101:10	streamed 6:1	35:14,15 54:3
state 28:12	stating 94:14	streamline	115:2
29:7,10 42:4	stations 8:22	30:23 36:2	struggles 48:10
42:12,15 47:18	19:9 97:13	streamlined	stuck 50:2
58:17 59:14	status 77:8	37:7	students
64:5,7 66:16	83:1,2	streamlining	117:10
78:24 79:16,22	statutorily	35:3	studies 41:25
93:3 99:16	65:19,25 66:7	street 7:8,16	79:9 80:11
101:7,22	statutory 35:5	9:25 16:21	stuyvesant
113:16 120:19	stay 5:16 12:19	18:5 19:20	117:8
stated 19:8	90:3	22:3 83:7	subgroup
113:11	step 20:6 72:22	street's 16:21	76:10
staten 1:9,11	95:22 102:10	streets 15:12,18	subject 16:18
5:9 23:17	106:17	16:6,12,13,14	22:5
24:17 57:16,18	steve 27:1,9	16:17,20,22	submission
57:19 58:3	stick 62:23	18:6 19:23	31:20
60:17 61:6	95:11	25:24 26:1	submit 5:17
73:21,24 74:2	stifling 86:13	strength 86:25	19:3 27:7 31:7
81:14 85:16,17	stopped 82:15	strengthen	64:20 66:1
85:22 86:1,3,7	storage 28:17	44:15 87:2	87:5 98:15
86:21 87:7,17	29:15 30:12	strictly 57:10	submitted 5:23
87:22 88:2,4,7	35:24	strides 29:1	31:12 60:24
88:8,9,16	storefront 9:17	strong 94:4	67:1
93:21 94:22	storm 14:24	strongly 59:18	submitting
97:7 98:3,7	28:3	118:19	27:10 118:21
119:9	storms 14:5	struck 32:16	suboptimal
states 6:23	24:2	112:18	22:10
78:23 79:4,5	stormwater	structural	subscribing
79:11,18 83:15	12:24 15:21	114:19	29:21
90:10 101:14			

	I	1	
substance	105:12 114:5	40:15 45:8,14	taken 120:3,12
69:24 70:10	116:19	48:1,16 49:7	121:9
substantially	supported 4:9	56:24 58:25	takes 25:21
97:25	47:14 101:9	72:18,21 74:5	42:13
substitute	supporting	74:12 75:24	talk 28:10 58:5
93:18	37:9,9	76:2 82:23	59:17 64:1
success 106:10	supportive	83:9 90:8	67:23 77:18
sucked 66:14	37:25 38:1	92:14 94:8	84:25 88:18
sufficient 22:15	supports 39:20	95:1 97:16	89:3,13,15
41:19 94:5	87:2	98:6 102:10	102:1 117:21
suggest 3:17	sure 19:17 21:4	103:24 104:3,6	talked 18:17
40:12 59:16	26:18 31:20	104:11 105:5	35:2 69:17
63:12 74:3	48:12 52:17	109:18 110:18	118:9
104:24	53:10,12 59:10	118:22	talking 4:14
suggesting	63:17 73:18	systematically	26:1 36:20
46:22	81:8,9 84:6,11	52:21	45:10 78:13
suggestions	85:7 87:25	systems 15:1,17	82:10 83:10
99:4,22	91:16	17:1 40:19	89:16,17 92:11
suitable 29:21	surgery 9:2	78:10 80:25	95:18 113:3
suited 56:15	surges 28:3	81:2 102:24	115:24 117:10
sum 81:2	surprising	109:16	117:21
summer 13:20	101:18	t	tall 19:11
sun 29:4	survey 101:11	tab 5:9	target 8:8
super 37:25	101:16	tag 8:8 18:15	targeted 26:15
102:13,18	surveys 101:15	tajiddin 63:21	115:22
108:3,14	sustainability	63:22,23	targets 7:5 9:7
supply 34:13	27:14	take 3:6,6	10:9
support 15:14	sustainable	18:25 23:23	tariffs 29:5,8
15:20 20:14	27:22	48:22 51:23	task 4:10 14:15
24:25 40:8	swap 58:19	55:18 63:1	tasked 86:13
48:18 51:22	sway 41:19	69:6,12 72:22	tax 71:6
53:18,19 54:16	sworn 120:5	115:7 116:1	taxation 71:7
75:11 101:10	system 10:13	113.7 110.1	taxes 73:4
101:13,17	15:25 35:19		

[taxis - think] Page 46

taxis 7:13	terribly 109:8	18:8 19:7	116:8,11,18,25
taxpayer 73:4	tesla 9:9	20:15,16,25	117:1,3,4
78:19 92:16	testified 60:21	23:4 26:18,23	118:24,25
95:2	testifiers 84:3	26:24,25 27:5	119:7,8,9,14
taxpayers	119:5	27:6 31:8	thanks 21:14
118:17	testify 4:3,16	34:22,23,25	72:4 90:19
teacher 93:19	4:25 5:4,6 27:5	38:3,6,9,11,16	96:1
teaching 93:18	38:16 57:1,13	42:23,25 43:4	theft 115:16,19
team 18:15	63:17 70:18	43:17 44:21,24	theme 61:9
tech 110:11	72:8 84:5 96:2	45:1,11 46:6	thermal 16:25
technical 24:23	103:19 104:22	52:3,4,10,11,17	thieves 109:3
27:13,16	testifying 5:3	53:3,13,25	thing 22:3 37:6
111:16	87:9 104:24	55:5,24 57:2,4	44:1 62:6 63:7
technically	120:5	57:6,18 60:15	69:5,14 102:1
46:10	testimony 5:17	63:20 66:3	109:12
technological	5:20,21,22,23	68:21,22 69:14	things 20:2,8
113:8	6:3 18:9 19:3,8	70:10,14,16,17	21:18,20 23:1
technologies	20:21 23:15	72:3,7 73:15	26:2,13,16
12:9	27:7,10 31:7	77:23 78:1,2,6	32:3,9 36:20
television 59:1	31:11 39:15	81:4,10,11	48:15 83:21
tell 45:4 117:18	43:5 45:4,16	83:24,25 85:14	90:6 112:5
117:25	49:15,15 52:2	87:6,9,13	113:4
temperatures	53:10 57:3,8	88:14 90:25	think 9:1 23:2
13:18	57:10 60:25	91:3 93:7,12	23:11 32:10,13
tends 60:4	67:1 69:24	93:12,13 95:24	32:15,18,23
tens 50:21	70:10,15 78:1	98:17,18 99:2	33:1,5,7 34:5,7
tenure 72:15	87:14 88:21	99:24 100:2,7	34:9,19 35:9
term 10:25	91:4 98:16	103:10,11,13	35:25 37:11,19
11:8,23 72:20	100:2 112:18	103:18 104:18	37:24 44:1,17
109:3	116:11 119:8	104:19,21	45:8 46:9,20
terms 25:8 34:8	thales 110:7,8	106:20,21	47:8,22 48:3
45:3 48:12	110:11	107:17 110:2,5	48:14 49:15
59:7 68:16	thank 6:8 12:1	111:11,15	51:21,23,24,25
117:22	12:10,11,13,20	112:22,23	53:4,7,11 54:9

[think - true] Page 47

55 10 14 00	10.04	4 1 10 10 14	. •1
55:13,14,20	threats 12:24	today 12:10,14	transcriber
56:5 61:11,18	28:5	38:21 39:15	121:1
63:4 67:14,15	three 5:1 34:17	85:19 94:20	transcript
67:17,20 68:7	43:20 57:9,10	102:2,5 103:6	121:3,5
68:16 70:4	70:14 76:6,15	103:19	transcriptionist
72:16,21,25	76:21 97:4	today's 4:11	120:7
73:9,11,12	101:12 115:3	28:6	transfer 97:13
77:17 86:18	throw 70:25	together 7:18	transit 10:13
87:19,22,25	112:11	31:14	49:1 88:1,3
88:13,14,22,23	ticket 66:14,24	told 117:22	98:8
89:14,21,25	tillard 116:14	tolerant 117:15	transition 7:6
90:17,21,22	117:2,3 119:3	tonight 47:9	transportation
92:4,6,13 93:6	tilled 116:16	58:6 73:10	97:16 98:6
97:24 99:8,20	time 11:25 12:3	81:15 98:4	99:14
108:3,13,22	12:22 23:8	100:21,22	travel 79:10
109:2,7,18,24	40:10 51:24	111:16,22	treat 61:7
112:3,13 114:3	57:5,9 58:12	tool 3:13 30:8	treated 104:14
114:25 115:1,4	59:18 60:10	tools 112:14	tree 113:3
115:15,16	65:17 70:22	top 46:8 66:14	trees 15:24
thinking 21:20	71:13,24 72:9	66:23 90:8	22:24
24:14 58:8	72:12,22 81:11	111:7	tremendous
thinks 115:18	84:6,9 87:8	topic 31:23	66:23 108:25
third 105:23	93:13 95:15	81:15	tremendously
thought 18:16	109:6 116:2,19	torch 114:24	32:11
21:22 26:5	117:21	total 78:24	trial 107:14
37:4 45:5,13	timeline 8:1	towards 117:12	tribeca 119:12
73:22 83:12	25:1,10 103:1	track 29:7,10	trip 87:8
107:22 118:4	103:9	trade 39:17	triple 89:5,6,15
thoughts 57:21	times 14:19	48:1,2 49:11	triumph 75:9
77:22	32:17 101:19	traditional	true 9:6 53:8
thousands	101:21 111:3	9:21 64:25	87:3 91:20
14:25 50:22	112:21	trail 94:22	97:25 99:17
threat 13:10	tiya 6:4,11	training 27:13	120:9 121:5
27:24			

truly 4:2 12:15	type 66:20	uncertain	unfairness
104:3	107:11	117:22	74:14
trump 54:11	types 13:1 17:3	unchanged	unfettered 67:4
trust 60:11	21:16 26:13	39:2	unfold 4:15
trusted 33:11	51:10 87:18,19	unchecked 86:9	unfortunate
truth 93:4	87:21 99:7	103:6	85:9
truths 79:14	typewriting	uncompetitive	unfortunately
try 46:7 84:8	120:7	79:19	86:12 112:4
108:8	typically 74:24	uncontested	unidentified
trying 17:8,10	u	79:20	26:11,24 31:10
53:6 66:15	ubers 7:12	under 8:3	35:1,11 45:1
115:4,7	ultimately	47:21 58:12	52:12 53:3
turn 11:9 60:8	49:11 105:16	69:8 75:9	68:22,25 92:19
89:14	ulurp 16:9,11	undermine	unified 74:21
turnout 39:12	16:18,23 17:6	86:2	uniform 86:5
41:2,16 46:2	17:9,14,23	undermining	union 100:20
52:21 58:21	18:4 19:18,21	85:10	102:5
59:15 105:9	20:6 21:20,21	underperform	unique 28:4
tv 67:9	21:23 22:5,10	80:4	88:15
twice 13:14	22:16,18,25	understand	unite 73:17
two 8:18 10:17	23:6,12,23	70:8 72:24	103:21 104:23
13:5,8,18	24:9,12,20,23	116:2	111:18
20:17,18 22:8	24:25 25:4,18	understanding	united 6:23
30:6 35:1 43:3	25:21 36:6	49:20 52:3	79:18 101:20
47:3,9 51:12	85:10 86:4,7	74:19 75:2	110:12
53:17,22 58:5	86:11,15 87:2	77:6,7	university 1:9
60:6,8 62:2	87:3,15,16	understood	unjust 71:2
76:21 79:4,14	unaffiliated	16:2 84:15	unknown 25:10
80:14,16 88:18	39:5 49:21	99:25 118:1	unnecessary
89:19 90:8	51:12 83:7	underused	86:9
91:8 100:22	unassigned	16:22	unwanted 86:9
101:9 102:10	19:7,16	unequal 97:10	update 31:19
104:10 107:24	17.1,10	unfairly 110:16	updating 28:5

10.10	111 615	1 4	50.00.51.1
upsides 48:12	vehicle 6:15	volunteer	59:20 71:1
urban 27:15	vehicles 6:18	73:17 103:20	72:23 77:15
urge 30:22	6:21 7:10	104:23	78:13,25 79:25
40:18 42:21	15:22 20:11	volunteering	80:6,10,11
urgent 10:8	vermont 78:25	38:10	83:7 88:24
use 10:13 15:12	versed 61:5	vote 32:22	90:11,12,12,15
18:1 86:5,15	version 51:11	40:15 45:21	91:14,22,23
90:8 109:3	51:14	50:7,25 51:6	93:23 94:2
used 9:12 13:20	versus 22:16	51:25 56:23	95:6 103:21
uses 18:2 95:2	vet 74:23	59:23,23 60:9	105:9,23 106:2
using 18:6	vice 2:11 78:8	62:1 67:19	106:18 111:4
usual 85:25	view 48:25 49:1	70:5 71:9,11	118:9,23
utility 7:25	68:9 85:20	72:2 73:5,7,14	voter's 48:3
8:12,23 9:22	viewpoints	76:1 77:15	voters 3:17,18
utilization 7:21	104:9	78:14 79:2	4:7 32:13 39:2
utilize 21:2	views 38:21	80:3,4 83:3,16	39:5,7,20,22
74:13 91:25	virginia 72:23	83:23 89:4,8	40:3,7,16
utilized 75:7	virtually 4:12	89:10,18,23	41:19 42:2,17
v	5:5,6	90:4,12,24	44:2,5,7 45:23
vacancy 47:19	visibility	91:18,23 92:9	46:4,16 48:5
vacation 78:17	116:21	92:16 93:25,25	48:14 49:12,21
valerie 2:12	vision 24:15	94:9,10 95:21	55:13,15,17
value 14:9	25:2	102:12,13,18	56:3,3,4,7,17
110:13	visit 5:19	102:19 105:18	56:20,20 58:25
values 4:8 56:4	vital 23:9	108:20 110:19	60:2,8,11 63:5
104:4,9 106:16	voice 86:11,13	110:20 111:19	67:11 70:4
110:16	86:23 111:6	112:2 118:16	71:14 72:13
van 88:25	voices 104:5	voted 55:13,15	73:12,13 74:4
variables 54:5	106:14 111:9	61:17 62:16	74:15,22 75:18
variations 49:9	void 30:3	voter 40:10	76:1 77:16
various 49.9	voluntarily	41:9,10 44:11	78:21,24 79:16
70:20	17:19	46:1,2 48:17	79:17 80:15,17
10.20	voluntary	50:5 51:12	80:18 81:22
	17:18	52:21 58:21	82:2 83:2,6,10

83:23 89:15	\mathbf{w}	wanting 11:7	98:13 99:12
90:10,21,23	waiting 65:9	35:2	we've 5:13
93:4 94:21,24	84:5	wants 33:14,14	11:20 24:23
94:25 95:22	waiving 10:5	80:4 111:4	31:14 33:25
96:12,25 101:6	wake 7:2	113:25	62:23,24 74:17
101:10,11,11	walk 82:8	war 113:15	78:13 93:3,3
101:25 102:11	walked 82:15	115:24	97:14 100:23
102:22 103:25	wall 24:3,8	warrant 69:22	weaken 86:4
104:14 105:2,6	want 3:12 4:13	washington	weakening
105:21,24,25	7:10 16:10	107:9	86:15
106:5,14	19:17,19 20:4	waste 97:7,8,9	weather 13:19
108:10,11,20	21:3 24:15	97:11,12,15	15:8
111:2,6,9	26:3 27:6	wasted 105:18	website 5:24
112:6,20 113:4	30:22 33:17,18	watching 8:9	websites 65:13
113:14 117:11	33:18,19 43:1	water 14:24	wednesday 1:5
118:19	44:11 47:11	waterfront	week 10:18
votes 75:10,14	50:7,8,16,16	16:5,12,16	weeks 82:7
75:17 110:17	51:6,23 61:10	17:11 18:6	weigh 74:5
voting 38:25	63:17 64:1	23:16 25:12,22	weinberg
47:25 48:2,4	65:16 67:24	25:24 26:3,6	100:10,11,13
48:12 58:9,15	69:15 73:3	82:9	100:16,18,19
58:25 60:3	76:10 77:3,6	way 7:1,5 14:25	103:12,13
71:3,15 72:20	77:13,17 84:2	15:18 21:1	106:23 107:3
74:8,13 75:7	84:11 89:23	23:18,21,21	107:17 109:11
75:15 76:3	100:3,22 102:1	37:14 41:9	weisbrod 2:5
80:13 85:1	103:5 104:3	45:16 57:22	91:7,11,18
91:12,24 92:1	110:5 112:11	58:13 66:18	92:2,11 93:8,9
92:4 106:11	115:21 116:19	69:7 72:25	98:21 99:20
111:24 112:9	116:24 119:7	77:19 79:7	119:4
118:11,12	wanted 58:5	102:11 108:21	weisbrod's
vulnerable	69:22 70:1,9	110:16 112:6	92:20
14:4 15:8	70:25 88:18	ways 5:17	welcome 3:2
	96:8,23 101:5	15:13,20 16:1	6:7 27:2 42:23
		25:20 46:1	44:20 57:16

(0.16.70.6	1 0 1	05.16	41 2 42 1 5 15
60:16 72:6	wonderful	worn 95:16	41:2 42:1,5,15
welcomes	100:18 119:14	worry 32:13	42:18,20 46:10
71:20	wondering	85:5	46:14 50:21
welcoming	23:22 36:24	worse 13:2	54:3 58:15,17
119:9	37:3	worst 61:23	58:18,24 66:8
went 22:24	wood 84:4 91:5	worthless	66:12,13 67:2
west 57:17	93:15 95:25	83:11	67:6,21 70:5
119:12	96:2 99:2,24	wrap 12:2	74:10 75:24
westchester	word 43:20	wreaking 85:21	76:1 77:9 82:6
50:21	82:17	writing 5:18	94:11 96:11
whichever	words 65:14	66:2	101:2 110:12
89:23	work 9:25	written 5:20	113:10 114:13
white 2:12	10:11 11:21	11:19 19:3	years 3:11 12:8
13:15	16:15,21 17:8	29:6 31:7	14:21 23:19
wide 54:19	18:19,25 20:24	39:15 45:4,15	24:3,6,18
106:5	30:24 31:21	60:24 66:25	33:22,25 34:8
willing 52:1	57:20 58:11,22	98:16	34:17,18,18
82:3	66:18 76:8	wrong 46:24	38:24 39:18
win 9:9 53:7	81:19 107:23	108:10	40:24 41:3,8
68:8 110:22	109:1,9	wrongly 68:10	41:11 42:7,11
wind 27:2	worked 18:17	wylde 2:13	46:18,25 47:6
wing 62:7	31:14,16 57:23	y	55:16 57:25
winning 105:12	57:24 70:19	yankee 75:4	58:21,23 59:10
wish 5:6	72:14 98:22	yard 6:14	59:11 62:11,25
wishes 4:3 86:4	worker 70:19	yeah 19:21	65:18 66:16
116:23	working 17:16	21:23 24:12	72:13 74:8
withdrawn	65:23 79:11	33:8 66:25	75:22 78:12
64:17	97:4 118:20	67:25 69:7	81:13 86:6
withstand 24:1	works 18:24	91:13 92:25	88:6,10,11,11
witness 74:11	36:13 62:23	year 9:10,20	93:17 94:7
120:4	69:7,13 102:12	10:15,18 13:7	97:9 100:24
witnesses	110:15	13:12,17 14:2	101:7
102:16	world 83:14	14:6 20:10	yields 41:16
	114:3	14.0 20.10	

[yimby - zero] Page 52

	114.15 1166	
yimby 34:10	114:15 116:6	
york 3:5,9,11	117:6 118:21	
6:9,13 7:8,17	119:12 120:19	
7:17,20 8:6,10	york's 30:17	
8:15 9:24	yorker 71:24	
10:12,18,20	73:6 78:11	
12:23 13:3,11	81:12 83:18	
13:12,15 14:2	103:20	
14:5,11,15,17	yorkers 3:15,23	
14:21 15:13	7:11 13:14,15	
23:10 28:11,13	13:22 15:14	
28:22 29:4,15	17:18 28:20	
30:4,9,16 32:2	30:12 41:13	
36:2 37:17	54:8 61:16	
40:23 41:1	62:1 72:1 73:2	
42:12 47:11	78:15 81:20,21	
49:22 56:8	83:19 94:14	
57:23 58:1,13	95:14 96:13	
58:16,22 60:18	103:22 104:4,5	
61:13 62:12,24	114:25 115:10	
64:5 65:5 71:2	115:14	
71:13 72:9,10	young 71:17	
72:19 73:18,18	73:25 77:20	
76:18 79:2	117:10	
80:1,19 83:11	younger 112:20	
83:23 88:6	Z	
89:22 94:20	z 80:18	
95:8 96:3 97:1	75. 10	
101:11 103:1	zan 52:18 zero 8:2 81:2	
103:21 104:23		
104:24 106:10	98:10	
109:12 110:15		
110:21 111:19		
112:1 113:24		