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MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you, everybody, for being here.

I want to introduce my colleagues, Paul Quintero, Jill Bright, the two other Commissioners, Jeffrey Friedlander, our counsel, Kyle Alagood, and Laura, over there, who's our communications and Website person.

So, welcome to Queens. And we're here, as we were yesterday in Brooklyn, to make a point that we wanted to be in a location where more, most of the citizens of New York are. And so often, hearings are held only in Manhattan; so, we decided to hold these in Brooklyn and Queens. I wish we could have also held one in the Bronx, which would have been helpful to people who live there, and in Staten Island and in Manhattan, but we only had time for two, and I don't think we would have filled the room with witnesses if we had five. So, here we are.

So, a couple of other opening points.
This commission is trying to be open and transparent as no other commission has been, no other Quadrennial Commission has been, and we've got a Website, and trying to put on the Website, or putting on the Website, all our research and
all the communications we get. I think not doing that is a disservice; and, for example, in the recent commission they got letters from, for example, the speaker of the City Council, asking for a specific raise, and giving the reasons for it. And the public, even though it was three months or four months before their report came out, the public never saw that until the report came out.

Openness is better for the public and it's better for us, because if we can get feedback from members of the public and witnesses and others.

So, we don't have a large number of people here; it's a pity that we don't have more. And maybe we can think, at the end of our commission, work on whether there are ways that can be addressed or improved.

The witnesses should understand that when we ask you questions or make comments, they don't necessarily indicate our actual views. What we're trying to do, and this is something the Supreme Court judges say, all U.S. Supreme Court judges say all the time, we're trying to tease out information. So, don't make assumptions based on what we ask you. And we will, Susan, and I know you won't mind this -- in fact, it's more fun for you -- we will interrupt you from time to time to stimulate the discussion.

So, Susan Lerner is the head of Common Cause New York, which is part of the wonderful organization that John Gardner founded in Washington, and the New York branch is headed by Susan Lerner, who we're now introducing as our first witness.

MS. LERNER: Thank you.
And first I just want to thank the Commission and complement you for your not only stated, um, devotion to transparency, but actually following through. And sometimes all too frequently, unfortunately, we've seen a bit of the disparity between what people in official positions say and what they're actually able to carry through with. So, you know, kudos and gratitude for that, for allowing the public to see what you're contemplating, what positions various groups and individuals have taken, what your research reveals, so that there's a better understanding on the part of the public for what is, after all, a controversial subject. It
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shouldn't be a controversial subject, but politically in today's climate, as I'm sure you're all too aware, it is a sensitive subject; and, therefore, the transparency is very much appreciated, as well as the fact that you're willing to go outside of the typical Manhattan venue places.

And I'm sorry, also, that there aren't more people. I think in the future we can be of more assistance in letting the public know that these sorts of hearings are being conducted and that they're invited to participate.

I don't have a written prepared comment for a number of different reasons. This is a very busy time, and I also understood that this was more of an informal hearing. So, you know, after our discussions, sometime within the next week or so, we will prepare a more formal written presentation. But I basically wanted to share some of our positions, and some of our concerns with you.

Generally speaking, as good government advocates we believe that it's important that management at the government level is well-compensated, but we also understand the
tension at the time when there is a very unfortunate negative, um, meaning that taxpayer money is not being well spent.

MR. SCHWARZ: Could I ask you a question? That sort of echoes what, that sort of echoes, that sort of echoes one of your very first statements that it shouldn't be a controversial subject, but it is. And then you made a similar comment just now.

Explain a little more why you think you wished it weren't a controversial subject, or why it shouldn't be a controversial subject.

MS. LERNER: In the past several decades there's been a concerted anti-government propaganda push, is how $I$ would put it, and a so-called taxpayer revolt that the taxpayers are paying too much, the government employees are overpaid, that they are lazy bureaucrats, um, and that somehow the public is not getting the value of the money it pays them in taxes.

As a good government advocate, and as an observer and student of government, I feel that that is a very unfair knock, and perpetuates a negative stereotype of government that does not help us make intelligent public policy decisions
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and spend public money well. Because the truth of the matter is there is no free lunch. You do get what you pay for. And there's no question that any enterprise, government in particular, representing so many different people, has to be efficient and get good value for the dollar.

Yet at the same time, when the budgets are cut to the very bone, choices are made and polarities set up which are unfair and which do not really address the full needs of the population.

We are all part of the government. We all need a say, as this Commission is giving the public, at least the opportunity to be heard on how they feel on compensation issues. But too often it is political concerns which drive the consideration, not an objective determination of the balancing of different factors, which is the desire not to have endlessly escalating public budgets without any top in sight. And yet the need to hire, and to retain competent people who feel that their work is valued, not only in thanks from the public, but in the ability to support their families in an adequate way, if not as well as if they had
stayed in the public, in the private sphere, at least well enough for them to feel that they can maintain their status as public servants and not short their families. It's something which comes up all the time when we talk to people in the judiciary. It's something we hear right now up in Albany with the legislature, that the particularly the New York City, um, legislators find the lack of any pay increase to be a personal hardship to them and their families in terms of their finances. So, there's always a dynamic tension.

I'm also very mindful of the fact that right now we seem, as a society, when we look at the issue of inequality, to be encouraging a situation where there is a tremendous gap between the executive compensation and the compensation of everybody else. And some of the raises that have been bandied about, you know, as being requested, either actually by the DAs or reported in the press, I do have some concerns that they exacerbate a, too great of a disparity between the leaders of a particular department or entity and the people who are the workers within it to, you know, use that terminology.
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MR. SCHWARZ: I'm sure, Susan, I'm sure Susan is going to get to more specifics, but I wonder if Paul or Jill, on the, in a way, statement on a lot of the philosophy and the principles that Susan has given us, if you guys would like to pursue further questions with her on that?

MR. QUINTERO: I just wanted to pick up on -- I don't know if you can hear me or not -- but you talked about, I'll call it multiples of some benchmark. We hear about that in the private sector, and we spend a lot of time trying to benchmark against everything we can, because we know what we're paying, what we don't know is what should we be paying.

MS. LERNER: Right. It's a challenge.
MR. QUINTERO: And so, could you share your thoughts on what -- if that's even a concept, but multiples of what, to whom, what's appropriate, what's not.

MS. LERNER: I don't have a rubric in terms of the multiples; like, for instance, people have talked about the fact that in a more, a time of what some people call inclusive capitalism, that there was much less of a disparity between the
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highest paid executives and the average worker, employee of a corporation, and that it was -- it was something on the order of, you know, a magnitude of 30 times higher, and now it is thousands of times higher.

And in discussing my potential testimony, looking at some of the figures and some of the requests and things that have been reported as possible requests, $I$ was struck by the fact that the staff of City Council members are famously very lowly paid. And yet, when you're talking about a substantial raise on the part of the Council Members, which may very well be, you know, well-deserved and well in line with a cost of living increase, certainly, it seems to me to be quite reasonable, especially for somebody who hasn't had one in a number of years.

Bur when we look at, for instance, the question of stipends or what are called LULUs for committee chairs, it seems to me that that money could be better spent staffing a committee that has a lot of administrative responsibilities, more effectively with a higher paid, more skilled staff than by giving the chair of the committee more money for his or her personal income.

And so, there's a question of allocation of taxpayer resources that go into, you know, our concerns, which I know is somewhat outside of the Commission's charge, because you, of course, are limited in talking about what the elected officials should be earning. But I think a statement on the part of the Commission that there should be, you know, some sense of if the elected officials are going to have cost of living increases, and expect regular salary increases, which I, personally, believe all workers, all employees in a capitalist system should aspire to, and should be able to gain, then, hopefully, the Council is willing to deal with the fact that the people whom it relies on for the day-to-day work and research and legal advice also should be looking at a raise.

So, it's a difficult situation politically where we know, for instance, that the uniform workers of the city have been granted very limited raises by the arbitration. On the other hand, they have had a more regular series of raises over time. And ideally what we aspire to is that the basic idea behind a Quadrennial Commission is that it would meet every four
years, that it would, as a matter of course, be looking at the cost of living increases necessary and determine whether there was a basis for a slight uptick in base salary beyond the cost of living.

But when you parse it out, I do agree with the editorial in The Daily News yesterday that smaller regular increments are actually, I think, easier politically, are more predictable for the people who are in office, and is the kind of, um, general government modeling of how all employees should be treated that we believe is a positive factor, rather than saying this is too politically charged, we're not going to touch it, we're going to go for nine years, or ten years, or 15 years before we have the courage to take on the issue of compensation; rather to say that work is valued, public service is valued, public service will not be compensated at the same levels as private service, because there are different objectives, but that it has to allow people who want to be public servants and not, um, people who are going to go right back into the private sector to be able to be compensated. So --
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MR. SCHWARZ: Susan, I want to take you back a little bit, where you used the words "cost of living." And there are at least two ways of looking at changes in cost of living.

One is the Consumer Price Index. And the other is changes in median household income. Between those two, if you were to pick either one of those two, which would you pick, or what do you see as the pluses and minus of those two different --

MS. LERNER: I believe that the CPI is a more objective standard, in the sense that it is widely highly reported. Median income, it seems to me, is subject to a number of different factors that are harder in some ways to quantify and perhaps more political. And so, we find that the CPI is a more objective standard. And that's the one that we looked at when we looked at possible increases, comparing, you know, where salaries started in 1983, where they are currently, and seeing what the current amounts are in relation to if you simply track the CPI from 1983 to today, where would the salaries end up. So, we're very comfortable with the CPI. I'm not sure that I'm quite as comfortable with the median income.

MR. SCHWARZ: I wonder if the median income, though, doesn't have -- I assume that it has some flaws, but $I$ wonder if it doesn't have a closer correlation to what public officials actually do. I mean, they -- inflation, which is the CPI, I mean, the Federal Reserve can influence that, but I don't think even the most powerful Mayor in the world can influence CPI.

But median income, $I$ don't know if it's flawed or not, but even if it is, does, isn't it more closely correlated to what they're aspiring to do, public officials?

MS. LERNER: So --
MR. SCHWARZ: Think about that for a moment.
MS. LERNER: I am. Let me -- I'm -- as I want to do, thinking a bit out loud. So, it's -I mean, I see where you are in that regard, in the sense that if the City's policies are depressing the median income of -- you know, median income period, then tying increases to that measure would be rewarding, or would be an incentive for elected officials to be more proactive in trying to raise the median income, and I guess, I think the median income has so
many moving parts that $I$ don't know that that, in and of itself, tying the compensation to the median income would be more of an incentive than, um, you know, the current situation where elected officials do need to be concerned about the economic health and well-being of their constituencies.

And for City Council, it's the median income of where? Is it going to be the median income of their district, in which case you're going to have a lot of disparities citywide --

MR. SCHWARZ: CPI varies by borough, too, you know. So, it's, that same problem exists. MS. LERNER: So, it's got to be citywide. I'm just not sure it would work as an incentive. I think the economic well-being of the City is a pretty strong incentive.

And you can raise the median income by helping the top, um, so that you pull the average up. And that, in and of itself, is the incentive certainly we would like to see at common cause. MR. QUINTERO: Well, there are two things. You mentioned average, and we're seeing median. Median would not be influenced by size. So, I think that was helpful. But you mentioned two
things earlier that I just want to go back to.
If there's supposed to be some --
MS. LERNER: The midpoint is going to shift if you shift your range to a higher point.

MR. QUINTERO: Only if you have more people in the higher range. But the median is just going to be the middle person. So, if you have 100 people, the 50th person is what the median will measure. If you have 200 people, then the 100th of that 200 would be the median.

So, if you increased the number of people in the city, yes, that could shift; but if you have the same people, then the average is what you would avoid median.

MS. LERNER: Okay. All right.
MR. QUINTERO: But separate from that, you mentioned two things that I'd like to come back to that are issues that you touched on. One was, some sense of multiple. If we don't look at median income, how are we to attribute a reasonable multiple of what the average Joe Public, Jane Public earns to their elected official, point one.

Point number 2, most people are not realizing salary changes in real terms. And so,
by, um, by providing an inflation-protected rate, and going back to the inequality you mentioned earlier, doesn't that exacerbate this sense that, wow, I don't get a real protection in salary but someone else does. So, I'd like you to comment on that, just because of the comment you made earlier.

MS. LERNER: Well, I am not advocating that -- I don't think that the equation is between what elected officials make and what a median income, or average New Yorker makes. I do think there has to be more of an equivalence in terms of equivalent jobs in the private sector. So, I do think that the relativity is not to, um, you know, a rank and file sanitation worker and to a teacher, but more towards somebody that has more policy and management responsibility in the private sector.

And I think, but what I'm also talking about is, assuming that the public sector sort of exists in its own sphere, with some relation, but not a direct proportional relation to what happens in the private world, I'm talking about the proportionality within the public sphere. So, I'm talking about the, um, income, the
compensation for members of the City Council, and the City Council staff on a daily basis, and trying to see if what ultimately is recommended is a sizable increase in salary for the City Council.

Our calculations, if one were simply to adjust for the CPI, then the salary would be growing up to about 135, \$140,000, from its current 112.5.

Is the Council cognizant of the fact that its workers, its employees, the people, its aides and the people that they, the Council members rely on are probably not going to be looking at that kind of a jump. And, you know, separate and apart from how does the public feel about what these people are being paid, there's also a question of fairness within government. And I don't frankly hear that being discussed very much.

I hear Council members who say oh, it's really too bad, that my staff doesn't get paid very much. I say to myself, well, whose fault is that? It's not the staff. You know? That's up to the councilman.

I think it is interesting, you mentioned
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the, a letter from the speaker in the last Commission. Certainly the wait and see attitude of the current Council is not exactly a profile in, um, transparency or courage. Understanding that, as I said, this is a hot potato political issue. But, you know, our Charter, thank you, Mr. Schwarz, does have appropriate protections to keep the Council from voting its own raises.

So, you know, this is an area where one of the things that we are concerned about at Common Cause is the great negativity and fear of talking about any cost that is attached to government. Oh, anti-tax, it's taking money from the taxpayers. I'm back to where I started, which is you, you don't get something for nothing. And you have to have, be able to have a rational discussion, you know, as you say, and as you are considering about what is fair, what are the factors that should be balanced. And I do feel that here in the city we have started with an interesting model, in terms of where we pay salaries for our elected officials in relation to each other, you know, going back to 1983. And in terms of their relations to each other, it seems to make sense, in terms of the responsibilities
of the different offices.
And keeping pace with the cost of living is something that we think all segments of our society should be looking to do for the people that they employ. And we don't feel that the public sector should be exempted in this instance, if we think the public sector should be an example, as it has been in some other areas in providing benefits or providing stability of employment.

And I think the error is in the private sector, where people are not realizing the gains that their productivity has created.

MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you. I know you've got a good deal more to say, but what's been talked about so far.

MS. BRIGHT: I don't know if you were going to say a little bit about stipends and LULUs, and how that should be treated.

MS. LERNER: We believe that they should be abolished, straight up. They have been so roundly abused in the past. They have been used as a substitute for regular raises, and they are under the control of only one person, without any transparency, without any objective
determination. So, we think that they've been abused politically, and we think that they've led to an unnecessary proliferation of committees and subcommittees that are not meaningful necessarily; and, therefore, contribute to an inefficiency in the council, which is, to be blunt, a political dodge. So, instead of being willing to say we think we ought to be paid X straight up, here is something we can do without really having to reveal to the public that we've given ourselves a raise at the discretion of the speaker, and we don't have to vote on it.

It just happens to us. We can negotiate it behind closed doors. And I think it is one of the worst aspects of government. It is something which is very much peculiar to New York, both in New York City and New York State. And it's something we wish to see abolished at both levels, because it's basically dishonest, and not honest.

MR. SCHWARZ: Then you don't have any trouble with us tying whatever recommendations we make, and we haven't made any decisions on any subject, including the one of LULUs, but if we did make one, you have no problem, in fact, I
guess you would advocate our tying our pay raises to the Council to that change being made.

MS. LERNER: We would advocate for that. And if that were the report, we would certainly be applauding that portion of the report, in the sense that we feel that, um, people, elected officials should be paid a fair rate, and that the public should know what they are paid, and there should not be these fidgets to add a bit here and a bit there, making problems with stipends being used in Albany.

Yes, paid. The public knows what you're being paid. You know when you run for office what you are going to be paid, and there should not be surreptitious ways to sweeten the pot.

MR. SCHWARZ: You mentioned one point a few minutes ago, smaller regular increases. And we've heard other people suggest that maybe instead of any system of pay raises like this commission, or a regular analysis, there should be, every year, like a cost of living increase. I have two problems with it. And again, we haven't decided, but I'd like to get your reaction to those two.

One is that ordinary citizens don't get such
a guaranteed future benefit. And the second is, if that is done, where is democratic accountability for just the point you made about the LULUs, where is the democratic accountability for the action?

MS. LERNER: No. I am very much in favor of the commission system. I would not be in favor of an automatic preset number.

First of all, we have fat years and we have lean years when we discuss the city budget. Sometimes it is within the control of our elected officials to help that situation; and in other cases there are factors outside of New York City which may cause a shortfall. And I think that there needs to be a more global assessment of is this the right time for an increase; is it a time where we look at a very narrow CPI increase; is it a time when we say, this is a lean period for the entire city, it's not the time to even talk about a CPI increase. I think that that should be a determination made on a regular basis, in a transparent, objective fashion the way this commission is addressing it, rather than just having it happen automatically and then realize, oh my gosh, we just gave these people a 2 percent
raise, and this is actually not the time when the police, the firefighters, the teachers are all taking pay cuts, the City Council shouldn't get an automatic raise.

Unfortunately, there may be times in the future where we could reluctantly see that that might happen with that kind of a system. So, that would make me uncomfortable. I don't see one size fits all.

MR. QUINTERO: Just two small things to follow up on. You mentioned earlier about the pay within the department. And while we don't have all the particulars, it's our sense that some of the senior staff members of many of the elected earn more than the elected, not the opposite. So, that's one thing I want you to comment on.

The second thing is, you haven't mentioned, and I'd like to get your sense on the total compensation, which would include benefits and retirements and things that, um, are also a form of compensation. You mentioned law enforcement officers, and the like; so, if you could touch on both of those, your perspective on that.

MS. LERNER: Yes. I mean, what we see is very highly paid staff members tend to be the political appointees.

And what I'm talking about are, you know, more of the rank and file, the district staff members, the people who are counsel to committees and who see their salaries brought up, and some of the, you know, top ranking council positions, adviser positions, certainly not fall into that, let's elevate them for the pool.

And then, as to benefit packages, I don't think Common Cause has a position necessarily, but I have a very strong personal position, which in a situation where we do expect those involved in public service not to be compensated at the same level, as a similarly responsible position in the private sector, $I$ think that part of the compensation is not only the benefit packages and also pensions.

I, personally, have very little problem with a defined pension program. I think there's something very unseemly with somebody who has devoted a substantial part of their working life to public service, and then finding themselves suddenly in poverty. And I think that the problems which the public pension systems have
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been facing of late have to do with the fact that, um, creative accounting allowed different levels of government not to make the regular, um, the regular distributions into pension funds that would have kept them well-funded.

So, I personally believe that the benefit package, again, is something that government modeled well for the rest of society, at a time when all of these things are at risk, reminding the general public that there is another way to do this; that you can have some job security, that you can have benefits and a reasonable pension going forward, is, I think, a positive factor.

MR. SCHWARZ: So, Susan, please, you've got more points, make them, and --

MS. LERNER: So, basically, you know, we thought that no more than a 25 to 30 percent raise for the Council, given the fact that there hasn't been a raise in such a long time, would be a figure that we would be comfortable with. It's pretty close to the CPI, as we calculate it. We do feel that LULUs absolutely should be abolished, and we hope that the Commission will in its recommendations we know that you cannot
enforce that. But the Council really needs to be pushed in that regard. We were somewhat startled by the District Attorney's request for a very large jump in salary. I understand the inflation within the legal community, but I would be curious: This is an area where I would be curious of what the disparity is between the D.A. and not the rank tops of the divisions, but the everyday trial attorneys there, and whether that is creating more of a hardship on the disparity for, you know, your everyday ADA, as compared to what the D.A. is earning.

We're comfortable with, um, you know, the Comptroller receiving a bit more than the public advocate. We think there are really substantial duties that the comptroller has which are unique, and which require a solid skill set, and I think it should be recognized.

And, you know, we are cognizant that as far as borough presidents are concerned, it was interesting to me to see when we calculated the CPI, you know, if you start with a system in 1983 would seem to have a good proportionality between the different offices, we noted that both, that the borough president and the citywide officers
are actually compensated at a level lower than the CPI, if the salaries had kept pace with the CPI. And we thought there was more of a disparity with the borough presidents than there were with the comptroller and the public advocate. So, it seems that a bit of a bump up there might be needed.

MR. SCHWARZ: And by "there," you meant where?

MS. LERNER: Borough President. The comptroller and the public advocate, a small increase, perhaps increase the borough president a little bit more.

MR. SCHWARZ: Interestingly, we looked at one statistic, which was -- and this might be interesting to our next witness, too.

We looked at one, and at least starting in '83 and going to date, if you compare the increase in pay for the Mayor and the increase in pay for the borough presidents, they're almost identical. The Mayor is 103 percent, and the borough presidents are, like, are 100 percent. And I thought that was an interesting way of looking at the figures.

MS. LERNER: Um-hum. And our computations
are slightly different. We have the borough president at 100 percent, and the Mayor at 104.5 percent.

MR. SCHWARZ: I'm sure you're a better mathematician than I am.

MS. LERNER: The public advocate, interestingly enough, had an increase of only 83 and a third percent. City Council members, on the other hand, did pretty well. They had the highest increase of just under 137 percent.

MR. SCHWARZ: And do you agree, as a generality, among all the relevant factors are whether any office has new responsibilities over the relevant period of time?

MS. LERNER: I think, new responsibilities. And, also, I think, with the Comptroller, one of the things that does impress me is the size of the city budget and the amount of oversight that's necessary. So, in terms of oversight over the pension funds, but also the complexity of contracts, the great sophistication and complexity of procurement for our city requires somebody with, um, very significant management skills. I'm not suggesting that the Comptroller, him or herself, has to be the world's best
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financial analyst or accountant, but they have to be a very capable manager, capable of identifying and hiring a highly skilled financial staff and keeping them focused on the most important aspects of the oversight.

So, I think that it requires a very strong manager in that position, and I think there are pressures in that particular citywide position which are unique.
(Time noted: 6 p.m.)
MR. SCHWARZ: But on the public advocate, you remember that in the late '90s the then Mayor cut the budget of the public advocate dramatically, the consequence of which was the public advocate is able to do fewer things.

So, are those two facts irrelevant, or are those two facts in some way separately considered?

MS. LERNER: No. Well, the entire question of the role of the public advocate, what should it be, how is it defined, I think, still remains a very open one in our city, of which there are multiplicity of ideas and positions that run the gamut from why do we need this, to this is an important position that should be strengthened,
and everything in between.
So, on the grounds that actually the budget was cut, now somewhat increased, the fact that there was less of a raise, right, we're not at 100 percent of a raise for the public advocate from 1983 to now, we're at under 85 percent, would seem to factor that in.

MR. SCHWARZ: So, Jill, do you have any other questions?

MS. BRIGHT: No.
MR. SCHWARZ: So, thank you.
MS. LERNER: I think I've, you know, pretty much covered, you know, the things that we have been looking at and, um, I think that, as I said, exhortation to future administrations to regularly appoint a commission, you know, lauding your actual transparency, and we've very strongly suggesting that you tie any salary increases for City Council to the abolishment of LULUs, and let's set a solid base salary, and let's have that be what people are paid.

MR. SCHWARZ: Okay. Well, thank you very much, Susan.

MS. LERNER: Thank you.
MR. SCHWARZ: I will introduce our next
witness, who $I$ just want to tell the other people who are here, she had specifically requested the time that she came; and then, so, we're going to do her, and then turn to the other people who are here.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: I'm sorry. I'm a little late.

MR. SCHWARZ: Gale, just let me say two things to you.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: I'm a little late. I apologize.

MR. SCHWARZ: Don't apologize. We're grateful that you're here. I'm not going to make all my opening remarks; they aren't necessary. But welcoming to Queens, and stressing the openness and transparency that we've had and telling you that we want to have a dialogue with you, and you heard, we interrupted the former witness, and I hope not impolitely, but we did interrupt her, and I think it makes for a more useful conversation, and you shouldn't, nor should the public read anything into how we phrase a question, because we're still thinking about how we should come out on all the issues.

So, Gale Brewer is currently the Borough
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President of Manhattan. She is a useful witness to us, because she has also been a City Council person, and I know her, also, first as an incredibly powerful advocate at the time of the 1989 Charter Commission, where she was one of the people who, one of the three or four people who most affected what we ultimately did.

So, thank you for coming.
BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You're the one who gives all the accolades for those years, you and Eric Lane and Gene Russianoff and many others. So, it's an honor to be here. I'm Gale Brewer. I'm currently the Manhattan Borough President, but prior to this role, I served 12 years in the City Council, four as chair of the Committee on Governmental Operations, and I also worked, as the Chair knows, for Council Member Ruth Messinger for many years. This independent Quadrennial Advisory Commission is required, as you know, by the City Charter to be called every four years to review the compensation of elected officials in our city. There has not been a commission called since 2006, making this the longest period
without a review of salaries.
Unfortunately, following this Charter requirement has been the exception rather than the rule, and in the last 15 years, it's only the second salary commission. This is bad for everyone, as I think Susan Lerner indicated. I understand that it was politically difficult to call a salary commission in the wake of the September 11th attacks, or in the midst of a great recession. The continuous failure on the part of mayors that follow the law is more likely to result in distortion when the commission is fully impaneled, and I believe it makes your job more difficult.

Section 3-601 of the Charter mandates the Commission to consider at least the following factors:

The duties and responsibilities of each position, current salaries, the length of time since the last change, any change in the cost of living, salary compensation for other city officers and employees, and trends for similar positions in government and the private sector. Nationally, since 2007, the cost of living has increased approximately 15 percent.

According to a recent trainings report, New York City wages have risen approximately 10 percent between the middle of 2009 and mid-2014, with the first substantial increases occurring since the beginning of 2014.

During the same period in 2011, when the last Commission was supposed to be impaneled by then Mayor Bloomberg, hundreds of thousands of city workers were working without contracts, and I think we know that. The inflation rate for 2010 was 1.6 percent, and for the prior year was negative 0.4 percent, and there was concern over deflation. Real wages were declining and unemployment was at or near 10 percent. So, it is unclear what, if any, raises a pay raise commission would have recommended. I believe it is fair to say they would not have been large.

Further support for a 15 percent increase over the nine-year period is found in the managerial pay raises given over this time period. That's the management of the City of New York.

From what we could find in a New York Times report, it shows in 2009, Mayor Bloomberg gave a 4 percent managerial pay increase retroactive to

2008 and a 4 percent increase for 2009.
Then, recently, Mayor DeBlasio gave city managers a total of a 7 percent increase from 2011 to 2015, for a total of 15 percent.

A look at the five largest cities in the United States appears to indicate that modest raises should be recommended. The mayors of Los Angeles and Houston both earn more than New York City's Mayor, and New York City has the lowest City Council salaries of all five cities except Houston. I know in L.A. it's a more powerful council than in New York City. The Mayor doesn't have the same level of power, so it is slightly different, and the counties sometimes play a bigger role.

Elected officials salaries for those cities are listed below, and I think you can get them, but New York is 225,000, L.A. is 246,000, approximately, Chicago is 216, Philadelphia is 218, approximately, and Houston is around 234,000. And I have the Council here, also.

So, given the criteria established by the Charter, it would appear that modest increases of about 15 percent are in order for all offices for the period covering the last nine years.

Given a 15 percent increase, Council members would make 129,375; and the Mayor would earn 258,750.

And the Council in other areas, we know that in New York now it's 112,500; L.A. is 189,000, approximately; Chicago is 117; Philadelphia is 129; and Houston is 62,000, approximately.

I also do not believe these salary increases should take effect immediately upon passage of legislation. The 2006 Commission stated that limiting the ability of government officials to raise their own salaries and receive them immediately would improve the integrity of government and public confidence in it.

MR. SCHWARZ: So, Gale, could I ask you a question right at that point?

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Sure.
MR. SCHWARZ: I mean, the -- that was a recommendation, and nothing happened.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Right.
MR. SCHWARZ: And there are, I think, two questions of concern about your suggestion. Any given official can decide whether to take a raise or not.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Right. And I would
make sure that it did not happen in the current Council or anybody else's term. It should be taken in the future.

MR. SCHWARZ: Yes. But I mean the -there are two questions about that suggestion as an immediate action, as opposed to something which changes the current schedule, and so forth. And the two questions are:

One, as a matter of law, the current system, by setting up a Quadrennial Commission in the early part of the second year, could not have contemplated waiting until the early part of the fifth year.

And, also, the Charter does address the timing of raises by saying, no raise can be enacted between an election and January 1st.

So, those factors, I think, raise a concern about the consistency with the law of requiring the raise to be delayed. And then, if we consider the question that we're being asked to do, is not -- is not to evaluate the individual job holders, but rather is to value the office. In looking at it that way, waiting for 11 years for a change in the pay for the office has, doesn't sort of ring right.

So, react to those two questions about your suggestions.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Well, I hope I'm answering your question. But, to me, when you run for the Council, or any other position, we all ran in 2013 and took office in 2014, in the current, then you know what the salary is. So, I know that you have a legal issue to deal with, but you also have a political issue to deal with.

So, the notion of following the law here, as you stated, and I think I'd rather go with the political side. I went through term limits hell. And, you know, you could go through something similar, given the fact that people feel so, um, don't have a lot of respect for elected officials. So, I mean, I think you have to skip the law on this one and go with the political reality of nothing should be taking place until somebody runs, and if they win for the next cycle.

MR. SCHWARZ: Of course, politically, someone who votes for a raise and takes it is --

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: We're talking about now, or --

MR. SCHWARZ: Now, I'm just talking
abstractly, really -- who votes for a raise and takes it, then in the forthcoming election, that's an issue, it's a legitimate issue.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: It definitely is. MR. SCHWARZ: So, it's not that the only way the, a decision is tested politically is if you wait; in fact, in some ways, it's more challenging politically if you don't wait.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Well, six of one, half a dozen of the other. I know term limits was so awful that I have -- you know, still have nightmares about it.

MR. SCHWARZ: Which? The change in term limits, or the --

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Yes. Because, of course, it was to take place, you know, immediately, and we had to decide whether, you know, it was not going to take place in the next session, but the notion of how desperately the public wants to know transparency; so, if you don't, you know, in that case they wanted to vote on it. In this case, I think they want to know what the salary is of the person whom they are voting for, and they don't want things in mid-session.

I think that's what the public feels. And term limits for those of us who are around, it will be hovering.

That's how they look at it, I think.
MR. SCHWARZ: So, I interrupted you. I think you were --

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: No, that's okay.
I'm just going to say not much more. The Commission should strongly urge the Mayor to do two things:

One, commit now to impanel another pay raise commission in 2019, you know, depending on whoever is elected, but whoever is Mayor, that should be happening.

And second, to introduce legislation that contains an effective date, as I said, of January 1st, 2018. That, as we know, is the first day of the next term of office for New York City elected offices. This will put the City back in compliance, I think, with the Charter, in terms of the first suggestion and allow smaller raises to occur more regularly.

I agree with Susan Lerner not to have them, anything except through the Commission, because it's transparent and the public knows it's taking place.

In times of economic turmoil this would allow commissions to decline to recommend raises, as a very well, as it may well happen. Um, what happened after September 11th, God help us, or a financial crisis. And for myself, I ran for borough president two years ago and lowered the salary, as did all of my colleagues, and if $I$ do accept any pay raise, I'll only do it if re-elected in the office, regardless of the wording of any legislation. That's my opinion.

At that point, my constituents would be able to judge the job I have done and decide whether or not I am worth the salary.

Finally, while it is a city charter, and not the salary levels, that make the job of City Council member part-time, and allow for stipends or LULUs, I've long taken the position that the job of council member is and should be treated as full-time, and LULUs should be abolished.

Currently, in addition to their salaries of 112,500, the vast majority of council members receive stipends ranging from 5,000 to 25,000 . The vast majority get stipends of 8 to 15,000 -8 or 15, usually.

I think LULUs have become a way of giving all but the least favored council members additional compensation. I think only two now don't get LULUs.

I also believe that declaring the job to be full-time will provide a significant public benefit. It will underscore the idea that council members work for the taxpayers who pay their salaries.

If the Council enacts rules for future individuals in requiring full-time schedules, then a local law should provide for an additional 20,000 a year, or adjust a 20 percent salary adjustment. That would be in addition to the 15 percent increase for all offices, but would require the elimination of LULUs and a change to full-time status.

This adjustment should sunset if the rules are ever repealed. The City Charter should eventually be changed to reflect this.

I just want to say, when I was in the Council for 12 years, it is ironic, because some of the most intelligent members -- um, I think of, um, Mike McMahon; I think of Oliver Kopell, and others, they were also attorneys at the same
time. And you could argue that they were very full-time in the Council, or you could argue that they were not full-time because they had another job, but I would tell you they were excellent, intelligent chairs.

So, that's, just so you know, it's a challenge. It's something that I don't know how many have outside jobs, um, currently in the City Council. I know that one of them is $a$, has a pharmacy business, and an extremely intelligent gentleman. So, it depends. But it's a funny little wrinkle that we should be aware of. MR. SCHWARZ: But I understood your -A PARTICIPANT: I think they should be full-time, but I'm letting you know that there's a little funny wrinkle there, because some of the more intelligent people in the past have been people who have done an outside job in addition, and it's just --

MR. SCHWARZ: I don't know the facts about the pharmacy person, but if that person is earning income because of his ownership of a pharmacy, that's not an outside job; so, it may well be --

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: I don't know if it's
unearned or earned. I just don't know. I don't know.

But thank you, Gene --
MR. SCHWARZ: No. But I wanted to ask you another question.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Sure. Go ahead.
MR. SCHWARZ: You referred to your years in the -- your -- was it eight, or --

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: I was in the Council for 12 years.

MR. SCHWARZ: For 12 years, yes. And you said the job is and should be treated as full-time. So, as far as the "is" goes, could you describe for us what work you did as a City Council member? How the elements of that make it full-time? Because it is unfortunate that we have not had enough of a record of people coming in and talking about their jobs. I think that's the more important subject.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Feel free to come and talk to me, Mr. Chairman. They're afraid to come and talk, Mr. Chairman. I'm letting you know. They all call me and said, are you going to talk? They also don't talk off the record, but they will not come. Just so you know.

The job depends. So, you can, in the past years, um, you could certainly have probably two committees you could get away with. I think I did five or six. And so, that would be one determinant. I think we should look to see how many committees a person is on, and they should show up at them. And there's always an issue of signing in for five minutes, getting counted, and leaving. And, you know, stupid Gale sits there for the whole meeting.

But the same with the budget hearings. So, you -- I think along with the full-time, it should be somewhat defined, obviously working we could work on some kind of a definition, because if you only have a couple of committees and you do your constituent work. So, you have a responsibility to show up at a Council meeting twice a month, full voting, and then you can have as few under the current system, or as many committees as you wish, committee assignments. I don't know what the minimum is, but it's probably two or three. And they meet once a month.

My understanding is they might even have shrunk slightly under the current Council, I
don't know. But $I$ do think a definition of that. And then you also, um, I think if it's full-time, you can work on, you know, some kind of community board or neighborhood representation; that's another possibility. But what you do is you go to your committee meetings at 10 o'clock in the morning, 1 o'clock in the afternoon, and if you're a chair, you do the extra work. I had technology and governmental operations; so, technology was a bad committee, because I supported DeBlasio over Quinn; so, I got a bad committee, although I loved it and I turned it into something.

The governmental operations dealt, as you know, a lot with issues that you are concerned about, from charter revision to Board of Elections, et cetera. So, there's a lot of outside time devoted to the work of the committee. And so, you know, you would meet with the different agencies and meet with staff from the committee.

So -- however, if you're doing it the way I would do it is, if you are full-time and you have no LULUs, then you would also perhaps push to have more of the committee members involved with
the working of the committee. There's very -I don't know how it works in Congress, $I$ don't know how it works in Albany, but the other members of the committee do not play a large role in the workings of that committee.

MR. SCHWARZ: Well, in terms of constituent services and helping navigate the bureaucracy of the city, from your own experience, what was that element of the job?

A PARTICIPANT: Well, I'm a nut on that topic. So, the way we did it was we had a storefront office and we did, it was open seven days a week, and we -- you know, people walk in with every kind of problem, and you answer it by working with the agencies from housing to health to noise. I don't know the number of constituents that are served. It's, you know, we did thousands. Upper West Side is very active. And I think you also have a responsibility to the community boards, and you have a responsibility to the business improvement districts, which are the, in a sense, also boards that deal with the local businesses. But I think you would look to see on the Charter, and I can't do it by heart, um, where there is responsibility
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as a council member, and do more monitoring or some kind of metrics on whether or not that particular member is participating in those activities. I don't know if they do or not, in general. I am a nut on this issue; so, I did. But I think that would be something to look at more carefully. This has never been monitored. We do get, to the credit of the speaker's staff, there's a lot of discussion about, you know, making sure that you have your committees, but you can show up for five minutes and sign in and sign out. I passed the Webcasting bill, so people can watch it on television or on computer, and they can see who walks in and walks out and doesn't stay there.

MR. SCHWARZ: They can watch any committee.
BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Yes. It's Gale Brewer's law.

MS. BRIGHT: Just a point of clarification. You talked about supporting a 15 percent increase, and you kind of cited that nine-year period. And yet, I think earlier, you said something about the period around the recession, where if there had been a commission, there might have been no increase, in fact.
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So, tell me why you then settled on the 15 percent, as opposed to another example you cited, which is the 7 percent that the Mayor gave to his management team over the 2011 and 15 period.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: We tried to come up with a 15 percent because of, between the Bloomberg and, um, Bloomberg in particular had the 4 percent, and then the DeBlasio had the 7 percent, that's where we got the 11. But, in addition, I want to be honest, that kind of brings the Council Members up to what they get now if you add in the LULUs and you average them out. That's what the issue is. I'm sorry I wasn't clear on that. MS. BRIGHT: That's okay. BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: And then we suggest, because then you would just be where you are now, basically. We suggested this addition of the 20,000 -- depending on how you count it. So, it's 20,000 a year, or just a 20 percent salary adjustment, depending on how you want to do it. But you need something more, we feel, than the 15 percent increase, because with the LULUs, that's what they would make now. So, it would be something additional to be worked out. We had a
suggestion.
MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you.
MR. QUINTERO: Yes. I wanted to go, first of all, I do want to applaud the discussion. Thank you so much; it means a lot.

You shared a lot about the Council Members' role. I'd like -- because I think one of the areas that, at least for some, that most people don't understand the Borough President's role, and we put some information, it's on the site again, but just to reference some of the data that we found. You know, we find it's about, pretty consistent, an operating budget anywhere from 4 to 5,000,000, staffing in terms of headcount in the 50, 60s; so, there's a significant staffing and managerial function that's being done by the borough presidents.

And so, what I'd like to do is, the first point that you mentioned was understanding the scope and the role of each position, and I'd like you to help us understand the activities at the borough president's office, what the staff are focused on, and perhaps compare and contrast to your Council days, so that we can have a better appreciation of what we have to do.
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BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Well, obviously, before the Board of Estimate discussion, the borough presidents had a bigger role in terms of the contracts and the land use. I still have the chair from the Board of Estimate in my office; so, people come in and sit in it all the time from the Board of Estimate. It's a very big, popular attraction.

But I was around then. Most of my staff, Board of Estimate, what is that? But the Borough President.

So, the nice news about current is that all five of us are very close. We talk weekly, if not daily. We text constantly, and we are like the five buddies, you know, we're joined at the hip. Three of us served together in the City Council, Staten Island, Queens, and myself, and the other two are state-elected before. So, we have a very close relationship, which might not have been true in the past, from my understanding.

I would say that our biggest role is the role of Land Use. You can argue, of course, that the Mayor, under the City Planning Commission and the City Council, have the most to do

QUADRENNIAL COMMISSION
regarding land use, because that came out of the Charter.

However -- I mean, I know a lot about land use. I was on the community board. I had to negotiate a lot of deals in the City Council. I was always appreciative when then-Borough President Scott Stringer brought us all together on really complicated projects.

Because as a Council Member, you don't have a big Land Use staff. You have your little council staff. And the City Council speaker, you may or may not be in favor with, as Susan Lerner described, or you may or may not be able to get the attention of that Land Use staff that much, even though there is one there. So, you really do rely on your borough. And you have different interests in Queens and Staten Island, and so on. So, the City Council members rely, now today also, on the Council Members, on the borough presidents for Land Use. We have six or seven people excellent on the Land Use staff.

So, now, we're facing the DeBlasio zoning proposals. It's like facing, you know, Mount Everest in terms of comprehension. ZQA is imbedded in my brain. MIH. If you say those two
words to the public, they're like excuse me? But there's going to be a vote soon, and it could change the whole way New York City looks. So, we had 25 meetings in 60 days on this topic with the Council and the community board. So, that is a role that all of the borough presidents play, bringing people together, community boards, Land Use, housing advocates and, um, Council Members, even the Congress people have been coming to our briefings, personally, because it's so huge. So, that's one. And that's, you know, beyond the current zoning proposal. This is a real estate, real estate, real estate, there are no other interests in the City of New York, just real estate. And so, the borough president can play a big role in determining that issue.

The second issue is appointments. So, you know, community boards play a big role, and I think not just in land use, but in being the people's court where you can get your first line of information on noise issues, on Land Use, on housing, on where the school should be located, et cetera.

So, we're -- you know, we have 12 community boards. Brooklyn, I think, has 14. We work with
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the City Council to appoint them, but if you add up the business improvement districts and the hospital boards and the EDC boards, et cetera, it's 1,000 people whom we appoint in the Borough of Manhattan, 1,000 people.

MR. SCHWARZ: Do you appoint the heads of the business improvement --

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: We appoint some of the -- well, we appoint people to the board.

MR. SCHWARZ: People to the board.
BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: People to the hospital board, people to the cultural boards across Manhattan, and community boards, and the youth board, and the Gansevoort board, and the Hudson River Park board. And I could go on and on. It's almost 1,000 people, maybe more, and we train them. I don't know that any other borough is doing that. But we had hundreds of trainings -- Roberts Rules of Order, budget, Land Use, zoning, we have almost like a college semester.

MR. SCHWARZ: You know, this is an example of why having an actual, live witness is very beneficial. Because I think I know a lot about city government. I never heard of those extent of appointments. And Jeff, who is probably the
genius lawyer for the City over the last 40 years --

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: He is a genius, but he just retired. It's terrible.

MR. SCHWARZ: -- but without trying to expose you in any way, Jeff, I think you didn't know about some of those appointment powers that the borough presidents have at times.

MR. FRIEDLANDER: Well, I knew about many of them. I mean, the borough president shares with the Mayor, of course, and some various boards and commissions, including the appointment of the City Planning Commission.

MR. SCHWARZ: Would you be able, Gale, to send us a list of all the appointment powers you have?

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Yes. Absolutely.
MR. SCHWARZ: That would be great.
BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: That would be helpful.

And then, the third issue is the capital budget, which we share with the City Council and the Mayor. You know, we appoint, we allocate, I think about 30 -- and each borough is different. I think we do around $\$ 30,000,000$ of capital. We
have a small amount of expense for youth and cultural, and seniors. It's not a lot. We do some of that, too. And we do it primarily on the expense side. We do it with an outside group making the analysis. Again, this is just the Manhattan, because I don't want it to be political.

And then, you know, it is, I read the Charter with the wonderful Jim Caras, and we can introduce legislation. We introduced about 50 bills. Nobody read the Charter of Manhattan before. We have to do it with a Council Member. But it's, like -- you know, first of all, I had a lot of bills that I didn't get a chance to finish in 12 years. I did a lot that I did. So, they're still -- I get to prioritize. I get to pick them, and I can find council members -- we passed a lot of bills already.

So, I get to go to bill signings and say, you know, we've done a lot of bills.

We can send you that information, also. Most of the other borough presidents are not picking up on that. I think if you are coming from the state, you may not realize it. Jimmy has done some from Staten Island.

It was done some from Queens --
We're right there across the street, and we are constantly producing bills. They get drafted by the Council and they pass.

So, we have a great staff, and we find members to co-sponsor, and I think they like to do it, because they know that we try to have good ideas with them.

MR. SCHWARZ: So, on the budget powers of the borough presidents, and you now spoke about the budget realities.

On the expense side, $I$ know it's the case that there are certain things that you can propose that the Mayor is required to include in the budget that goes to the Council, and then, just like anything else, it's ultimately up to the Council. But just focusing on that first. Is that a power that the borough presidents are using.

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: I'm not aware of that. Jim would be able to help me here. Would you like to come down and help me out, Jim? Jim Caras was at the City Council for 21 years.

MR. CARAS: I can answer that from my prior finance counsel role.
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BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: He's general counsel and head of Land Use in our offices, but he was with the City Council for 21 years.

MR. SCHWARZ: So, just explain who you are, for the record there.

MR. CARAS: I'm Jim Caras. I'm Borough President Brewer's general counsel and director of Land Use. I was deputy general counsel at the City Council working closely with Gale when I moved over to the Borough President's office.

But prior to that, I was the finance counsel to the City Council, which is how I am able to answer this question.

The truth is, and we've discussed this in the Borough President's office.

No borough president has ever proposed the offset in cuts that are required in the borough in order to have the proposals considered by the City Council.

MR. SCHWARZ: Is that clear, for regular budget, or capital budget?

MR. CARAS: Yes. That's for, I believe it's both, but I'm not sure, without the Charter in front of me I wouldn't be able to answer. I know it's for the expense budget that you're required

QUADRENNIAL COMMISSION to have offsetting cuts in your, affecting your own borough, to have the Council consider your proposals. And at the Council we've reviewed the submissions from the Borough President which had, you know, valid proposals for new spending, but they almost never had the offsetting cuts, because it's very hard to come up, especially during lean years, with cuts that would be palatable to your community boards and its constituents.

MS. BRIGHT: So, only self-funded?
MR. CARAS: Yes. And some in the boroughs. But you couldn't even propose cutting a citywide program to fund, the way I understood it.

MR. SCHWARZ: You know, my memory of the 1989 Charter, which is 26 years ago, may be wrong, but I think the borough presidents have the right, without, um, compensating deductions, to require the Mayor to include a certain amount of -- a certain percentage of discretionary, um, increases. And, um, I don't think we're going to resolve that question here, but that's what I remember our intending and providing.

MR. CARAS: Well, as soon as I can, I'll go look at that.
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MR. SCHWARZ: So, go read the article that Eric Lane and I wrote that has a section on the borough president's budget powers.

MR. CARAS: Okay. I've read the article. You know, I'll go back and I'll look at it. I will go back to it again.

MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you.
MS. BREWER: And I was on the, you know, budget negotiation team and finance committee, and I didn't remember that either; so, certainly on either end, you know, the City would mandate that the borough president find the compensation, I don't remember that. It would have caused havoc. And there are other people looking at it. I like the second part better.

MR. SCHWARZ: I mean, I know we put that in, that right in, and I don't, I remember compensating for some other purpose, but my memory is irrelevant. It's what you people --

BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: No. Your memory is quite good.

Are there any further questions?
MS. BRIGHT: Thank you very much.
MR. SCHWARZ: So, thank you very much.
BORO PRESIDENT BREWER: Thank you very much.

MS. LERNER: You know, I apologize, but there's one point that $I$ meant to make, and that is: We do not, at Common Cause, support raises retroactively.

MR. SCHWARZ: You mean, cash being given to people? Like the district attorneys asked for? MS. LERNER: Yes.

MR. SCHWARZ: Yes. No, I don't think anybody else has come forward with support for that idea, and it would be very strange, since it would apply to some people and not others. And --

MS. LERNER: Right.
MR. SCHWARZ: But --
MS. LERNER: Yes.
MR. SCHWARZ: So, I think our next witness is Roxanne Delgado, who knows all of the things that I usually say in advance, and is the most diligent and productive producer of facts on an extremely tight schedule.

You know, she would do well in a court room when you have to --

MS. DELGADO: I would like to thank the Chair and present Commissioner to make me feel so comfortable and welcome.

With regard to the Council Member in Queens, he does own two pharmacies, and it is not earned income. One pharmacy makes between 5,000 -47,000 towards the annual disclosure of 2014 and another pharmacy makes between 60 to 100,000, and actually owns, has an S company related to real estate venture that distributes between 100,000 to 149,000 last year.

MR. SCHWARZ: Just to understand that a little more. Is that analogous to the fact that Mayor Bloomberg obviously was able to get income from his company, as long as he wasn't being paid a salary for working there? Is you are saying that the pharmacy owner is --

MS. DELGADO: Passive income. It is not earned. And --

MR. SCHWARZ: How on earth do you know that? That is --

MS. DELGADO: I went to COIB and reviewed the disclosure forms, and I saw that it was listed, the section earned income. Employer, function, something -- professor.

Um, one was partner, you think of, one was a partner. It was in his father's firm.

And there is another section that says
income, securities held and also, from holdings.
MR. SCHWARZ: And is the term passive income used on the form or that is, you can tell that from the form?

MS. DELGADO: Just my knowledge. You don't have to take a role in earning that income.

MR. SCHWARZ: Okay.
MS. DELGADO: Thank you. I wanted to clarify what the Borough President was mentioning to, Council Member Koo from Queens.

The 25 percent income cap would reply to his earnings. So, but then I also want my, the reason why I am here and I thank the Committee for letting me speak again because I was concerned with the testimony from the Citizens Union. I wrote an open letter to him and posted it on the Website of the commission.

Okay. Citizens Union mentioned, given the population size of the City of New York and a budget of 73 billion, supports a pay raise for -Sorry.

Citizen Union mentioned that given the population size of the City of New York, and the budget of 73 billion, it supports his recommendation of giving the City Council a pay raise.

But I would like to refute that because first the City Council member district average population is 134 thousand and at average number household is 61,000 per the 2010 census, which I included on your Website.

Second, in regards to the 73 billion budget the Mayor's office submitted a proposed budget to the City Council. Public hearings are held and agencies submit their financial reports.

And the staff lobby why they need more money. Also the public testified what services they feel are more important to their community.

Therefore the budget is adopted by a combined effort, and most of the data provided is from the agency heads, to submit their budget.

In no way am I -- (Inaudible) -- the City Council hard work. But it seems that it was over inflated in City Council, in Citizen Union's testimony on total population size and budget amounts.

Most if not all of the City Council members do not have any financial or accounting background.

Second, in regards to LULUs, I do agree that
if LULUs are abolished, then an additional increase of 10,000 would be fair since that is the average LULU that 92 percent of the City Council members receive.

47 out of 51 City Council members do receive LULUs. From the table submitted by Citizen Union on the Council Member positions on compensation, 31 City Council members said, and the Mayor supports eliminating LULUs.

So my question is, then, why haven't they done so already? Action speaks louder than empty promises.

Also reported in the article of February 2014, titled Winners and Weasels, when they ran in 2013, 35 City Council member candidates told voters they backed eliminating LULUs, yet only 10 of them kept their promise and refused the money.

Just as in 2006, only five of the 51 City Council members voted to eliminate LULUs as recommended by the Commission, and voted themselves 25 percent pay raise in addition to keeping the LULUs.

Again, the elected officials ignore both the voters and the Commission and they kept the LULUs.

And I could give you a list.
But there are City Council member Curly, who is, served -- who voted against eliminating LULUs.

And some are actually holding high offices currently. I will not mention any names.

MR. SCHWARZ: You know so many facts.
Do you know how many of the City Council members who are eligible for LULUs decline, do decline to take them?

MS. DELGADO: There was an interesting article that $I$ will post later this week.

Ten stated that they declined their LULUs, out of 35 that promised they were up for reforming to eliminating LULUs.

Out of those 10, when the, there was a news article that followed up on their promises, they said they donated their LULUs, they contacted some of the charities to -- they received \$100 from the $\$ 8,000$ stipend. So, you know -MR. SCHWARZ: The news article is interesting, but not necessarily definitive, but any way --

MS. DELGADO: It follows up though. When they did an interview they went to the

City Council member and said did you keep your promise and 10 said yes, and the other 21 said, 35, that is 24 said, no.

We decided to keep the LULUs, but we stood for reforms.

Then when they followed-up with the 10 that declined their LULUs, they went to, they said, who did you donate your money to.

They said bla, bla, these charities. And they went to a few of the charities, yes, they donated one hundred dollars. So, that is --

MR. SCHWARZ: Do either you or Kyle, who has looked at the disclosure forms, our Kyle Alagood -- can you tell from the disclosure form whether someone has, um, accepted a LULU?

MS. DELGADO: No.
MR. SCHWARZ: Why not?
Don't they have to show compensation from the City?

MS. DELGADO: They put their compensation as a, between, between 99,000 to 125,000 .

MR. ALAGOOD: The range of salary would encompass both base salary plus LULUs. MR. SCHWARZ: Why on earth should a City
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MR. SCHWARZ: -- is expressed as a range?
MS. DELGADO: I know.
MR. SCHWARZ: It is not our business.
Susan --
MS. BRIGHT: Don't let it be a range, but an absolute number.

MS. LERNER: That is a dodge about the LULUs. It is absolutely a dodge.

MR. SCHWARZ: The disclosure forms are too lax.

MS. LERNER: The forms are lax and not on the Web. So, you have to go and request them or personally, in today's day and age, and sit there and go through them.

And the application process is not an easy one. So, that in and of itself is, you know, is an interesting factor. It took us a long time to get disclosures that the -- at the state level, but at least we got them on the Web.

MS. WERBER: It is costly. It is $\$ 40$ for a year's worth of.
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MR. ALAGOOD: For the record it is \$41.
MS. LERNER: You have to identify, you have to notify the Council Member that you are interested IN.

MR. SCHWARZ: This is not subject that we can act $O N$. We can at least comment, and we have the right to comment on frankly anything that we want to.

MS. GARCIA: I just would like to say, they gave me a --

They were wonderful.
(Inaudible)
That was great. She said it is not on the Website and they are not, they reported the own salaries between ranges. So, it keeps you in the dark.

For those that have accounting background you would assume that the base salary is 110, if you don't have accounting background and there is nothing mixed in the pot.

I am sorry. So again, the elected officials ignored both the voters and the Commission and they kept the LULUs.

Third and most disturbing to me, it Citizens Union recommends 20,000 bonus, and it seems like
the 20,000 bonus seems to be in several, in several testimony, which doesn't, which doesn't seem kosher to me.

I am keeping that to myself. Most disturbing to me, Citizens Union's recommendation the 20,000 bonus to the City Council if they count their outside income to 25 percent with full disclosure.

However, as verified in the annual financial disclosure and reported in the November 12, 2015 titled New York City Council members offering to give up outside income -- something most of them don't have --

For 71 percent raise, 40 of the 51 City Council members have zero earned income, and 7 of the other City Council members have outside income earned between 1,0005,000.

So basically we are asking them to give up nothing for a 20,000 bonus.

So, basically Citizens Union is proposing to give them 20K to give us nothing, to give up nothing.

Again the issue remains whether the City Council is full-time or part-time, and it seems to remain part-time if they can continue to seek
outside employment.
Statutory, the jobs of is a part-time job, and as the lady testified yesterday, many clock in committee meetings and leave before the public testifies. So, this 20K bonus, in my opinion, is unjust with no merit.

Citizens Union mentioned that higher salary will lead to less corruption, is contrary to the fact.

Several Council Members were arrested and imprisoned after they received their 25 percent raise.

Former City Council member Miguel Martinez Larry Seabrook, Dan Halloran were arrested and imprisoned for corruption.

Current City Council member Ruben Wills was recently indicted, and former City Council member and current Assembly member Eric Dilan fined \$8,000 for taking an affordable apartment while he and his wife made combined income over 174,000. He lived in that apartment when he was a City Council member.

Lastly, many people earned below living wages, but they are not stealing from their employers.

Greed is a lack of character in the person that isn't satisfied, has nothing to do with how much they are paid.

In regards to future reform, a real reform is eliminating the City Counsel discretionary fund, a/k/a pork spending, which the City Council members allocate directly to non-profits in their communities.

It was recently reported in June, 2015 titled city's new budget allots 57 million for pork spending, that -- their pork money jumped from I've evaluated 57 million, over 7 million more over the past two years.

If the City Council would abolish discretionary funding then they will, they do deserve a $20,000 \mathrm{~K}$ bonus, because that is real reform. Discretionary funding is basically additional campaign funding to buy support from the community. They have ribbon cutting ceremonies and media coverage, praising them for their allocation.

But this is public money that belongs to the communities. If they abolish the discretionary funds, then public office will attract the brightest and best candidates, and they will have a chance to win.

Lastly, the real way city elected officials, especially City Council can gain experience not with outside work, but by remaining in the meetings and listening to all of the public and experts testify on the issues.

And thank you so much.
And I just want to make a quick comment about Gale Brewer.

It seems like the 20,000 number keeps appearing in several testimonies, and it seems like they are trying to match to a number, like they want to, the end result has been decided.

And they are trying to provide the Commission with whatever data they pick and choose to support that number.

Again, I see the same chart, in the last Commissioner's report.

They put the base salary of the City Council of 112,500 .

But actually it is 125, if you include the LULUs.

And also there is, New York has, it is really, it is a part time job.

So if you consider that the LULUs and the
part that, um, part-time job, New York is the second top paid within that list, within the list that you have there.

The testimony. It is something that I wanted to go back is that -- again, 20,000 -- so they are recommending to get additional bonus 20,000, if they give up the LULUs and change the full-time status.

So basically telling me, there is claims, full-time status but if we want it to be exchanged, full-time, they want 20,000.

So it doesn't make sense to me. Is it full-time or not?

For my opinion it is not a full-time, from what I have seen.

So, and the fact that most of them are willing to make this perspective to apply to the beginning, the next term is most of them will be reelected.

That is a given, because I saw something, a recent article where 91 percent win reelection, either they are unopposed or the incumbent has a huge advantage due to discretion funding.

And also, no knock on Gale Brewer, because I really do like her.
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They did not appoint 1,000 to the board every year, they just replace vacancies.

Because in my community board, Community Board 11, there are basically two vacancies available every year. They are not filling 1,000. It is a big responsibility but I, there is no way that they replace 1,000 appointees every year.

And I really don't like the fact that they continue -- when the CPI could be applied to 9 years back to 2006, because again, my City Councilman James Vacca ran in 2005 -- no, 2004, started his first term in two -- he ran in 2005, are he started his first term in 2006.

And then sometime in October, was given a 25 percent raise.

So his CPI adjustment applied to years that he was never even in office.

So this is why I don't think this is suitable, and also, this is happening when Nine Eleven happened. Most of us lost our jobs, including me and had to work more for less.

So this is why I don't think that the CPI should be the end all.

MR. SCHWARZ: Just a little question on
that. Let's assume that you are a company.
And you have 100 people who started working in year 1, and 100 more people who started working in year 5, and they are doing exactly the same job, there is no difference in their job.

When you, when -- in year 6, you decide what you think that job is now worth. Wouldn't the company give that same pay to both the people who have been there for five years and also for one year, assuming that they are doing exactly the same job?

MS. DELGADO: I would say no.
First, because most employers, including my former bank employer, would consider a year of service.

MR. SCHWARZ: That is a different question. MS. DELGADO: Sorry. Yes.

But the job they would, based on, not based on --

MR. SCHWARZ: If we considered years of service, then just to take, one Attorney General has worked in the job for 30 years, and 3 others I think will have started the job within the last, either this year or two years ago.

And I don't think of a system which could be
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devised, to distinguish between those people. Because our job is to consider the value of the job, and not the individual people.

MS. DELGADO: No. Okay. I agree.
Regarding for example the one year, one year service --

A company will, based on their responsibility will have a base salary, for example, let's say you are staff accountant one, they have different levels.

When you joined the company they paid like 55 K , and someone later on was employed, but that accountant level, accountant one now pays 60,000. There is a discrepancy.

That is why I don't believe in going back and -- and let's say accountant 3--

MR. SCHWARZ: I don't think anybody in our group is suggesting going back.

MS. DELGADO: Gale Brewer and the CPI, retros actively to 9 years before.

MR. SCHWARZ: But that is valuing the job today as opposed to rewarding people who, I mean the D.A. example is a perfect example.

Should the person who has been there for 30 years be paid for that job, more than the person
who is coming in to the job now?
Any way, that is a question we have to consider.

MS. DELGADO: Also marketing manager.
Timing, if you could come to a company, the company's financial and they -- and their needs demand supply also.

I am not too certain. I am not too crazy about the CPIs being, the end all and applying to every year.

No one is guaranteed a raise every year. I never heard of this. People go with no raises for decades.

MR. SCHWARZ: We don't, we are not suggesting that people be granted future raises on the basis of --

MS. DELGADO: Going back to 2006, and applying the CPI to 2006, up to 2015, and that is basically, that is, 25 percent raise, again --

MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you.
MS. DELGADO: Thank you.
MR. SCHWARZ: Okay. Now, I think Mr.
Sementilli.
MR. SEMENTILLI: Egidio Sementilli.
Thank you.
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I am honored to meet you.
Pleasure. I have been reading up on all of the, the -- great work. Although I think you are wrong. I think we need to start all over again, we need the two legislative body system.

MR. SCHWARZ: Two houses.
MR. SEMENTILLI: Absolutely. Two houses.
I think, it was interesting and I like the idea when a lot of the powers were, would shift to the Borough President, to the community board.

Although it is not being applied.
It is not being applied. You know, in substitution of the two house system we have a one house system but the powers of government should have, and needed to be basically spread out to the City Council, well, City Council, but spread out to the Borough President and also the community boards.

I think it would play a big part. You know -- City Hall and the community were supposed to mean something, and now they are just political appointees.

MR. SCHWARZ: I can tell you why we did not use the two house system. It is because we analyzed having an upper house, and it was clear
that while the lower house would become broadly representative of all of the ethnicities in the city, if you had a smaller upper house, it wouldn't.

Anyway, it is it is not for this discussion. MR. SEMENTILLI: I know. But I found that interesting. By the way, the largest, we are the largest in the country of single housing.

I think the largest would be Nebraska.
We are the single largest. I am honored to be here. Thank you so much.

And I am here to say, no, no, no.
I think that the Panel is a great panel here. I think we need some more average people like myself on the Panel. If you need more people to represent, to be on the Panel, I will volunteer. I am ready.

I am practically broke and um, and I understand what Ms. Delgado has been saying and I think that absolutely no. No. No. No.

Once again, the City Council is in itself um, a part-time position. It was always a parttime position.

In fact, kind of -- tonight I have kind of agreed to a full-time position, solely based, if
it was a full-time position they couldn't go and campaign in the summer, and be stuck in the office.

That might be the only positive aspect of it for reelection. I think it is a part-time position. They have a large staff, large funded staff.

The boro president employs over 75 people.
The City Counsel person I think the average, and Ms. Delgado if you could throw some numbers at me, about 10 people average, about 10 people average, for City Council.

We have the Controller, oh, my God, the Controller you have departments. I go crazy just looking on the Website to try to find departments. You have 50 departments and employees.

You have the public advocate, I think she was, I would agree, Ms. Public Advocate, probably needs a little more money, a larger staff but she, they did cut her.

And um, but still, my point is, the only requirement for elected office is to be a citizen and over 18 years old. No qualifications for anything else that is it.

So having said that.
And um, I think only the Attorney General, the, not the Attorney General, the District Attorney although recently has been, there has been some cases that it shifted from administrative position to a prosecuting position, so therefore you need to be a lawyer.

Besides that, there is no other requirement.
We, and Ms. Gale, the Councilwoman, God bless her, she has had 12 years, now she is also doing another four years of Borough President.

She will be a 20 -year.
Most of our elect officials have become 20 years. It is not, it is not a part-time job, it is a career for them. And to analyze and --

I think you mentioned the right words, value of the job. Your job is to value, is the value of the job, not the individuals.

Well, fine, value of the job.
The value of the job does not account close to 35 percent, or 71 percent raise here. It doesn't justify it.

People are struggling every single day. And with all due respect, I looked at some of the bios, you people are very impressive and

God bless you in your careers and so on.
There is an elitist board here, elite board here. And maybe that is why this board looks at 35 percent, $\$ 20,000$ bonus, 15 percent, 71 percent, somewhat favorable, because you are dealing in an environment where people are making 160,000, 130,000.

It is nothing to the people that you deal with on a day-to-day basis. It is peanuts, \$160, 000 .

You think, dealing with people that have three or four or $\$ 5,000,000$ salaries.

So maybe they might have a mind-set and this is why I said, I am ready to volunteer to level out this great board here and honored.

But once again, I will finalize it, absolutely no, no, no.

And thank you for the opportunity.
MR. QUINTERO: Don't go.
Can you spell your name for the reporter.
You can give the full spelling.
MR. SEMENTILLI: E-G-I-D-I-O.
S-E-M-E-N-T-I-L-L-I. Yes.
MR. QUINTERO: Just a second.
First of all, the reason we wanted to have
public hearings is to have collective inputs of the people.

But I also want to make sure that we are getting the benefit of the recommendations.

So, I think if I heard it right, um, essentially the recommendation should be zero increases is what you are saying for all of the elected officials; is that correct?

MR. SEMENTILLI: The value of the job here, and it can't be compared to what your own background and your own experience is.

And the background, the value of the job should be, should be analyzed here by what testimony of myself, testimony of people like Ms. Delgado and I am sorry, the general public is not here.

And if the general public was here, the general public would say, most of the general public is living close to the poverty line here.

The poverty line.
It is a call.

Politics is a call. I have run for office and lost for office, Google my name. I am out there, challenging the establishment, as much as I possibly can.

But, the reality is, it is a call. It is not full-career politicians to be there for 20 years or 30 years, or to do musical chairs at times from City Council to Assembly, and vice versa. It is not meant to be this way.

It is meant to be a calling. They know exactly what they are coming into.

And the value of the job is they are really, is the value of the job, when you have a supporting staff.

Supporting staff, it means, City Council, 10 personnel, doing every aspect of your job, and your job is to show up twice a month. And what's the value of the job.

MR. QUINTERO: Let me just dissect that a little bit.

We want to make all of these into crisp areas.

I think $I$ heard a few different things and I wanted to make sure that we are hearing this right.

Value of the job in my mind is the quantification, and I did not hear a quantification.

The roles and responsibilities, as I think

QUADRENNIAL COMMISSION
what you are describing, and I want to go to that, um, someone that has 8 to 10 people let's say versus one person, versus 900 people, are you saying that the differences in the managerial complexity of managing one person or no one, or managing the Department of 900, should have no factor in the Commission's consideration.

I am speaking about the role of the job.
I am not speaking about the value. I need to get your perspective on that.

MR. SEMENTILLI: Comparison to the --
Yes.
MR. QUINTERO: Well, in the public sector.
MR. SEMENTILLI: You see, you want to intertwine the prior -- the public sector, and that is where the problem comes in.

Because the fact is that you cannot, this is a calling, it is a duty, it is an obligation.

It is an obligation for elected officials or, individuals to come out there and serve the public. We are here to serve the public. And that is what it should be.

MR. QUINTERO: I am speaking of the public. I mean --

MR. SEMENTILLI: The qualifications that you
are trying to compare, or trying to, obviously the Committee is looking to dish out some money here for these individuals, and by the fact that all these variables, let's talk about the variables that you have abstracted from some of the views here, you have abstracted variables as you just stated, supervising, um, management, employee management.

Um, and all these other budgetary analysts or ideology, however it is physically applied to it. You are trying to create an argument here, and it is not your job to create an argument, on behalf of elected officials.

You are supposed to put a value of a job. Am I correct? The value of the job here, and also the input of the general public.

The general public is not here today. I am sorry to say that. It is not here, it hasn't been at the other meeting, the Committee hasn't been out there.

If you go to the communities, you go to the -- come to the community boards and have some hearings on the different counties and invite people. Let them know.

I did not know.

If Ms. Delgado did not inform me --
I am pretty much on top of these things.
And I did not know that there was a hearing here.
So, I think if you go out there and you extract the public's input, the general public input, you are going to get what I am saying here, a no, no, no.

MR. QUINTERO: That is what $I$ wanted to hear. So the recommendation is, no increase.

MR. SEMENTILLI: Absolutely not.
MR. QUINTERO: Thank you.
MR. SEMENTILLI: To try to tie it into LULUs.

LULUs.
We keep forgetting, City Council LULUs, you are making the LULU rules for LULUs; are you?

You don't have the power for that, you don't, you only have the recommendation for it.

At the end of the day, Mr. Bloomberg, I mean Mr. De Blasio is going to have the final say in this. And this is where the problem comes in.

Because now as Ms. Brewer mentioned, there is the mandatory inclusionary housing issue, there is the zoning ZLA, or zoning, I have been to the community boards myself, dealing with this issue.

Now we have here, and -- and what are the rumors out there, unofficial and please forgive me for -- any disrespect to the committee.

I am honored to be here, especially with Mr. Schwarz. But the fact is this board is looked upon, or the public is looking at this, this is Mr. DeBlasio's stake to the City Council to have a zoning passed, to have the mandatory inclusionary housing passed and that is a problem.

And I hope that is not it. I really hope not. Any further questions?

MR. SCHWARZ: No.

MR. SEMENTILLI: Mr. Schwarz.
MR. SCHWARZ: We are an independent commission.

MR. SEMENTILLI: I hope so and I know that.
I respect you for that and the Committee. Do you also file a conflict of interest? Is this board considered a conflict of interest -guidelines? I am just curious.

MR. QUINTERO: I don't know.
MR. SEMENTILLI: I couldn't find one.
Maybe somebody could look at it and see if
you are required to file one. I do appreciate it. God bless you all.

MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you.
Is Mr. Rocco here?
MR. ROCCO: Yes. I'm honored to be here tonight. I wouldn't have given up this opportunity for anything in the world.

I'm a Nine Eleven survivor. I may have cancer. I have asthma; ten years later, it was detected. When I heard a saying about Nine Eleven, I was down there, I was a firefighter, I was down there when the buildings came down.

The way I was going to give back to my community, $I$ have a civic organization that's located in the Bronx. I put about 18 to $\$ 20,000$, like, on Westchester Square Civic Association. I've done everything to try to bring life back to my community, and all I see is what our local officials and our community board is, they constantly badger me and pound me down. Recently I had to take my signs down. I had to close up. I do not receive one penny from anyone. All the money is mine. I've been asked where do I get my money, it was my pension money.

Right now when I hear this money that these
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City Council are getting, it's appalling. I'm living off of maybe hamburgers and struggling. As a firefighter, I do not receive one iota of pension, all I get is boxes of medicine, and this is the God honest truth.

What I do is, I follow to see where this money trail goes, and what I don't like is that we have five people going after money for graffiti removal, and none of the graffiti gets done. I've taken my own money, bought my own machine and take care of it. All I see is money wasted, wasted, wasted.

We have the BID, which you're talking about, the business improvement districts. They have not improved our areas. They get \$396,000, and made our communities worse from day one. I refuse to participate with them. As it stands now, I do not spend one dime in the community. We have a lot of people feel the same way. It's a failure. They've turned our streets into carnivals and to filth and everything. We need to step back and get real sanitation. We need to step back and take ahold of this. A lot of the money, I can say, is not coming into the community. And like other people said, well,
they're giving money back to the community.
I don't see a dime given back to the community. Recently, I was on News One, and I was thanked by News One for having one of the cleanest communities in the Bronx -- not from any help from our local politicians.

I was on the Community Board 9 prior to getting on the Fire Department, and I worked diligently with the Parks Department. My dad had 30 years of service with the Parks Department, Never missed a day. I'm talking about old, hard knocks people that go out and work. If you look at my hands, my hands are dirty because I work.

I go and ask these politicians, our local officials, for help. They turn their backs on me. Some of the answers I get from them, I meet them in the street, and I said, Councilman Vacca, the manhole is caving in, they just got a million-dollar street re-pavement. His answer was: Fix it yourself.

So, I took that word and I used it into wisdom and I decided to work with DOT and fix it ourselves. What I say about these raises, is no, no, no. The more they hamper me, the more they kick me, I will fight. I don't want to get into
politician, and I don't like the dirty, I don't like the wasteful, $I$ don't like any of that. We need to get back to real city, to real city service people --

Now, even with the Police Department, it's all of these agencies, we've lost it. It became a political ploy. All of it is political. I see the waste is so much. It's unbelievable. I don't -- after seeing all of this -- I've been doing this for five years, putting my money in. I have worked with CPR classes. I've worked with the elderly. I go to our City Council and I said, we have people -- I stop, when I stop my vehicle and wait and I see an old lady go in the garbage can, pick some food, taste it and put it in the wagon, I cry. I found out we have no senior housing in the area. Our senior housing was turned into low income, and it was a, it was a building that was snuck in. Everything is sneaking. They sneak in. Beds go in there, and then they tell the community. Our community board, I tried working with the community board.

All I got from the community board is I'll put you on an advisory board, an advisory board. It goes in the garbage. Give me some 311
numbers. I have books of 311 numbers that, after I gave them in, $I$ don't know if they're interfering with the 311 numbers and attacking me. I've been attacked in my home. I've been attacked in my store. You're going after middle class people. This is a disgrace. I have a woman that's in The New York Times, and she said, when you're ready to give me the story, everybody is going to run. I'm also going to leave out of New York City. You have the power. I say, no, no, no, do not give any more money. Find out where this money is going.

I live on coffee and a donut for my breakfast. I live on, I'm down to minimal stuff and I get things done. My money goes into buying paint. We have done so many projects. I've worked with Montefiore Hospital. Our asthma rate was unreal. We had generators blowing poison into homes. We have the senator down the block. We have all these officials. No one took any respect and went to find out why we're dying in this community.

I've been in The New York Times. I've been in all of these newspapers. I don't want the
notoriety. I have a whole chest full of medals of saving lives. The last medal they gave me, someone said, you went out and you did that, you went out for a medal. That medal is still stuck in the wall. I threw them away. I'm a New Yorker. I want New York to live again. We became a welfare state, hand-outs, nobody wants to vote. I try to get people, we have a handful of people want to stay here. We had the first influx of people ran.

I also want to go to the community boards, which I brought it up once, a lot of racial slurs. A lot of racism is coming out of the community board. Don't let the black man win. I hate this. I hate it. And then we have all these agencies are saying racism and everything. I deploy it. I am in a mixed community from Bangladesh, Indian, Italians, you know, totally mixed community. I love it. I love it. What's happening in the communities, they do not want the community to get together. You know? I just don't know where to go with it. I'm at wit's end. I will not stop. I've been getting kicked, and kicked, and kicked. And the ones who are doing it is our local officials.

They're criminals. They're criminals. And that's it. And now you want to reward them with money? This is a disgrace. If this happens, I'm going to The New York Times and letting them know of all the incidents where money is going, \$150,000 for graffiti money. Nothing gets done. I go out with a can of paint and I take care of it. I've worked with Hurricane Sandy. Our local officials, no one came. I handled trailer truck loads of supplies, brought them down; we couldn't even get a vehicle to transport them. But then they came and they said, do you have any goods that we can put on a bus and make a show. All it became is photo op, photo op, photo op, photo op. I hate the cameras. I will not give an official the opportunity to get a photo op.

I've cleaned up East Tremont, where they had prostitution in the parking lots of Pep Boys. I cleaned up 500 of these bins that come down and people on the community boards know that it's illegal, shouldn't be doing it, they offered me $\$ 700$ to do it, and I said I wouldn't take a dime. I was on the -- with the schools, I was the treasurer. I walked around with a checkbook. They couldn't get any money out of me. Why?

They offered my the coffee and the donuts. They handed me phony bills, not because I'm God-sent, because I know right and I know wrong. I know what makes a city thrive. I know officials that are good. I use the sense that I was given. My parents were good people, hard working people. The sense $I$ have is a gut feeling sense. I can tell a politician if he's no good by just using that sense, and I stay away.

I'm not here to badger to do, but to get these politicians money and a raise -- my brother works for DEP. They haven't gotten raises.

My son is a firefighter. They haven't gotten raises. These are civil service people that are begging for raises.

They just had a fire and tried to save a baby. You know, all of these people.

My son saved, on St. Patty's Day saved a woman choking to death in a bar, and his partner. They weren't even recognized for it in the community. They weren't even recognized. I went to the firehouse and I recognized my own son, thanked him. Where are these politicians? Where are these people? You know, it's, this is appalling, it's appalling. I get so disgusted

QUADRENNIAL COMMISSION I'm going to pack up tomorrow and get out of here. I raised --

My wife was a school teacher. She died early on me and left me two babies. I was starving in my home. I was starving. I was eating toilet paper and ketchup. Toilet paper and ketchup. I went to a Catholic church, and you know what they said, after giving thousands for windows, they wanted to give me a mop and let me clean the floors. I'm proud. I wound up cashing soda bottles. I got on my feet. I had a man who his son is top man in the state police. He came with groceries, and he gave me fuel for my house. I will never feel cold, hungry, whatever. We have these politicians, they're millionaires. They get $\$ 10,000$ a month. If I had \$10,000 a month, I'd have people eating in my community.

I have people come to my -- I just had a woman, they're on, you've got to see how low, how degrading the community is. You know? The politicians don't care. They don't care. They go to our churches. I've been to every church in the area. All they look for the churches is to make a political stand. They've undermined me in
the churches. They've undermined -- I gave donations, the money I had, a stack of 20 s to our Catholic church, and Catholic church became a political thing. Out 43rd Precinct Council became a political thing. We have crime. We have crime. I just want to sum it up. I know I get on a roll. I'm very compassionate. You know, right now, I'm giving you a whole bunch of stuff. I applaud you guys. You know? Just think when you give out the money. Don't become part of the problem, become part of the cure, and think about the money. Because does the money really serve and go where it has to? Do a little investigation work. You know? Because they're well off. A lot of the politicians are well off.

I want to thank Gale Brewer. She came up with some great ideas. I watch her on TV. I watch all the politicians. Instead of sitting there at night, I kind of, I watch and see what I can learn. It's been a learning experience for me for the past five years, and I just see politics, politics, politics. The City is sinking. The City has had it. It's really had it. We have no, we have no middle class who want to be here. We're finished. The middle class is
low class. And the opportunity comes and you're rewarding politicians. Don't do that.

I'd like to see term limits -- really like to see term limits. Everybody is slipping in. These guys are coming out with pensions that could choke a horse. They come out -- if they had any decency, they would retire, go to Florida, take the millions and leave. They want to run for more terms.

Come on, you did the damage. You hurt us. This is a great city, the best city in the world.

Listen. Thank you. I'm sorry I got on the soapbox. But you know what, after they spoke, they're higher echelon, I get to meet people and I ask them, what do you like about the politicians? Nothing. Corruption. They're no good. They're no good. They're no good. So, I said, vote. We don't even have voters anymore. The majority, the minority is the votes. If you get five people that come to vote, they don't want to go out and vote. We lost it. So, you get five people that come out and vote, this is what you got, and that's why the same ones keep in office and keep in office.

I tried getting on the community board, and
they didn't want me on there, because I'm a hard worker, been on a community board. They don't want my neighbor, who's a Port Authority cop in the K 9 unit. They didn't want him. They don't want you. They want a 16-year-old with no life experience that they can replace, whatever it is. Community board applications should be put in a drum and turned, number 63, like bingo, they're on there. And that's the fair way. Not the qualifications. I have an over-qualified, I'm not the person they want me to be. You know? It should be a selective thing. A lot of people said that, number, 33, bingo. You are on. And the community board members, we have some of them, their character, $I$ don't want to get into it. I don't even want to get into their character. Appalling. You know? So, there's a lot that's to do here. It's the whole system. It's from here all the way down. It's broken. It's broken. Don't reward them with the money, please. Please. I know you're great people. I know it. Take this in heart. Do not reward them with the money. Fix some of it first, and then you reward. You're rewarding -- you're rewarding people for doing bad.

And like Virginia said, come over to some of these community board meetings. When I go over and try to speak at a community board meeting, they intimidate me -- three minutes, three minutes, three minutes. After they keep saying that, my three minutes is gone; right?

The last time, last meeting I said I'd like to give my three minutes to Igitio, because he's on specific topics that help the community.

They deny me. They deny me. They stop my e-mails. They want me to go away. I can't go away. I can't. I can't go away. I gotta be civil. I gotta be whatever it is, but I can't go away, because the love, the love for my community and my borough is there. I can't see the -- I can't see everything else. I gotta stop, because I just have a lot of -- I see, I trust in you. You know the gut feeling I bring home? The gut feeling is, you guys make the decision.

MR. SCHWARZ: Great.
MR. ROCCO: All right. Make it based on the little person that has to deal with the old lady that's starving, that falls in the snow and I gotta get her home, and the ones that don't have the voice. The one I brought to a community
board meeting, and they said that she is stupid, and this was appalling, she was trying to fix some kind of intersection problem. They claim she was stupid, we doesn't know what she's saying. She just survived a stroke, and if she's stupid and you don't understand what you're saying, we have provisions, you get an interpreter. But don't degrade people. Our BID -- you know what our BID said? They said, you are, they said the people in the community are pigs. So, if you were in my community, they would be calling you a pig. I took a personal insult. We never asked them for anything. We gave. And they think of us as pigs, and that's an old establishment where it was set up with nobody in the community. Councilman is on there. The BID has got the room. Click, and no one representing the community inside is on there.

So, everything is closed, closed, closed. Fixed. Unfix it. Don't reward them with money. And again: No, no, no. Thank you.
(Continued on the next page.) desirous of testifying? (Pause) MR. SCHWARZ: So, we are closed. Thank you, Mr. Reporter, for your patience. (Whereupon, at 7:28 P.M., the above matter concluded.)

I, ROBERT X. SHAW, CSR, a Notary Public for and within the State of New York, do hereby certify that the above is a correct transcription of my stenographic notes.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { deploy }[1]-96: 17 \\ & \text { depressing }[1]-14: 20 \\ & \text { deputy }[1]-59: 8 \\ & \text { describe }[1]-45: 14 \\ & \text { described }[1]-53: 13 \\ & \text { describing }[1]-87: 1 \\ & \text { deserve }[1]-73: 16 \\ & \text { deserved }[1]-10: 14 \\ & \text { desire }[1]-7: 19 \\ & \text { desirous }[1]-105: 2 \\ & \text { desperately }[1]-40: 19 \\ & \text { detected }[1]-91: 10 \\ & \text { determinant }[1]-46: 5 \\ & \text { determination }[3]- \\ & 7: 18,21: 1,23: 21 \\ & \text { determine }[1]-12: 3 \\ & \text { determining }[1]-54: 16 \\ & \text { devised }[1]-78: 1 \\ & \text { devoted }[2]-25: 22, \\ & 47: 18 \\ & \text { devotion }[1]-4: 14 \\ & \text { dialogue }[1]-32: 17 \\ & \text { did it }[2]-48: 11,48: 12 \\ & \text { did you }[2]-68: 1,68: 8 \\ & \text { died }[1]-99: 3 \\ & \text { difference }[1]-77: 5 \\ & \text { differences }[1]-87: 4 \\ & \text { difficult }[3]-11: 18, \\ & 34: 7,34: 14 \\ & \text { Dilan }[1]-72: 18 \\ & \text { diligent }[1]-62: 19 \\ & \text { diligently }[1]-93: 9 \\ & \text { dime }[3]-92: 18,93: 2, \\ & 97: 22 \\ & \text { direct }[1]-17: 22 \\ & \text { director }[1]-59: 7 \\ & \text { Director }[1]-1: 14 \\ & \text { dirty }[2]-93: 13,94: 1 \\ & \text { disclosure }[7]-63: 4, \\ & 63: 20,68: 14,68: 15, \\ & 69: 13,71: 8,71: 10 \\ & \text { disclosures }[1]-69: 22 \\ & \text { discrepancy }[1]-78: 14 \\ & \text { discretion }[2]-21: 11, \\ & 75: 23 \\ & \text { discretionary }[5]- \\ & 60: 20,73: 5,73: 15, \\ & 73: 17,73: 23 \\ & \text { discuss }[1]-23: 10 \\ & \text { discussed }[2]-18: 18, \\ & 59: 14 \\ & \text { discussing }[1]-10: 6 \\ & \text { discussion }[6]-4: 4, \\ & \text { 19:17, 49:9, 51:4, 52:2, } \\ & \text { 81:5 } \\ & \text { discussions }[1]-5: 17 \\ & \text { disgrace }[2]-95: 7,97: 3 \\ & \text { disgusted }[1]-98: 25 \\ & \text { dish }[1]-88: 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { dishonest [1] - 21:19 } \\ \text { disparities }[1]-15: 11 \\ \text { disparity }[6]-4: 17, \\ 8: 22,9: 25,27: 7,27: 10, \\ \text { 28:4 } \\ \text { disrespect }[1]-90: 4 \\ \text { dissect }[1]-86: 15 \\ \text { disservice }[1]-3: 2 \\ \text { distinguish [1] - 78:1 } \\ \text { distortion }[1]-34: 12 \\ \text { distributes }[1]-63: 7 \\ \text { distributions }[1]-26: 4 \\ \text { district }[4]-15: 10,25: 4, \\ 62: 6,65: 3 \\ \text { District }[2]-27: 3,83: 3 \\ \text { districts }[3]-48: 22, \\ \text { 55:2, 92:14 } \\ \text { disturbing }[2]-70: 24, \\ 71: 5 \\ \text { divisions }[1]-27: 8 \\ \text { do you }[9]-13: 8,29: 11, \\ 31: 8,55: 6,63: 17,67: 8, \\ 90: 20,97: 12,101: 15 \\ \text { dodge }[3]-21: 7,69: 11, \\ 69: 12 \\ \text { doesn't }[12]-14: 3, \\ \text { 14:4, 17:3, 18:21, } 36: 12, \\ 38: 25,49: 15,71: 2, \\ 75: 12,83: 22,104: 4 \\ \text { dollar }[2]-7: 6,93: 19 \\ \text { dollars }[1]-68: 11 \\ \text { donat }[1]-68: 8 \\ \text { donated }[2]-67: 18, \\ 68: 11 \\ \text { donations }[1]-100: 2 \\ \text { donut }[1]-95: 14 \\ \text { donuts }[1]-98: 1 \\ \text { doors }[1]-21: 14 \\ \text { DOT }[1]-93: 22 \\ \text { dozen }[1]-40: 10 \\ \text { drafted }[1]-58: 3 \\ \text { dramatically }[1]-30: 14 \\ \text { drive }[1]-7: 17 \\ \text { drum }[1]-102: 8 \\ \text { due }[2]-75: 23,83: 24 \\ \text { duties }[2]-27: 16,34: 18 \\ \text { duty }[1]-87: 18 \\ \text { dying }[1]-95: 22 \\ \text { dynamic }[1]-8: 12 \\ \hline \text { E-G-I-D-I-O }[1]-84: 22 \\ \text { e-mails }[1]-103: 11 \\ \text { early }[3]-38: 11,38: 12, \\ \text { 99:4 } \\ \text { earn }[3]-24: 15,36: 8, \\ 37: 2 \\ \text { earned }[7]-45: 1,63: 2, \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ```63:16, 63:21, 71:15, 71:17, 72:23 earning [4] - 11:6, 27:12, 44:22, 64:6 earnings [1] - 64:12 earns [1] - 16:22 earth [2]-63:17, 68:25 easier [1] - 12:9 East [1] - 97:17 easy [1] - 69:19 eating [2] - 99:6, 99:17 echelon [1]-101:14 echoes [3] - 6:5, 6:6 economic [3]-15:6, 15:16, 42:2 EDC [1] - 55:3 editorial [1]-12:7 effect [1]-37:9 effective [1] - 41:16 effectively [1] - 10:23 efficient [1] - 7:6 effort [1] - 65:15 Egidio [2]-1:21, 79:24 eight [1] - 45:8 elderly [1] - 94:12 elect [1] - 83:13 elected [25] - 11:5, 11:9, 14:23, 15:4, 16:22, 17:10, 19:22, 22:6, 23:11, 24:15, 33:23, 36:16, 39:15, 41:13, 41:18, 42:10, 52:18, 66:23, 70:21, 74:2, 82:23, 85:8, 87:19, 88:13 ELECTED [1] - 1:2 election [2] - 38:16, 40:2 Elections [1] - 47:17 element [1] - 48:9 elements [1]-45:15 elevate [1]-25:9 Eleven [3]-76:21, 91:8, 91:11 eligible [1] - 67:9 eliminate [1] - 66:19 eliminating \([5]\) - 66:9, 66:16, 67:3, 67:15, 73:5 elimination [1] - 43:16 elite [1] - \(84: 2\) elitist [1]-84:2 else's [1] - 38:2 employ [1] - 20:5 employed [1] - 78:12 employee [2]-10:2, 88:8 employees [6] - 6:17, 11:12, 12:11, 18:11, 34:22, 82:17 employer [2] - 63:21,``` | ```77:14 employers [2] - 72:25, 77:13 employment [2] - 20:10, 72:1 employs [1] - 82:8 empty [1] - 66:11 enacted [1] - 38:16 enacts [1]-43:10 encompass [1] - 68:24 encouraging \([1]-8: 15\) end [8] - 3:16, 13:23, 61:11, 74:13, 76:24, 79:9, 89:19, 96:23 endlessly [1] - 7:20 enforce [1]-27:1 enforcement [1]-24:22 enterprise [1]-7:4 entity [1] - 8:23 environment [1] - 84:6 equation [1]-17:9 equivalence [1] - 17:12 equivalent [1] - 17:13 Eric [3]-33:11, 61:2, 72:18 error [1] - 20:11 escalating [1] - 7:20 Esq [1]-1:25 essentially [1] -85:6 established [1] - 36:22 establishment [2] - 85:24, 104:15 estate [5] - 54:13, 54:15, 63:7 Estimate [4]-52:2, 52:5, 52:7, 52:10 et \([3]-47: 17,54: 23\), 55:3 ethnicities [1] - 81:2 evaluate [1] - 38:21 evaluated [1] - 73:12 eventually [1] - 43:20 Everest [1] - 53:24 everybody [4]-2:1, 8:18, 95:9, 101:4 everyday [2]-27:9, 27:11 exacerbate [2] - 8:22, 17:3 exactly [4] - 19:3, 77:4, 77:11, 86:7 example [9] - 3:2, 3:4, 20:8, 50:2, 55:21, 78:5, 78:9, 78:23 excellent [2] - 44:4, 53:21 except [2] - 36:10, 41:24 exception [1] - 34:3``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```exchanged [1] - 75:11 excuse [1] - 54:1 executive [1] - 8:17 executives [1] - 10:1 exempted [1] - 20:6 exhortation [1] - 31:15 exists [2] - 15:13, 17:21 expect [2] - 11:10, 25:13 expense [4]-57:1, 57:4, 58:12, 59:25 experience [5] - 48:8, 74:3, 85:11, 100:20, 102:6 experts [1] - 74:6 explain [2] - 6:10, 59:4 expose [1]-56:6 expressed [1] - 69:5 extent [1] - 55:24 extra [1] - 47:8 extract [1] - 89:5 extremely [2]-44:10, 62:20 \\ FNone``` | ```Federal [1] - 14:7 feedback [1] - 3:11 feel [16] - 6:22, 7:15, 7:22, 8:2, 18:15, 19:20, 20:5, 22:6, 26:23, 39:14, 45:20, 50:22, 62:24, 65:13, 92:19, 99:14 feeling [3]-98:7, 103:18, 103:19 feels [1] - 41:1 feet [1] - 99:11 fewer [1]-30:15 fidgets [1]-22:9 fifth [1] - 38:13 fight \({ }_{[1]}\) - 93:25 figure [1]-26:21 figures [2]-10:7, 28:24 file [4] - 17:15, 25:4, 90:20, 91:1 fill [1] - 69:1 filled [1] - 2:18 filling \([1]\) - 76:5 filth [1]-92:21 final [1] - 89:20 finalize \({ }^{[1]}-84: 16\) finance [3]-58:25, 59:11, 61:9 finances [1] - 8:11 financial [7]-30:1, 30:3, 42:6, 65:10, 65:23, 71:9, 79:6 find \([11]-8: 9,13: 16\), 35:23, 51:12, 57:17, 58:5, 61:12, 82:15, 90:24, 95:12, 95:22 finding \([1]-25: 23\) fine [1]-83:19 fined [1] - 72:18 finish [1] - 57:14 finished [1] - 100:25 fire [1] - 98:16 Fire [1] - 93:8 firefighter [3]-91:11, 92:3, 98:13 firefighters [1]-24:2 firehouse [1] - 98:22 firm [1] - 63:24 first [20] - 4:10, 4:12, 6:6, 23:9, 33:3, 35:4, 41:17, 41:21, 51:3, 51:18, 54:20, 57:13, 58:17, 65:3, 76:13, 76:14, 77:13, 84:25, 96:9, 102:23 fits [1] - 24:9 five [15] - 2:19, 36:5, 36:10, 46:4, 46:8, 49:11, 52:13, 52:15, 66:18, 77:9, 92:8, 94:10,``` | ```100:21, 101:20, 101:22 fix [4] - 93:20, 93:22, 102:23, 104:2 fixed [1] - 104:20 flawed [1] - 14:11 flaws [1] - 14:4 floors [1] - 99:10 Florida [1] - 101:8 focused [2] - 30:4, 51:23 focusing [1] -58:17 follow [3]-24:11, 34:11, 92:6 followed [2]-67:17, 68:6 followed-up [1] - 68:6 following [4]-4:15, 34:2, 34:16, 39:10 follows [1] - 67:24 food [1] - 94:15 forgetting [1]-89:15 forgive [1] - 90:3 form [5] - 24:21, 64:3, 64:4, 68:15, 69:1 formal [1] - 5:18 former [4]-32:18, 72:13, 72:17, 77:14 forms [4]-63:20, 68:14, 69:13, 69:15 forth [1] - 38:7 forthcoming [1] - 40:2 forward [2]-26:13, 62:9 found [4] - 35:19, 51:12, 81:6, 94:16 founded [1] - 4:7 four [7]-3:7, 11:25, 33:6, 33:16, 33:22, 83:11, 84:12 frankly [2] - 18:18, 70:7 free [2] - 7:2, 45:20 frequently [1] - 4:16 Friedlander [2]-1:13, 2:5 FRIEDLANDER [1] - 56:9 Fritz [1] - 1:10 front [1] - 59:24 fuel [1] - 99:13 full [26] - 7:10, 42:20, 43:6, 43:11, 43:17, 44:2, 44:3, 44:15, 45:13, 45:16, 46:12, 46:18, 47:2, 47:23, 71:8, 71:24, 75:8, 75:10, 75:11, 75:13, 75:14, 81:25, 82:1, 84:21, 86:2, 96:1 full-career [1] - 86:2 full-time [20]-42:20,``` | ```43:6, 43:11, 43:17, 44:2, 44:3, 44:15, 45:13, 45:16, 46:12, 47:2, 47:23, 71:24, 75:8, 75:10, 75:11, 75:13, 75:14, 81:25, 82:1 fully [1] - 34:13 fun [1] - 4:3 function [2]-51:16, 63:22 fund \([2]\) - 60:14, 73:6 funded [3]-26:5, 60:11, 82:6 funding \([4]-73: 15\), 73:17, 73:18, 75:23 funds [3] - 26:4, 29:20, 73:24 funny [2] - 44:11, 44:16 future \([8]-5: 9,23: 1\), 24:6, 31:15, 38:3, 43:10, 73:4, 79:15```G <br> gain $[2]-11: 13,74: 3$ <br> gains [1] - 20:12 <br> Gale $[14]: 1: 19,32: 8$, <br> $32: 25,33: 13,37: 15$, <br> $46: 9,49: 17,56: 14,59: 9$, <br> $74: 9,75: 24,78: 19,83: 9$, <br> 100:16 <br> gamut $[1]-30: 24$ <br> Gansevoort $[1]-55: 14$ <br> gap $[1]-8: 16$ <br> garbage $[2]-94: 15$, <br> 94:25 <br> GARCIA $[1]-70: 9$ <br> Gardner $[1]-4: 7$ <br> gave $[10]-23: 25,35: 24$, <br> $36: 2,50: 3,70: 10,95: 2$, <br> $96: 2,99: 13,100: 1$, <br> 104:14 <br> Gene $[2]-33: 12,45: 3$ <br> generality $[1]-29: 12$ <br> generators [1] - $95: 19$ <br> genius $[2]-56: 1,56: 3$ <br> gentleman $[1]-44: 11$ <br> gets $[2]-92: 9,97: 6$ <br> give $[17]-67: 1,71: 12$, <br> $71: 18,71: 21,75: 7,77: 8$, <br> $84: 21,91: 13,94: 25$, <br> $95: 9,95: 12,97: 15,99: 9$, <br> $100: 10,103: 8$ <br> given $[16]-9: 5,21: 11$, <br> $26: 19,35: 20,36: 22$, <br> $37: 1,37: 23,39: 14,62: 5$, <br> $64: 18,64: 22,75: 20$, <br> $76: 15,91: 6,93: 2,98: 5$ <br> gives $[1]-33: 10$ <br> giving [8] - 3:5, $7: 13$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



|  | ```28:14, 29:7 interests [2] - 53:17, 54:14 interfering [1] - 95:3 interpreter [1] - 104:8 interrupt [2] - 4:3, 32:20 interrupted [2]-32:18, 41:5 intersection [1] - 104:3 intertwine [1] - 87:15 interview [1] - 67:25 intimidate [1] - 103:4 introduce [4]-2:3, 31:25, 41:15, 57:10 introduced [1] - 57:10 introducing [1] - 4:9 investigation [1] - 100:14 invite [1] - 88:23 invited [1] - 5:12 involved [2] - 25:13, 47:25 iota [1] - 92:3 ironic [1] - 43:22 irrelevant [2]-30:16, 61:19 is that [12]-11:24, 11:25, 18:22, 22:25, 52:12, 58:18, 59:20, 63:10, 75:5, 85:8, 87:17, 92:7 is there [2] - 7:2, 103:15 is this [3]-23:15, 90:6, 90:20 ISLAND [1] - 1:6 Island [4]-2:16, 52:17, 53:17, 57:25 issue [16] - 8:15, 12:17, 19:6, 39:8, 39:9, 40:3, 46:7, 49:5, 50:13, 54:16, 54:17, 56:21, 71:23, 89:23, 90:1 issues [6] - 7:15, 16:18, 32:24, 47:15, 54:21, 74:6 Italians [1] - 96:18 \\ J \\ James [1] - 76:12 \\ Jane [1] - 16:22 \\ January [2] - 38:16, 41:16 \\ Jeff [3] - 1:13, 55:25, 56:6 \\ Jeffrey [1]-2:5 \\ Jill [4]-1:11, 2:4, 9:3, 31:8 \\ \(\operatorname{Jim}[6]-1: 25,57: 9\), 58:21, 58:22, 59:6 Jimmy [1] - 57:24``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { job }[46]-26: 11,34: 14, \\ 38: 22,42: 13,42: 16, \\ 42: 19,43: 5,44: 4,44: 18, \\ 44: 23,45: 12,46: 1,48: 9, \\ 72: 2,74: 24,75: 1,77: 5, \\ 77: 7,77: 11,77: 18, \\ 77: 22,77: 23,78: 2,78: 3, \\ 78: 21,78: 25,79: 1, \\ 83: 14,83: 17,83: 18, \\ 83: 19,83: 20,85: 9, \\ 85: 12,86: 8,86: 9,86: 12, \\ 86: 13,86: 14,86: 22, \\ 87: 8,88: 12,88: 14,88: 15 \\ \text { jobs }[5]-17: 13,44: 8, \\ \text { 45:18, } 72: 2,76: 21 \\ \text { Joe }[1]-16: 21 \\ \text { John }[1]-4: 7 \\ \text { joined }[2]-52: 15,78: 11 \\ \text { judge }[1]-42: 13 \\ \text { judges }[2]-3: 23,3: 24 \\ \text { judiciary }[1]-8: 6 \\ \text { jump }[2]-18: 14,27: 4 \\ \text { jumped }[1]-73: 11 \\ \text { June }[1]-73: 9 \\ \text { justify }[1]-83: 22 \\ \hline \\ \hline \quad \text { K } \\ \hline \quad \text { L } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | ```53:14, 53:20, 53:21, 54:7, 54:21, 55:19, 59:2, 59:8 Lane [2] - 33:11, 61:2 large [6] - 3:14, 27:4, 35:17, 48:4, 82:6 larger [1] - 82:20 largest [5] - 36:5, 81:7, 81:8, 81:9, 81:10 Larry [1] - 72:14 last [12]-19:1, 34:4, 34:20, 35:7, 36:25, 56:1, 63:8, 74:17, 77:24, 96:2, 103:7 lastly [2] - 72:23, 74:2 late [4]-26:1, 30:12, 32:7, 32:10 lauding [1] \(-31: 16\) Laura [1]-2:6 law [8]-24:22, 34:11, 38:9, 38:18, 39:10, 39:17, 43:12, 49:18 LAW [1] - 1:5 lawyer [2]-56:1, 83:7 lax [2] - 69:14, 69:15 lazy [1] - 6:18 lead [1] - 72:8 leaders [1] - 8:23 lean [3]-23:10, 23:18, 60:8 learn [1] - 100:20 learning [1] - 100:20 leave [3]-72:4, 95:10, 101:8 leaving [1] - 46:9 legal \([3]\) - 11:16, 27:5, 39:8 legislation [4] - 37:10, 41:15, 42:11, 57:10 legislative [1] - 80:5 legislators [1] - 8:8 legislature \({ }_{[1]}-8: 7\) legitimate [1] - 40:3 length \([1]\) - 34:19 Lerner [6] - 1:17, 4:5, 4:9, 34:6, 41:23, 53:12 LERNER [30]-4:11, 6:13, 9:16, 9:21, 13:11, 14:14, 14:16, 15:14, 16:3, 16:15, 17:8, 20:20, 22:3, 23:6, 24:25, 26:17, 28:10, 28:25, 29:6, 29:15, 30:19, 31:12, 31:24, 62:1, 62:7, 62:13, 62:15, 69:11, 69:15, 70:2 let's [8]-25:9, 31:20, 77:1, 78:9, 78:16, 87:2, 88:4 letter [2] - 19:1, 64:16``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ```letters [1] - 3:3 letting [5] - 5:10, 44:15, 45:22, 64:14, 97:4 level \({ }_{[7]}-5: 24,25: 15\), 28:1, 36:13, 69:22, 78:13, 84:14 levels [5] - 12:20, 21:19, 26:3, 42:16, 78:10 life [3]-25:22, 91:17, 102:5 limited [2] - 11:5, 11:21 limiting [1] - 37:11 limits [6] - 39:12, 40:10, 40:14, 41:2, 101:3, 101:4 line \([4]-10: 14,54: 20\), 85:19, 85:20 list [4]-56:15, 67:1, 75:2 listed [2] - 36:17, 63:21 listen [1] - 101:12 listening [1] - 74:5 live [5] - \(2: 15,55: 22\), 95:14, 95:15, 96:6 lived [1] - 72:21 lives [1] - 96:2 living [13] - 10:15, 11:10, 12:2, 12:5, 13:3, 13:4, 20:2, 22:21, 34:21, 34:24, 72:23, 85:19, 92:2 loads [1] - 97:10 lobby [1] - 65:11 local [7]-43:12, 48:23, 91:18, 93:6, 93:14, 96:25, 97:8 located [2] - 54:22, 91:15 location [1] - 2:10 LONG [1] - 1:6 longest [1]-33:25 looks [2] - 54:3, 84:3 Los [1] - 36:7 lost \([4]\) - 76:21, 85:23, 94:6, 101:21 lot [27] - 9:4, 9:12, 10:22, 15:11, 39:15, 47:15, 47:17, 49:9, 51:5, 51:6, 53:3, 53:5, 55:23, 57:2, 57:14, 57:15, 57:18, 57:20, 80:9, 92:19, 92:23, 96:12, 96:13, 100:15, 102:12, 102:18, 103:17 lots [1] - 97:18 loud [1] - 14:17 louder [1] - 66:11 Louis [1]-1:22 love [4] - 96:19, 103:14 loved [1] - 47:12 low [3] - 94:18, 99:20,``` | 101:1 <br> lower [2] - 28:1, 81:1 <br> lowered [1] - 42:7 <br> lowest [1] - 36:9 <br> lowly [1] - 10:11 <br> LULU [3] - 66:3, 68:16, 89:16 <br> LULUs [39] - 10:19, 20:18, 21:24, 23:4, <br> 26:23, 31:19, 42:18, <br> 42:20, 43:1, 43:4, 43:16, <br> 47:24, 50:12, 50:23, <br> 65:25, 66:1, 66:6, 66:9, <br> 66:16, 66:19, 66:22, <br> 66:25, 67:4, 67:9, 67:13, <br> 67:15, 67:18, 68:4, 68:7, <br> 68:24, 69:12, 70:23, <br> 74:22, 74:25, 75:7, <br> 89:13, 89:14, 89:15, <br> 89:16 <br> lunch [1] - 7:2 | ```37:2, 41:9, 41:13, 50:3, 52:24, 56:11, 56:23, 58:14, 60:19, 63:11, 66:8 Mayor's [1] - 65:8 mayors [2] - 34:11, 36:7 McMahon [1] - 43:24 mean [15] - 14:6, 14:7, 14:18, 24:25, 37:18, 38:4, 39:16, 53:3, 56:10, 61:16, 62:5, 78:22, 80:21, 87:24, 89:19 meaning [1] - 6:2 meaningful [1] - 21:4 means [2]-51:5, 86:11 meant [4]-28:8, 62:2, 86:5, 86:6 measure [2] - 14:22, 16:9 medal [3] - 96:2, 96:4 medals [1] - 96:1 media [1] - 73:20 median [21] - 13:6, 13:13, 14:1, 14:2, 14:10, 14:20, 14:21, 14:24, 14:25, 15:3, 15:8, 15:9, 15:18, 15:23, 15:24, 16:6, 16:8, 16:10, 16:14, 16:20, 17:11 medicine [1] - 92:4 meet \([7]\) - 11:25, 46:22, 47:19, 47:20, 80:1, 93:16, 101:14 meeting [6] - 46:10, 46:17, 88:19, 103:3, 103:7, 104:1 meetings [5] - 47:6, 54:4, 72:4, 74:5, 103:2 member [14]-42:17, 42:19, 45:15, 49:1, 49:3, 65:3, 66:15, 67:2, 68:1, 72:13, 72:16, 72:17, 72:18, 72:22 Member [8]-1:18, 33:18, 53:9, 57:12, 63:1, 64:10, 66:7, 70:3 Members [5] - 10:13, 50:11, 53:19, 54:8, 72:10 members [30] - 3:12, 10:10, 18:1, 18:12, 18:20, 24:14, 25:1, 25:5, 29:8, 37:1, 42:22, 43:2, 43:8, 43:23, 47:25, 48:4, 53:18, 57:17, 58:6, 65:22, 66:4, 66:5, 66:8, 66:19, 67:9, 71:11, 71:15, 71:16, 73:7, 102:14 Members' [1] - 51:6 memory [3]-60:15, 61:19, 61:20``` | ```mention [1] - 67:6 mentioned [15] - 15:23, 15:25, 16:17, 17:2, 18:25, 22:16, 24:11, 24:18, 24:22, 51:19, 64:18, 64:22, 72:7, 83:16, 89:22 mentioning [1] - 64:9 merit [1] - 72:6 Messinger [1] - 33:19 metrics [1] - 49:2 mid [1] - 40:25 mid-2014 [1] - 35:3 mid-session [1]-40:25 middle [5] - 16:7, 35:3, 95:6, 100:24, 100:25 midpoint [1] - 16:3 midst [1] \(-34: 9\) Miguel [1] - 72:13 MIH [1] - 53:25 Mike [1] - 43:24 million [4] - 73:10, 73:12, 93:19 million-dollar [1] - 93:19 millionaires [1] - 99:16 millions [1] - 101:8 mind [3] - 4:2, 84:13, 86:22 mind-set [1] - 84:13 mindful [1] - 8:13 mine \({ }_{[1]}\) - 91:23 minimal [1] - 95:15 minimum [1] - 46:21 minority [1] - 101:19 minus [1] - 13:9 minutes [8]-22:17, 46:8, 49:11, 103:4, 103:5, 103:6, 103:8 missed [1] - 93:11 mixed [3] - 70:20, 96:17, 96:19 model [1] - 19:21 modeled [1]-26:8 modeling [1] - 12:11 modest [2] - 36:6, 36:23 moment [1] - 14:15 money [39]-6:3, 6:20, 7:1, 10:20, 10:25, 19:13, 65:12, 66:17, 68:8, 73:11, 73:22, 82:20, 88:2, 91:23, 91:24, 91:25, 92:7, 92:8, 92:10, 92:11, 92:24, 93:1, 94:10, 95:12, 95:16, 97:3, 97:5, 97:6, 97:25, 98:11, 100:2, 100:10, 100:12, 102:20, 102:23, 104:20``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  | ```56:22 shared [1] - 51:6 shares [1] - 56:10 SHAW [2] - 105:10, 105:15 she's [2] - 104:4, 104:5 shift [4]-16:3, 16:4, 16:12, 80:9 shifted [1] - 83:5 shortfall [1] - 23:14 show [6] - 46:7, 46:17, 49:11, 68:19, 86:13, 97:13 shows [1] - 35:24 shrunk [1] - 46:25 sight [1] - 7:21 sign [2] - 49:11, 49:12 significant [3]-29:23, 43:6, 51:16 signing [1] - 46:8 signings [1] - 57:19 signs [1] - 91:21 single [3] - 81:8, 81:10, 83:23 sinking [1] - 100:23 sit [2] - 52:6, 69:17 site [1]-51:10 sits [1] - 46:9 sitting [1] - 100:18 situation [5]-8:16, 11:18, 15:4, 23:12, 25:13 six [3] - 40:9, 46:4, 53:20 sizable [1] - 18:4 size [6] - 15:24, 24:9, 29:17, 64:19, 64:23, 65:20 skill [1] - 27:17 skilled [2] - 10:23, 30:3 skills [1] - 29:24 skip [1] - 39:16 slight [1]-12:4 slightly [3]-29:1, 36:13, 46:25 slipping [1] - 101:4 slurs [1] - 96:13 smaller [4]-12:8, 22:17, 41:21, 81:3 sneak [1] - 94:20 sneaking [1] - 94:20 snow [1] - 103:23 snuck [1] - 94:19 so-called [1] - 6:16 soapbox [1] - 101:13 society [3] - 8:14, 20:4, 26:8 soda [1] - 99:11 solely [1] - 81:25 solid [2]-27:17, 31:20``` | ```somebody [6] - 10:16, 17:16, 25:21, 29:23, 39:19, 90:25 somehow [1] - 6:19 someone [6] - 17:5, 39:22, 68:16, 78:12, 87:2, 96:3 somewhat [5] - 11:3, 27:2, 31:3, 46:13, 84:5 son [4]-98:13, 98:18, 98:22, 99:12 sophistication [1] - 29:21 sorry \([8]-5: 8,32: 6\), 50:13, 70:21, 77:17, 85:15, 88:18, 101:12 Sorry [1] - 64:21 sort [5] - 6:5, 6:6, 17:20, 38:25 sorts [1] - 5:11 speak [2] - 64:14, 103:3 speaker [4]-3:4, 19:1, 21:12, 53:11 speaker's [1] - 49:8 SPEAKERS \({ }_{[1]}-1: 16\) speaking [4]-5:22, 87:8, 87:9, 87:23 speaks [1] - 66:11 specific [2] - \(3: 5,103: 9\) specifically \([1]-32: 2\) specifics [1]-9:2 spell [1] - 84:20 spelling [1] \(-84: 21\) spend [3]-7:1, 9:12, 92:18 spending [3] - 60:5, 73:6, 73:11 spent [2]-6:3, 10:21 sphere [3]-8:1, 17:21, 17:24 spoke [2] - 58:10, 101:13 sponsor [1] - 58:6 spread [2]-80:15, 80:17 SQUARE [1] - 1:5 Square [1] - 91:16 St [1] - 98:18 stability [1]-20:9 stack [1] - 100:2 Staff [1] - 1:18 staff [25] - 10:10, 10:24, 18:2, 18:21, 18:23, 24:14, 25:1, 25:4, 30:3, 47:20, 49:8, 51:22, 52:9, 53:10, 53:11, 53:14, 53:21, 58:5, 65:11, 78:9, 82:6, 82:7, 82:20, 86:10, 86:11``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { staffing }[3]-10: 21, \\ & 51: 14,51: 16 \\ & \text { stake }[1]-90: 8 \\ & \text { stand }[1]-99: 25 \\ & \text { standard }[2]-13: 12, \\ & 13: 17 \\ & \text { stands }[1]-92: 17 \\ & \text { start }[2]-27: 22,80: 4 \\ & \text { started }[8]-13: 20, \\ & 19: 14,19: 20,76: 13, \\ & 76: 14,77: 2,77: 3,77: 23 \\ & \text { starting }[1]-28: 17 \\ & \text { startled }[1]-27: 2 \\ & \text { starving }[3]-99: 5, \\ & \text { 103:23 } \\ & \text { State }[2]-21: 17,105: 11 \\ & \text { state }[5]-52: 18,57: 24, \\ & 69: 22,96: 7,99: 12 \\ & \text { state-elected }[1]-52: 18 \\ & \text { stated }[5]-4: 14,37: 10, \\ & 39: 11,67: 13,88: 7 \\ & \text { statement }[2]-9: 4,11: 7 \\ & \text { statements }[1]-6: 7 \\ & \text { Staten }[4]-2: 16,52: 17, \\ & 53: 17,57: 25 \\ & \text { States }[1]-36: 6 \\ & \text { statistic }[1]-28: 15 \\ & \text { status }[4]-8: 3,43: 17, \\ & 75: 8,75: 10 \\ & \text { statutory }[1]-72: 2 \\ & \text { stay }[3]-49: 15,96: 9, \\ & 98: 9 \\ & \text { stayed }[1]-8: 1 \\ & \text { stealing }[1]-72: 24 \\ & \text { stenographic }[1]- \\ & 105: 13 \\ & \text { step }[2]-92: 22,92: 23 \\ & \text { stereotype }[1]-6: 24 \\ & \text { stimulate }[1]-4: 4 \\ & \text { stipend }[1]-67: 20 \\ & \text { stipends }[6]-10: 19, \\ & 20: 18,22: 11,42: 17, \\ & 42: 23,42: 24 \\ & \text { stop }[5]-94: 13,96: 23, \\ & \text { 103:10, 103:16 } \\ & \text { store }[1]-95: 5 \\ & \text { storefront }[1]-48: 12 \\ & \text { story }[1]-95: 9 \\ & \text { straight }[2]-20: 21, \\ & 21: 9 \\ & \text { strange }[1]-62: 10 \\ & \text { street }[3]-58: 2,93: 17, \\ & 93: 19 \\ & \text { streets }[1]-92: 20 \\ & \text { strengthened }[1]- \\ & 30: 25 \\ & \text { stressing }[1]-32: 15 \\ & \text { Stringer }[1]-53: 7 \\ & \text { stroke }[1]-104: 5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  | ```sweeten [1]-22:15 system [13]-11:12, 22:19, 23:7, 24:7, 27:22, 38:9, 46:19, 77:25, 80:5, 80:13, 80:14, 80:24, 102:18 systems [1] - 25:25 T table [1] - 66:6 takes [2]-39:22, 40:2 Talia [1] - 1:18 talk [8]-8:5, 23:19, 45:21, 45:22, 45:24, 52:13, 88:4 talked [4]-9:10, 9:23, 20:15, 49:20 talking [12] - 10:11, 11:5, 17:19, 17:23, 17:25, 19:12, 25:3, 39:23, 39:25, 45:18, 92:13, 93:11 taste [1] - 94:15 tax [1] - 19:13 taxes [1]-6:20 taxpayer \([3]-6: 2,6: 16\), 11:2 taxpayers [3] - 6:16, 19:14, 43:8 teacher [2]-17:16, 99:3 teachers [1]-24:2 team [2]-50:4, 61:9 tease [1]-3:24 technology [2]-47:9, 47:10 television [1] - 49:13 telling \([2]\) - 32:17, 75:9 ten [3]-12:15, 67:13, 91:9 tend [1]-25:1 tension [2]-6:1, 8:12 term [12]-38:2, 39:12, 40:10, 40:13, 41:2, 41:18, 64:2, 75:18, 76:13, 76:14, 101:3, 101:4 terminology [1]-8:25 terms [14]-8:11, 9:21, 16:25, 17:13, 19:21, 19:24, 19:25, 29:19, 41:20, 48:6, 51:14, 52:3, 53:24, 101:9 terrible [1] - 56:4 tested [1] - 40:6 testified [2] - 65:12, 72:3 testifies [1] - 72:5 testify \([1]\) - 74:6 testifying [1] - 105:2``` |  | ```toilet [2] - 99:6 tomorrow [1] - 99:1 tonight [2] - 81:24, 91:6 topic [2] - 48:11, 54:4 topics [1] - 103:9 tops [1] - 27:8 total [4]-24:19, 36:3, 36:4, 65:20 totally [1] - 96:18 touch [2]-12:14, 24:23 touched [1]-16:18 towards [2] - 17:16, 63:4 track [1] - 13:22 trail [1] - 92:7 trailer [1] - 97:9 train [1] - 55:17 trainings [2]-35:1, 55:18 transcription [1] - 105:12 transparency [7] - 4:14, 5:4, 19:4, 20:25, 31:17, 32:16, 40:20 transparent [3]-2:22, 23:22, 41:25 transport [1] - 97:11 treasurer [1] - 97:24 treated [4]-12:12, 20:19, 42:19, 45:12 tremendous [1] - 8:16 Tremont [1] - 97:17 trends [1] - 34:22 trial [1] - 27:9 trouble [1] - 21:22 truck [1] - 97:9 true [1]-52:20 trust [1] - 103:17 truth [3]-7:1, 59:14, 92:5 turmoil [1] - 42:2 TV [1] - 100:17 twice [2] - 46:18, 86:13 tying [4]-14:21, 15:2, 21:22, 22:1 typical [1] - 5:6 \begin{tabular}{l}  U \\ \hline U.S \([1]-3: 23\) \\ ultimately \([3]-18: 3\), \\ 33:7, 58:16 \\ um \([43]-4: 14,6: 2,6: 18\), \\ 8:8, 12:10, 12:23, 15:4, \\ 15:19, 17:1, 17:14, \\ 17:25, 19:4, 22:6, 24:21, \\ 26:2, 26:3, 27:13, 29:23, \\ \(31: 14,39: 14,42: 4\), \\ \(43: 23,43: 24,44: 8,46: 2\), \\ \(47: 2,48: 25,50: 7,54: 8\), \end{tabular}``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| ```worth [3] - 42:14, 69:25, 77:7 wouldn't [5] - 59:24, 77:8, 81:4, 91:6, 97:22 wound [1] - 99:10 wow [1] - 17:4 wrinkle [2]-44:12, 44:16 written [2] - 5:13, 5:18 wrong[3] - 60:17, 80:4, 98:3 wrote [2] - 61:2, 64:16``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 54:12, 55:20, } 89: 24,90: 9 \\ & \text { ZQA [1] - 53:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Y |  |
|  |  |
| Z |  |
| zero $[2]-71: 15,85: 6$ ZLA $[1]-89: 24$ zoning $[6]-53: 22$, |  |

