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BILLS 170195, 170196, and 170197
RESOLUTION 170213

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Good morning. This is a public hearing of the Committee of the Whole regarding Bills No. 170195, 170196, 170197, and Resolution No. 170213.

Mr. Stitt, please read the titles of the bills and resolution.

THE CLERK: Bill No. 170195, an ordinance to adopt a Capital Program for the six Fiscal Years 2018 through 2023 inclusive.

Bill No. 170196, an ordinance to adopt a Fiscal 2018 Capital Budget.

Bill No. 170197, an ordinance adopting the Operating Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

Resolution No. 170213,
resolution providing for the approval by the Council of the City of Philadelphia of a Revised Five Year Financial Plan for the City of Philadelphia covering Fiscal

Years 2018 through 2022, and
incorporating proposed changes with
respect to Fiscal Year 2017, which is to
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be submitted by the Mayor to the Pennsylvania Intergovernmental Cooperation Authority (the "Authority") pursuant to the Intergovernmental Cooperation Agreement, authorized by an ordinance of this Council approved by the Mayor on January 3, 1992 (Bill No. 1563-A), by and between the City and the Authority.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Mr. Stitt.
Today we continue the public
hearing of the Committee of the Whole to consider the bills read by the Clerk that constitute proposed operating and capital spending measures for Fiscal 2018, a Capital Program, and a forward-looking Capital Plan for Fiscal 2018 through Fiscal Year 2023.

Today we will hear testimony from the Finance Department, City Treasurer, Sinking Fund Commission, Board of Pension and Retirement, and OPA.

The first person to testify
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from the Administration is?
THE CLERK: Rob Dubow.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Rob
Dubow.
(Witnesses approached witness
table.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Good morning, sir.

Good morning, ma'am.
MR. DUBOW: Good morning,
Council President Clarke and members of the Committee. My name is Rob Dubow. I'm the Director of Finance. With me today is Cathy Paster, First Deputy Finance Director, and there are various representatives of all the divisions within the Office of Director of Finance here to help answer any questions you may have.

You'll see in the testimony we summarized our mission statement and what the various units in the office do. Our request for FY18 is for \$1.5 billion. That's an increase of
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about $\$ 55$ million. The biggest reason for that increase is increases in pension and health benefit costs. The direct appropriation for Finance, requested direct appropriation, is about \$14 million.

And actually with that, I'll conclude my testimony. We're happy to take any questions.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. You may have broken a record for the briefest testimony in the history of City Council.

MR. DUBOW: I try. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

That's good stuff. I hope some of the other department heads pay attention. I just got a couple of questions for you. Our City credit outlook moved from stable to negative last year, and one of the primary factors listed in the reports was the City's recent trend of low reserve levels and growing operating deficits year over
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year.
Can you just kind of talk to me, one, about that and, two, about our game plan as it relates to enhancing that.

MR. DUBOW: There are a couple of things that are consistently mentioned by the rating agencies when they look at our ratings, which in addition to having the negative outlook is the second weakest amongst the top ten cities. It's the fund balance and also our high fixed costs, particularly our pension costs.

Every year we're kind of faced with trade-off between building our fund balance and making crucial investments. We think that kind of in the long run, we should try to get our fund balance up to between 6 and 8 percent of our revenues, but it will also take a while, because every year there are things that we know we need to invest in, like this year battling the opioid crisis or battling homelessness. So there are always going
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to be things where we have to make investments and then think about that trade-off, but it is kind of a longer term goal of ours to increase that fund balance.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Right. So I understand the fixed costs. They are just that. The expenditures are, to some degree, a matter of choice in terms of how much you spend, and I know Councilman Domb will get into this probably at length, so I'll just briefly touch on it.

My issue is investments, and I agree with investments, a politician, you know, we like investments, right? But I guess my question is the determining factor as it relates to return on that investment, and from my perspective, too often we really don't look at that in a real way. I mean, it's a good program, we like it, but from a fiscal perspective, how much spinoff will be associated with that particular
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investment in terms of dollars and cents down the line, and that's really -- and I think we actually had a hearing recently
to talk about tax incentives, what
exactly will they ultimately provide to
the City's fiscal challenge, and similarly I'd like to talk about investments.

Is there an analysis done by an Administration? I've never been in an Administration, so we don't -- I've never had an opportunity. Before we do something, we look at it, you say, well, best-case scenario, if we invest in this, the spinoff financially will be the following. Do you guys do that?

MR. DUBOW: We look at a few things. We'll look at that, but we also look at performance measurements too. So some things won't necessarily have a financial impact, but they'll be a performance benefit. So we look at a number of things before we decide -COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: What
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is that? What's a performance benefit?
MR. DUBOW: So, for example,
for homelessness, if we are going to do something that we think will end or reduce homelessness and has a proven record, then that's something we might invest in. It may not have a financial impact, it may have a financial impact, but really --

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I
think it would. I mean, the reality is is -- not to cut you off, although I just did. I think that what we end up spending in the long term on chronic homelessness is actually more than we would if that person ultimately ended up getting their life together or getting permanent housing and not having the government have to service them on a social perspective year after year after year, because that's similar to individuals that get incarcerated. We're spending $\$ 40,000$, 42, whatever that number is annually, and if that person
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had a job making 30,000, that person probably wouldn't go back to jail.

So the homeless thing, I
actually think that if you do it and you do it right, it can ultimately.

MR. DUBOW: Yes, in the long
run. But you might do that anyway even if it didn't have a long-term financial impact, I guess is the point $I$ was trying to make, that there are other things that will weigh when we decide whether we make an investment.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: All
right. So there's really -- it depends on the circumstance --

MR. DUBOW: Correct.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: --
in terms of the fiscal?
All right. One other quick
one. I actually saw something in the paper today. People are pretty excited about the newly found money as a result of the commercial assessments and \$118 million. We noticed, though, it's not in
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the Five Year Plan, any revenues
associated with that. Is there a reason why we wouldn't do it? Because the uncertainty of the final number?

MR. DUBOW: Right. We didn't know the numbers until last week. So we didn't know -- so we didn't know the numbers until after the Plan was finalized. But actually what we really want to do with that money is keep it in reserve, one, because of all the threats that we face. We've had another hearing on that on the federal and state threats. And it's another way, if those threats don't come through, it could actually help us build up the balance that you were talking about.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Well, the School District already spent their share of it. I'm just saying. We're going to keep it in reserve?

> MR. DUBOW: That's our

## proposal.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I
4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. mean, I understand that, but when you show your fund balance over a period of years, say -- I don't know what the appeal rate would be, successful appeals, but if it drops to 100 -MR. DUBOW: Well, we assume in the number that we were talking about last week, we were assuming a 20 percent appeal loss.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: 20?
MR. DUBOW: Yeah.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: So
you wouldn't show that in the out year fund balances?

MR. DUBOW: So when we finish
doing the Plan after -- we're not adjusting the Plan now, but when we adjust the Plan later, we would probably show that, yes.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. All right. I'll come back.
The Chair recognizes Councilman Domb .

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you,
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Council President.
Good morning.
MR. DUBOW: Good morning.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I have a lot of questions, so I'm not sure I'll get through all of them, but I'll come back to you.

MR. DUBOW: I thought you
would.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: This is just a general question for you. The fringe benefit cost contained in the budget detail, we just got the full detail like two days ago, and is there any way in the future that we can get this information way in advance of these hearings so we have a little more time? Because I think there was -- we had to read through 2,600 pages of budget detail. So that's just a request, if it's possible to get it earlier.

MR. DUBOW: So the detail we get done as quickly as possible, so I'm not sure how much quicker that would come
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over.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: All right.
So your testimony I think stated that the proposed General Fund budget totals over 1.5 billion?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: An increase of about 54.7 --

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: -- over
Fiscal Year '17. That 54.7 includes an increase of 50 million in Class 100 costs. The increase of fringe benefit costs and pension obligation costs are not reflected in that, are they?

MR. DUBOW: They are. That's
the prime driver of it.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: And does that
increase worry you, especially
considering we're going to be paying 91
cents just for fringe benefits for every dollar of wage, while the private sector, by the way, is 31 cents?

MR. DUBOW: Yes. The level of

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. our benefits costs is a concern. It's one of the things that we hope to address, one, through collective bargaining; two, through what we've talked about with dedicating sales tax revenue. So there are -- that's one of our big issues.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Just for the benefit of my colleagues and everyone in the Administration, am I not accurate by saying that for every dollar of wage, there's an 87 cent fringe benefit cost and a City overhead that $I$ know in the L\&I bill it was 37 cents, but maybe it's 30 or 40 cents depending on the department?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. So both of those numbers will vary a little by department and by what pension plan someone is in or what health benefits they get, but the general point you're making, that overhead is a significant cost every time we hire someone is -COUNCILMAN DOMB: So what I
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want to get clear to everybody is that when we hire somebody for 100,000 , it's not 100,000 . It's 224,000 when you include all --

MR. DUBOW: It varies, but it's
more than just the cost of salary.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: And if it's $\$ 50,000$ salary, it's really 112,000 . That's the impact. So when we expand jobs, we need to make sure we understand that piece.

Is it possible, by the way, going forward for next year to include the benefit costs by department so we see it in context of the total cost? MR. DUBOW: So as part of program-based budgeting, we're adding benefits into each department. So that will happen as we expand program-based budgeting to more and more departments. COUNCILMAN DOMB: Okay. Next question is, could you explain to me and my colleagues and taxpayers what it means for us if we can't meet our pension
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obligations and what the downgrade in the City's credit rating means for our ability to borrow money for these programs and services?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. The first
question, we do meet our pension obligations. We pay our benefits all the time, so --

> COUNCILMAN DOMB: If we get to
the point where we can't. MR. DUBOW: I don't -- I'm not going to speculate on that, because that's not something that we would let happen.

The second thing -- oh, our
credit rating? So having a lower credit rating means that our cost to borrow goes up. And so any time that we need to make a crucial infrastructure investments, the cost is higher.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: So I was
shown something recently that for every quarter point or every notch in the grade, it's about $\$ 11$ million in interest
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costs, up or down.
MR. DUBOW: Per quarter point?
That seems high. There's an extra cost, but I think that would have to be a really big borrowing for you to have that much additional cost.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: And I don't know -- if it's probably going on right now, but $I$ wanted to address the Council President's comment about the $\$ 118$
million and also about programs. I actually think we should look at every program that we have. The Managing Director was here yesterday. We spent 40 million on programs. I think we should do an analysis on a return on our investment on all those programs just to see are they proving out, are they doing a good job, and analyze every dollar we spent, because that's the only way we're going to save money in the long run.

And the second piece I just
want to bring up is that this 118
million -- last year we were talking
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about commercial assessments, commercial assessments, and we went outside and we hired somebody for $\$ 500,000$, a commercial appraisal firm, that produced $\$ 118$ million. 500,000 produced 118 million. That's a -- I'm not saying we should -that's a pretty good return on our investment. We need to do the same thing in the residential arena. And the other piece is, if we have 118 million -- and I know you said, Rob, 20 percent. It sounds like we're willing to risk losing 22 million, and my suggestion is that we budget, whether it's \$1 or $\$ 2$ million, in reserves to hire the best law firms and the best commercial appraisers to represent us in those appeals so we don't lose the 22 million, maybe we lose 5 or 8 . But there's a way to save that money, and I would strongly recommend we look at that, because that's a lot of money just -I'll give you one example. I talked to somebody this week. I forget. It was in
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South Philadelphia. He said, my property was assessed 150,000. And I know the property. It's probably worth 200. And he said, I went and got it appealed. I got it to 99,00. I'm saying to myself, God, he had it at 150, it was worth 200, and he got it appealed to 99. And I don't blame anybody. We don't have the expertise. We need to go outside to get the expertise. And so we already have a success ratio with commercial. We should do, by the way, this -- we should back it up with lawyers and appraisers, and in addition, we should hire outside to support OPA in the residential area. What I'm saying is, we should allocate maybe it's 2 or 3 million to support all the residential appraisers.

Thank you. I'll come back. Thanks, Council President. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Did you want a response?

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Yes.
MR. DUBOW: I thought it was
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just a statement.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: No.
The bell --
MR. DUBOW: It was like saved by the bell.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: No,
no. That wasn't your bell.
MR. DUBOW: So for the first
part -- and I probably should have said part of this to the Council President's question on return on investment. When we -- I think when program-based budgeting is fully implemented, you'll be able to look at a program, see the full cost and see revenue associated with it, and I think that will give both of you kind of the sense of what you were looking for, which is kind of what do we get and what are we spending on particular programs.

In terms of OPA, I think I'd
like to see the success with what we have, and I think the next year probably looking at appeals, it will probably be
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mostly commercial, and we have someone on board for that. But we should talk about your idea.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. The Chair recognizes Councilman Green.

COUNCILMAN GREEN: Thank you, Council President.

Mr. Dubow, we wanted to follow
up on some of the questions that the Council President and Councilman Domb raised regarding the additional 118 million. I know last week in testimony there were a number of questions in reference to a Plan $B$ regarding issues and concerns that members of this body raised concerning what may transpire in both Harrisburg as well as DC.

When did you receive the information regarding the additional assessment information?

MR. DUBOW: Really last week, and we were still kind of -- we got it last week and we spent most of the week
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vetting it.
COUNCILMAN GREEN: So when that question was raised in reference to a Plan B, you said we didn't have a Plan B. I mean, you didn't -- I mean, you had some indication that there was going to be additional increase in assessment value and taxes that were coming in. So I guess my question is, why was that not articulated, even though you didn't have maybe a specific number, why that was not articulated last week?

MR. DUBOW: Two reasons. One, we didn't know what the numbers were and, two, the --

COUNCILMAN GREEN: Well, you
had a sense --
MR. DUBOW: Can $I$-- let me
just finish. The potential impact of the federal budget cuts are much, much larger than this. This isn't a Plan B. This doesn't cover what we would face. So this is not a Plan B.

COUNCILMAN GREEN: Right. I
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mean --
MR. DUBOW: I would still say if you asked me do we have a Plan B, there is not a Plan $B$ to cover all of the --

COUNCILMAN GREEN: I understand
that, but $I$ think just from the questions that were asked, the sense that you knew that there was going to be additional dollars coming in from additional assessments, although we don't know what that amount is, that it could have given some perspective to members of Council that we anticipate reserving those dollars, although we don't have the exact number, for possible issues that we may have coming going forward, even though that in itself is not enough to satisfy all -- the full possibilities that may impact us from Harrisburg or DC. MR. DUBOW: We weren't comfortable enough with the numbers at that point to say that. COUNCILMAN GREEN: Okay. This

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. year in looking at the information from the Capital Program, we're going to be issuing a significant amount of debt this year. Is there any concern in reference to issuing that amount of debt, and based on some of the concern we just talked about, are there any possibilities of delaying some of those offerings?

MR. DUBOW: So it's always a
trade-off between the infrastructure investments we need and incurring additional debt. We thought that what we put in the program was stuff that was urgent and that we needed to do. So kind of our determination was that of the requests we made, which were far greater than what we wound up including in the Capital Budget and Program, that these were things that we really had to do.

COUNCILMAN GREEN: And if I remember correctly, we're carrying over like $\$ 450$ million from prior year?

MR. DUBOW: I don't know the
exact number, but, yes, we're carrying
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COUNCILMAN GREEN: Do you
anticipate -- what's the range you may anticipate of carrying over for next year?

MR. DUBOW: I'm not sure. I
think we'd have to get back to you on that. We're hoping to kind of work it down over time so that people spend the money that is put in the budget in that year.

COUNCILMAN GREEN: Okay.
Thank you, Council President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Gym.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Thank you very much, Council President. Good morning.
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MR. DUBOW: Good morning.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Actually,
again, kudos on the news about the commercial reassessments. I think it's important. It's one of the reasons that I think a good indicator that if we keep our property assessments on target and accurate, that the City will grow very naturally and in a great direction.

I had a really quick question
about CAMA and some of the -- if you could just give me a status update on where that is. And then actually something that I kind of learned from OIT is that $I$ didn't quite realize that OIT wasn't always in charge of the capital projects that are going on and, in fact, it falls to the departments, of which OIT may be a part, and now we're moving towards a more project-based oversight, and I'd like your perspective on how you think that will improve the situation around CAMA.

MR. DUBOW: So CAMA, we have an
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agreement in principle with the outside vendor to implement. We'll have a kick-off this fall, and it will probably take a couple of years to get it implemented. That won't stop us from doing full reassessments every year. It will probably just mean that those assessments will be a little less -they'll be less efficient. The communication process back and forth will be -- between OPA and BRT and Revenue will be clunkier than it should be, but it won't affect our ability to do assessments. It would also -- I guess it would be first used for the '21, FY21 assessment.

So OIT has always had some
level of involvement in the process. There's always been an IT director involved. There's a program manager who works in Finance, because a lot of kind of what you need to do in a project like this is look at work processes and how you change that. So you need a business
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COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Was there any recent changes in the vendor in the last couple of months?

MR. DUBOW: We have an
agreement in principle with a new vendor. We never actually reached agreement with the last vendor, and after months of negotiations, they actually kind of walked away on us.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: When did
they walk away? The fall?
MR. DUBOW: Yeah, probably.
August.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Oh, it was
August, okay.
And then you just reached the
new vendor in December; is that right?
MR. DUBOW: Actually just
within the last couple weeks we reached agreement in principle. Because we had to go through a new RFP process and then
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negotiate terms with them.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: And then
CAMA was originally supposed to be
implemented in what year? Like what was the original start date for CAMA, would you have said?

MR. DUBOW: So actually we had this conversation last week. There was a CAMA project back before OPA. So CAMA, I think it was originally supposed to be in place probably 10,15 years ago.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Yeah. It's been a while. And I know -- and there's additional capital dollars allocated for this project again?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: And is the additional capital dollars allocated because the vendor is seeking additional money in order to make it happen? We haven't spent the money for CAMA, have we? Because it doesn't actually exist. MR. DUBOW: I don't think the allocation -- if it increased, it was
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probably just because when we looked at what it would really cost, it was higher than the initial allocation, which I think was not a detailed analysis in the beginning.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: I mean, obviously we're hitting FY17 and then we're looking into FY21. So is the four-year trajectory for CAMA to kind of go into place in its fullest capacity, do you feel like this shift that OIT is talking about with a project management approach towards it is going to significantly alter anything in terms of the relationship between your two departments or the ability to commit to the FY21 deadline?

MR. DUBOW: We can definitely
commit to that deadline. I think the working relationship between our departments is really good. So I think that's only a positive.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: When you say that all -- we'll move ahead with manual
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assessments, what percentage of properties do you expect to be assessed each year?

MR. DUBOW: So OPA and Mike Piper will be here later today to confirm this, but all 570,000.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: So 100
percent of all properties --
MR. DUBOW: Yeah.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: -- will be
reassessed on an annual basis?
MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Okay. Thank you.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Reynolds Brown.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you.
Good morning, all.
MR. DUBOW: Good morning.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: This year
I'm paying particular attention to two general areas of review as testimony and
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charts are offered to us. One of them, of course, is MBE/WBE participation and the other area is pay equity across the system.

On your chart of Page 9, while
you do provide -- and it could be because we simply don't ask for this, but while you do provide what full-time employees are doing by demographics, what's not reflected here, which may skew my question, is of these, which are exempt and which are civil service. Because I fully understand that civil service requirements sometimes hamper us moving towards a system that looks like Philadelphia or a government that looks like Philadelphia.

So with that background, here's my question --

MR. DUBOW: On Page 3, there's
a chart that breaks out exempts and executive staff. So it shows -- and Civil service. It shows it in a little different way, but it has some of the
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information you're asking about.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: On Page 9?
MR. DUBOW: On Page 3.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Oh, Page
3. All right, then.

So here's my question: On Page
3 the average salary for a minority full-time staffer is $\$ 56,000$, which differs from their white male counterparts at $\$ 81,000$. Can you please explain that $\$ 24,000$ difference?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. And that's
everybody, so that includes civil service.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay. MR. DUBOW: For exempts, there's still a difference. It's smaller, but -- so it's between 84 and 78. I mean, they should be equal. So they're not where they should be, but it's better than the overall. And as you said, those are the positions we have more control over.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Those are
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the?
MR. DUBOW: The exempts.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Repeat
what you said, those are?
MR. DUBOW: I said the exempt positions, which are, as you said, the ones we have more control over, the differential is smaller. There shouldn't be a differential, but it's smaller, and we know that's something that we need to work on.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay. And similarly on Page 9, the average salary -- let me go to women. On Page 9, the average salary for an African

American female full-time staffer is 52,000 and for the white female counterparts it's 74,000. So therein lies a $\$ 22,000$ difference.

MR. DUBOW: Right. And, again, that winds up including civil service. It sounds like what you really want to see is also a breakout that would have exempts and show the difference there?
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COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: That would be helpful.

MR. DUBOW: Okay.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Going
forward.
MR. DUBOW: Understood.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: And then
lastly, of course, I look to see where there are African American female executives across government, and based on the information shared with us, there are no female African American executive staff members as reflected on Page 9. So is that due to inability to find any? Is that due to -- what is that due to? Let me not answer the question.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. And part of it is that we don't really have that much change on a year-to-year basis. So we had within the last year -- there's a new hire chart here. I think it was maybe six or seven new hires, but none of those were for executive staff. So as there are openings going forward, it would be
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something that we would definitely look at and clearly something that we need to address.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: How many opportunities opened up this past year at the executive level?

MR. DUBOW: None.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: The past
four years?
MR. DUBOW: I think not -- I
don't think -- I mean, I'll check, but I don't think any, because we've had stability in our upper ranks.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: The past
eight?
MR. DUBOW: So there were probably three or four over that time.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay. And were those exempt positions?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay. All
right, then. So across the government, that's what I'm paying attention to.

MR. DUBOW: Understand.
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COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: My broken
record is, again Charlie Rose and Gayle King again this morning on CBS had a feature story talking about pay equity and how that's resonating and bubbling up to the surface nationally. So we as a government should not be guilty of that.

MR. DUBOW: Agreed.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Johnson.
COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Council President.

How you doing, Rob?
MR. DUBOW: Good. How are you doing?

COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: Doing
pretty good.
Just a couple small questions,
but I was just informed that some of the
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things that were of concern to me were already asked, but I'll still just ask the question for the record.

So last year in the
Philadelphia Daily News, there was a report saying that Philadelphia spends more than we are bringing in and our credit rating has been downgraded from stable to negative, and I remember again under your leadership under the Nutter Administration, we had a AAA minus.

MR. DUBOW: No. We had -we've always just been in the A category. We never got up to AA or AAA. We're in the same category, just with a negative outlook.

> COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: So I'm
being very optimistic. But I guess my question is like what's our plan to focus on making sure we don't go deeply into the negative and our credit rating continues to slip as we move forward in the future?
And then I also would like to
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follow up with three particular programs that I looked at has been either slashed or $I$ don't think received the type of support that they deserve. One program is City Year. I'm one of the founding staff members. Great organization that works with young people in our schools, and each year I come to advocate and each year it gets cut. So I don't know what's the reasoning behind it, especially when, from my perspective, we're in a crisis when it comes to providing support for young people here in the City of Philadelphia, rather that's youth gun violence, rather that's the school system that's in the crisis. So I don't think that we're doing everything possible to support programs like this that support our young people. So I want to get your reasoning as to why it's not a priority. And then the African American Museum, I mean, it's like every year I'm always having a conversation that why is it receiving the minimum amount of
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support that it is. Obviously we see right here it's $\$ 60,000$. And I think they're supportive of it, but... MR. DUBOW: That's in two places. Actually they get money in Commerce too. So it's more than -COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: Do you have the dollar amount from Commerce? MR. DUBOW: It's bigger than that amount. Let me get you that. It's a larger amount than that.

COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: Thank you, Rob.

And last and make sure -- I think I'm definitely probably reading this wrong, but correct me if I'm not. So the Land Bank, there's like no funding for it. So is that coming from another department?

MR. DUBOW: There's $\$ 500,000$ in a contribution for Land Bank included in the Plan.

COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: And that's under what category?
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MR. DUBOW: I'll find it for
you.
COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: Can you
make sure we get it? Because obviously we're aggressively trying to move forward, affordable housing, and what's holding me up, separate from the market rate folks, are trying to provide affordable housing, and the City's policy right now is pretty much everything is going through the Land Bank, but there isn't any movement. And I think they're sharing staff between PRA and the folks who are operating the Land Bank. So at some point in time, we got to like pony up with the resources to make sure that the Land Bank is moving forward.

So that's basically it.
MR. DUBOW: Okay. So on the fund balance, we want to grow that over time. The challenge every year is, there are investments that we really need to make, and it's the trade-off between those investments and growing our fund
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balance. Over the longer term, we'd like to see it grow to between 6 and 8 percent of revenue. It's about 2 percent in the Plan. So we agree. We need to look at growing that, but that will take some time.

City Year, my understanding was that there was kind of a multi-year agreement with them on what their funding level was going to be and that what we put in the Plan is consistent with that, but that seems to be different from what you're hearing, so we should probably have a follow-up conversation on that.

COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: And the Land Bank does have funding? MR. DUBOW: It does, yeah. COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: Can you clarify like -MR. DUBOW: It's probably in Planning and Development. I think that's where it would show, but we'll -- yeah, it is. It's in Planning and Development. COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: Okay. All
4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC.
right. Makes sense.
Thank you very much, Rob.
MR. DUBOW: Sure.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Henon.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman, Council President.
Good morning.
MR. DUBOW: Good morning.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Councilman
called Rob. Hi, Rob.
First, can I ask you a couple
of questions on prep, on process.
MR. DUBOW: I'm sorry. On
what?
COUNCILMAN HENON: On prep,
preparation for the budget process --
MR. DUBOW: Oh, yes.
COUNCILMAN HENON: -- when it
comes to --
MR. DUBOW: As opposed to the
PREP tax credit.
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COUNCILMAN HENON: As opposed
to the tax credit, that is correct.
We were joking about
re-budgeting on the state level, when we do it, and $I$ guess it's kind of similar here. So it's a long, arduous process, I would imagine, in getting a lot of the information, especially when we're in a performance-based budget, which I'm stoked about, by the way. We've been talking about it for years, and I think it's certainly the direction to head in.

But as you put together your operating -- the Five Year Plan and the Operating Budget and the Capital Budgets, you have a briefing budget, and I kind of want -- and I know -- so let me ask you the question here. The binders, these Operating Budgets, Five Year Plan, and the briefing, is that going off of the binders, the details?

MR. DUBOW: Yes. They're all consistent.

COUNCILMAN HENON: All right.
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And I forget how many pages. I think Allan Domb had just mentioned there's thousands of pages of --

MR. DUBOW: In the detail,
yeah.
COUNCILMAN HENON: -- budget preparation.

So this is just going to be a statement, not to be real critical, but we just received the binders on Friday and I'm hoping that next year we can have them a little more in advance so we can get through a lot of those thousands of pages and details. It will just be better for this body to prepare. And I love the five-year Operating Budget book and the briefing books, but the devil is in the details. Maybe next year we can have it a little in advance since the Mayor -- we get our Five Year Plan as the Mayor introduces his budget a couple months ago. So it would be helpful. MR. DUBOW: No; I understand. COUNCILMAN HENON: I know it's
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a lot of paper.
MR. DUBOW: As you can imagine, it's a lot to get those books together.

COUNCILMAN HENON: And I'm echoing Councilman Domb's request on the detailed budget books for next year.

COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: Can I have
a point of information, Council
President?
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The Chair recognizes Councilman Johnson.

COUNCILMAN JOHNSON: Yeah. Just a point of information. Because we have staff members that also work with us in preparing, and I think $I$ was giving my staff just a little bit of a hard time because I was expecting to have some analysis of the budget prepared ahead of time and then at the eleventh hour, the two budget books showed up at the office, which made us have to cram over the past weekend. So I just want to just state that for the record, that the earlier, the better helps us in that process.
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Thank you, Councilman Henon, Majority Leader.

COUNCILMAN HENON: So with that being said and now behind us, the index funds, should the City be moving towards using the index funds for its investment with the pension fund solely?

MR. DUBOW: Not solely, but we have moved more heavily into index funds. We've actually gone -- we're over 50 percent in index funds now. I think maybe three years ago we were probably below 30 percent.

We do look at it on a case-by-case basis to see whether it makes sense to go into index funds, whether any manager we have is providing a benefit net of fees, and usually you would see that kind of in smaller things, like small cap investments where the market doesn't -- isn't as efficient, doesn't know as much about it. So there are some places where you definitely want managers, but we've moved more and more
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towards indexing.
COUNCILMAN HENON: And we're
increasing. So we've increased it. To me I think is a good one.

How does that compare, the performances, to other pension funds on the rate of return?

MR. DUBOW: So our rate of
return last year, we lost money. It was a bad year for pension funds in general, and I think we probably did a little worse than other funds. We've done a reallocation of our assets. We've moved more towards indexing. We look more like other funds now.

Through the end of March, our returns were over 9 percent, which now is better absolutely than what we've done before and better relative to our policy indexes. So I think if you asked us this time next year, you'd say we actually did a little better than other funds.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Just in the

```
first quarter comparison, are we
```
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MR. DUBOW: So we look at compared to -- we have kind of policy indexes that are broad measures of markets, and we're doing much better compared to them than we were before, which makes us think we're probably doing better than we were compared to other funds also.

COUNCILMAN HENON: And the change, do we go up in -- so we went from 30 to 50 percent.

MR. DUBOW: You're a little
over 50 percent, yeah.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Is that for FY18?

MR. DUBOW: Where we are now, yes.

COUNCILMAN HENON: So it's not just calendar year. We made that investment.

MR. DUBOW: It's kind of point in time, yes.
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COUNCILMAN HENON: Great.
One Philly is listed as a
Finance Department program.
MR. DUBOW: Right.
COUNCILMAN HENON: And I'm just
curious on just where it lies. You think it would be -- just for continuity, right? Do you think that it would be better aligned in the CAO's office or is it --

MR. DUBOW: We've had lots of discussions internally about that and think that it works best where it is now, because it is handling three major things, which is kind of hiring -- well, maybe four - hiring, benefits, pensions, payroll. Two of those things are in Finance, and kind of at its heart, the One Philly program is about kind of changing work processes. And so you really want, I think, the business owner to be the one running the project.

That said, we have weekly
meetings with the project manager that
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include the CIO and Cathy and I and Rick who runs the project. So it's really kind of tightly coordinated. We have a steering committee that includes the Chief Administrative Officer and the CIO, representative from the Mayor's Office, MDO, and us. So it's coordinated among the various entities.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Well, that's good to hear, because with that type of investment and the CAO's change and responsibilities in its structural makeup, having them included is, I think, a necessity and critical, because we just -- we hate to be inefficient on redundancies or duplicity of some of our programs. So you have this steering committee and the project manager that's bringing the committee together. I think that's nice to hear. Thanks.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Quinones-Sanchez.
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COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Good
morning. Good morning.
MR. DUBOW: Good morning.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I want
to talk a little bit around -- for the record, we're very pleased that we're moving to program-based budgeting and what it all entails, but I'm a little disappointed to hear that we're not ramping up the improvements of our own technology in the Finance Office. You've been in the Finance Office for a while. Where do you see this project? What's the timeline, and what do you think are some missed opportunities? Because technically we're operating with an Excel sheet on steroids.

> MR. DUBOW: Are you talking
about for the One Philly project?
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Yes.
MS. PASTER: Hi. I'm Cathy
Paster, First Deputy Director of Finance.
I think the current timeline, our best estimate right now is to have it
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go live in January of 2019. So obviously
a complex project, involves a number of different systems. So we have pensions, payroll, human resources, time and attendance, benefits. It's a big project, complicated, and that took a little longer probably than we thought, but that's our current estimate, January of '19.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: So do we have a project manager for that?

MS. PASTER: We do, yes.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: And
they're working with our different departments to make sure that we're building out a system that is going to adapt to this new program-based budgeting?

MS. PASTER: So I think that's kind of a two-part question sort of. So they are working closely with departments and have been during the whole course of this so that -- because part of this -- a big part of this actually is to make it
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easier for departments and more efficient for them to do the work they need to do as well. So we have met with all of them and tried to figure out all their needs so that the system will address it.

Program-based budgeting is not
a part of One Philly. So that's why I said it's sort of a different question. That would be a different system, a different process.
I don't know if you want to
take that.
It's not -- they're not related at this point. So I think that would be a different process, taking a different course. If they needed to link, though, that would obviously be a priority if they needed to do that. I think with the program-based budgeting, it's more of how it links with the FAMIS accounting system as opposed to those other human resources systems that are part of One Philly.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Now I'm
confused. So we're going to have two
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different systems to get to where we want to go with program-based budgeting?

MS. PASTER: No.
MR. DUBOW: No. The One Philly doesn't have anything to do really with program-based budgeting.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: SO
what's the replacement for FAMIS, which eventually should be --

MR. DUBOW: So FAMIS, the
financial management system, we have money in the Capital Program I think in FY -- in out years of the Capital Program to begin the FAMIS process. So we want to actually start that once One Philly is finished. So that's longer term, but that is included in the Capital Program. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: So what year are you talking about?

MR. DUBOW: I think it may
start in '20, I think.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: So what does one system have to do with the other if they're not interfacing or why do we
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have to finish one to do the other?
MR. DUBOW: It's just a
resource question, because a lot of the same people at the higher level would have to be involved in kind of managing it and overseeing it.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: So what
are our missed opportunities with that if we have a pretty antiquated financial system, I mean, in terms of time,
resources? We're moving to a new budgeting system and yet our system -MR. DUBOW: Actually, I mean, it's not impeding our ability to move to the new budget system. It's not doing that. I think a new FAMIS eventually -FAMIS is, I think, 35, 36 years old. So eventually it's going to --

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I
considered myself very young when I was 35, 36 years old, but in the technology world, it would be dog years, 37 times seven, right?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. There are
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upgrades over time, but it doesn't have the same kind of support that it used to have. We actually have brought back a former employee to help support it. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Why hasn't this been a priority?

MR. DUBOW: Because it works. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Because it works?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah, because it
works and it's --
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Even for
our program-based budgeting now? Is it going to facilitate -- again, we ask our departments to be everything, operational, are you leveraged, how do you account for stuff. Are we actually giving them the best tool for them to do their jobs?

MR. DUBOW: So, no, which is
one of the reasons we're doing One
Philly, is to give them better tools to do their jobs there. FAMIS does function. Where I was going is,
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eventually a system that will -- you're worried that in the longer term it's going to fail and so you need to replace it. I think that's the big concern, and that's kind of what we want to make sure. That's the timing issue. We want to make sure we get it replaced before there's no longer any support for it or it fails. MS. PASTER: I think that's right. I actually think that's also why One Philly came first, because we were more concerned at that time that some of those systems were closer to a failure point, and that means payroll and the inability to do electronic calculations and pensions, things that are critically important. And, again, like we said, we were afraid that would fail sooner, so we went with that one first, and we just don't have resources to do them all at once between Finance, having some of the same people working on them, and OIT as well. You know, they're really big projects.

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. Real quickly, what are we going to do differently this year around our budgeting? One of my concerns has been the -- not overtime management, because I really do think having talked to a lot of the department heads and working through some of this budget process through the Appropriations Chair is that we are underfunding departments that we know are then going to have overtime issues, and it looks -- the optics publicly, it looks like we're not managing it well. And when we get criticized, it's not the Mayor. It's all of us, Council, why aren't we managing well.

How are we going to ensure that we are appropriately funding departments so that it does not look that way?

MR. DUBOW: And I'm not sure that it's an appropriate funding level, because oftentimes the departments are staying within their Class 100
allocation. It may be that they don't
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fill positions as quickly as they anticipated or sometimes something comes up --

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: That's what I'm saying. I'm hopeful --

MR. DUBOW: Or if something
comes up, like protests after the election that you never would have anticipated.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: No, no.
I get that, but I feel like we changed from zero-based budgeting to performance-based budgeting -- I mean to program-based budgeting. The Mayor talked a lot about efficiencies to scale and saving money, and I'm just concerned that we're following the traditional path of not giving departments all that they need and then looking at these -- you're monitoring these transfer ordinances, saying are we appropriately funding for expenses we know are going to be out there.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah, and I think
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in general we are, but things will happen during the year that we haven't anticipated. And I think probably on overtime specifically, one of the things that we need to do a better job when we develop budgets is look at that split between overtime and the rest of Class 100, because I think sometimes the numbers that we budget for overtime probably aren't realistic but the Class 100 is.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Are we incentivizing people not to staff up and use overtime?

MR. DUBOW: No, I don't think
so. I think that --
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: And
we're going to have the HR discussion when HR comes up.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah, and I think part of it is departments really want to fill their positions. So when they do their budgets, they're optimistic about when positions will be filled, and then
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sometimes it takes longer than what they thought and that means that they'll have more overtime.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Okay.
We'll get into that discussion. We definitely need to talk about this HR stuff. I think in this particular budget, there's a lot of growth opportunities and I'm really concerned that we're not going to meet those numbers and what comes first.

MR. DUBOW: Understood. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
Real quick. Mr. Dubow, in the budget detail, Section 13, Page 16, it highlights Class 500 spending for City-sponsored events that include the Army-Navy game and Welcome America events. How much, if any, of these costs are reimbursed? I know that these are
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events that promote visitors and tourism and all that.

MR. DUBOW: So I don't --
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Is
there any direct reimbursement for some of our --

MR. DUBOW: So I don't think for these events there's much in the way of reimbursements. When there are events like the NFL Draft, those wind up getting reimbursed, but most of these are not that type of event.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: All
right. Since you just brought it up, I was going to save it for the Art. The sign on City Hall, the NFL Draft sign. MR. DUBOW: Yeah. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Who -- you don't know anything about it either?

MR. DUBOW: I saw it yesterday.
That's all I know about it.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: All
right. So you don't know? Okay.
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MR. DUBOW: No.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Because I'm going to bring it up for the Art Commission. I'm giving them warning. I brought it up yesterday. We lost $\$ 500,000$ because the Art Commission decided that it wasn't appropriate to put signs up on buildings, and I'm wondering why the NFL gets to do it. People are willing to pay. All right.

Community Development Fund, this is on Section 13, Page 76. It looks like there's a reduction, around $\$ 10$ million, for '18.

MR. DUBOW: On Page 76?
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Yeah.
MR. DUBOW: So I think we were just looking at -- that's kind of a contingency, an estimate of what we think will come in, and we just thought looking at history that 20 million was too high. So it's not a real reduction.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: This
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is a projection?
MR. DUBOW: Yeah.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. I was wondering if there's going to be some interim --

MR. DUBOW: No, it's not.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Unfortunately it might be worse than that.

So since it's in there, does
that mean that that's all that's authorized to spend? If we voted for the budget as is, would we only appropriate the amount of money?

MR. DUBOW: That's right.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Suppose we get more money. I don't know why we're appropriating less than --

MR. DUBOW: We also have in the Grants Fund, there's an amount for unanticipated grants. So we could do a transfer ordinance to move the money from there to here.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: But
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that kind of sends a signal that we're going to reduce it ourselves, but you're speculating that there's going to be an increase?

MR. DUBOW: No. I think this
is actually based on history of what we've seen over time. I don't think we reduced it.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I understand that, but what kind of signal are we sending to the people that care about this, that we are internally reducing the appropriations for a department?

MR. DUBOW: I think we're putting it in based on what we received --

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Why don't we just tell them what we got last year and then if it gets reduced, then it gets reduced? You wouldn't mind if we put it back?

MR. DUBOW: We would not mind

```
if you did that.
```
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: We put it back up?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. Thank you.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Domb .
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you, Council President.

I first want to just comment that $I$ guess I've been here now -- is it 25 years? No. It's 15 months, I think, right?

MR. DUBOW: That was me, the 25.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Right. I
just wanted to thank you, Rob, and your department for all your support and help. You've been great to work with. So I just want to get that out there.

MR. DUBOW: Thank you. And we enjoy working with you too.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you.
So here's my question. I have
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several questions. I'm going to follow up with Councilwoman Sanchez's question on overtime. I want to make sure I understand this clearly. When we pay overtime, we pay an extra 50 cents typically on every dollar in overtime. Unless it's double time, we pay --

MR. DUBOW: Right. It varies.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: And the extra
fringe benefit of an overtime dollar is another 10 or 20 cents, if I recall?

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. I think where you're going, it's less than if you hire someone new.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Right. So I just want to make sure my colleagues are aware of this. In some ways, overtime at 50 cents plus the benefit of 10 or 20 cents is 70 cents versus hiring a new person that's another $\$ 1.24$.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. There's a management issue too, which is you don't want people consistently working those type of hours just to wear them out.
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COUNCILMAN DOMB: I understand.
Just from a financial standpoint, as much as we harp on overtime, it's economically less than expensive for the City than a new employee because of our structure; is that correct?

MR. DUBOW: That's correct.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: And then the
other -- I have a couple more for you. So I'm going to just see if you give me a yes or no on this one.

MR. DUBOW: Probably not, but. . .

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Would you
support -- this goes back to a prior question. Would you support allocating \$1 to \$2 million to defend the potential of appeals on the commercial assessments and the hiring of an outside law firm and outside appraiser, which I think we already accounted for in the original proposal to defend the assessments?

MR. DUBOW: So we put
additional money in the '18 budget both
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for help with appeals and with developing the assessments and for additional assessors. So there is money in the budget for that.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Do we need to hire an outside law firm to help us with that too, though? Because you know how everybody does it, you get an appeal, you hire your best appraiser, hire your best lawyer and they come into the City.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. I think that Mike thinks that people we've hired are really good and would really help a lot. So I think he's comfortable with them.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Here's my quick business analysis: We have 22 million at risk. Putting 2 million out there would also send a message to the community that we are serious, number one, and, number two, we have great representation. Is that a yes or a no then?

MR. DUBOW: It was not either. COUNCILMAN DOMB: I think it's
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something we should consider.
Going back to what the Council
President, Councilman Johnson talked about was our bond rating. There's three components that you've schooled me on with this. One is pensions, fund balance, and expanding the tax-paying base. So on fund balance, am correct to state that our current fund balance will get us by 12 to 14 days roughly or 15 days?

MR. DUBOW: Sounds about right. COUNCILMAN DOMB: And we don't have a line item in the budget every year putting a certain percentage away, but do you think legislation requiring a certain amount of revenue be set aside for our reserves would be a good financial decision for the City to make given the likelihood of potentially another recession down the road or other unknown, uncertainties in the world?

MR. DUBOW: So I think building our fund balance is a good financial
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policy, and there's a trade-off in
everything we do. The trade-off is if we do it in such a way that limits our flexibility, that we have to kind of consider what the trade-off is between increasing the fund balance and limiting our flexibility.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: All right.
Second question is on the pensions. We're right now at, what, 4 and a half billion funded and we're short about 6 billion?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Forty-five
percent. And I know that you put forth a plan that gets us funded to 80 percent, if I recall, in 13 years?

MR. DUBOW: Correct. COUNCILMAN DOMB: And there's like four legs on that stool to support that, with the two biggest being MMO contributions and the return of the fund. Those are the two big pieces of it. MR. DUBOW: And the other two,
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just to complete the -- the other two are having the changes that we put in place for 33 apply to all employees and the sales tax.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Is that
moving forward? Where does that stand right now?

MR. DUBOW: Which portion?
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Your plan to get to 80 percent funding in 13 years.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. So the sales tax is being put in above the MMO. So that's happening. Investment returns are improving. So that's happening. There's legislation before Council on the changes and as part of our collective bargaining discussion. So, yes, it's all moving.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: So I'm going to say if we can accomplish 80 percent, even if we can accomplish 70 percent or 68 percent in 13 years, that is huge for the City, especially with the bond rating services. So whatever we can do to fix that pension problem is key. Key.
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Let me ask you the last
question for this round at least. On the tax-paying base, $I$ just want to make sure I understand it. When I looked at your pie chart on Page 47 of the big book.

MR. DUBOW: The Five Year Plan?
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Yes. This is probably unpopular, but I'm just going to bring it up anyway. What the heck.

There's really -- when you look at real estate taxes prior to this commercial assessment, I think we had 134 billion of real estate taxes, value, and we billed 91 billion. The rest is non-profits, whatever. And we look at BIRT taxes, they are not paid. I guess what I'm getting to is that eds and meds, non-profits, et cetera, which are great to have and I love them all, only pay one tax in this book, which is basically the wage tax. The other taxes aren't paid, which puts us in this position.

So here's my question for you,
Rob: Remember the economist Adam Smith,
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Wealth of Nations?
MR. DUBOW: Yeah. It was a little before my time, but I know the name.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: He said in a
book --
MR. DUBOW: I haven't been here that long.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: -- the best
tax in the world is one that is
widespread and very low.
I know the BIRT tax for the business community is a huge problem, and so how do we replace BIRT and get an Adam Smith type of tax on the books to help us? Because, look, I understand there's eds and meds. They still use City services. Maybe there's some way of accomplishing that goal.

MR. DUBOW: I mean, we probably kind of need to think about that and give you something more thoughtful than I would be able to do right on the spot here.
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COUNCILMAN DOMB: That's fine.
Thank you. Thank you.
Thanks, Council President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
You're welcome, sir.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Gym.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Thank you very much, Council President.

Rob, so recently the
Philadelphia Parking Authority came out with an analysis of its recent proposal on a potential parking increase that they said would generate money for schools. One of the questions is, of course, was back in 2014 when they came before City Council talking about increases in meter rates that would go 100 percent actually towards the School District at the time. I think Mr. Fenerty's testimony at the time said that virtually all of the additional revenue from this adjustment will go to the School District, and when fully implemented, this will result in an

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. additional 7 and a half million for the public schools.

This time around, however, the math is much different. So a $\$ 10$ million increase in parking meters will result in $\$ 600,000$ for the public schools, of which the Parking Authority primarily blames the funding formula that was established by the state in which money must go towards the City of Philadelphia first and then left over goes to the District. Of course, that is based off of net profits.

But could you explain that math to me a little bit better? Because I do not quite understand it. I don't understand anyway why 10 million equals 35 percent for the City and schools.

MR. DUBOW: I think the -- I don't think the way that it was portrayed, at least according to what we talked to the Parking Authority about -so the explanation was slightly different from the versions that I heard reported.
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So this year -- and I might be
a little off, but the numbers are
basically right. They are projecting about 9 and a half million going to the School District without --

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Admittedly,
that is less than the amount that they gave in 2014 with the parking tax.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. They project
that without these increases, that number would go down to about 4 million next year. With these, they would go to about 10 million. So I think their projections have about a $\$ 6$ million benefit for the District and about 3 million for the City's General Fund because of the way the state formula works. So it's 500,000 compared to this year, not 500,000 compared to what it would be without the increase.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: That's not what I'm looking at. I'm looking at a \$10 million increase in parking taxes results in $\$ 600,000$ to the schools. So
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what is the funding formula that is established by the state that looks at -help me understand the City-School

District breakdown. I cannot explain where the other 65 percent of the funds get eaten up.

MR. DUBOW: So --
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: And that
will have to be them, I assume. MR. DUBOW: What?

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: That will
have to be the PPA, I assume, if they ever come before us.

MR. DUBOW: So their expenses
go up and they have a chart that shows that that --

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: But what's
the distribution ratio between the City and the School District for whatever revenues are established?

MR. DUBOW: So the cap of what
goes to the City -- and that cap is
adjusted each year for inflation. So
it's not like a percent allocation. It's
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the City gets -- and the cap started at 35 and it has grown each year.
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MR. DUBOW: Million.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: 35 million.
MR. DUBOW: And then it grows
each year. And I think we're probably around 37 million now. So the cap keeps growing. So a portion of the money will go to the City and then what's above the cap goes to the School District. COUNCILWOMAN GYM: How is the cap determined for -MR. DUBOW: It's in state law. The cap amount is in the state law. But before that allocation is made, the Parking Authority's expenditures are subtracted from its revenues. For them what they show is that the big driver of their expenditures and one of the big drivers for us is pensions. The pension costs have gone up a lot. That eats into the additional revenue that they have to
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go to the City and to the District.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Right.
That's what their financial audit says. Obviously we're waiting for the Auditor General to fully complete a full performance and management audit, which I think could also shed light on what are additional drivers of expenses. It's still a significant chunk to have 65 percent of any revenues eaten up by the own entity itself before it's then going out.
I'm still, though -- so you
feel like the formula that's in the state law is written as starting off with an actual number and then increasing by inflation as opposed to some kind of distribution formula?

MR. DUBOW: Increasing by a percent, yes. That's my understanding. But it sounds like you think it might be different, so I can check.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Well, I
mean, in 2007 when we started this, the
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City of Philadelphia was getting something like 20 million, and between the City of Philadelphia in 2007 getting 20 million going then up to 37,38 million in a matter of seven or eight years, then we then look at the revenues for the School District fluctuating dramatically between -- it started off at 2 million and now is somewhere at 8, could have been 4. So this is a highly subjective, negotiable territory and I'm just trying to understand it better. Like the City commitment I understand is kind of fixed. The School District commitment clearly is not. But there needs to be a better accounting on how this distribution is coming out. When the testimony between the Parking Authority in 2014 says 100 percent of adjusted meter rates will go to the District and in 20175 percent of it is going to go to the District, I don't understand that.

MR. DUBOW: And that 2014
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testimony $I$ think was inaccurate because --

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Clearly, but why?

MR. DUBOW: So I think what
they said back then, it was all going to go to the School District, just wasn't accurate. It was just wrong. And I think what they're saying now is more accurate with how the allocation of the funds works.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: So that puts us in a difficult position.

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Thank you.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Green.
COUNCILMAN GREEN: Thank you, Council President.

Mr. Dubow, I wanted to follow
up on some questions that we heard earlier, and actually just looking at a
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recent Controller report regarding the increase in jobs and one of the challenges we have in the City is compared to other peer cities, we have not increased or come out of the recession with the same level of increase in jobs. So I had a chance to look at the Commerce Department testimony yesterday, as well as I had attended the Mayor's presentation from the Chamber of Commerce and also in his budget address made reference to certain job initiatives, like the Capital Consortium, which provides access to credit to small businesses. However, in looking at the budget detail that we just received on Monday -- and I reiterate the comments made by Councilmembers Johnson and Domb and Henon about getting the budget detail books earlier -- I noticed that the line item for the Capital Consortium was zeroed out.

Can you explain, if the Mayor
is talking about increasing jobs and made
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reference to the Capital Consortium, why the budget detail was zeroed out?

MR. DUBOW: I actually am not sure, so I'll have to look at that and get back to you.

COUNCILMAN GREEN: Okay. On
the detail, $I$ mean, it clearly shows it was funded last year and not funded for this year.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah. I understand
the question.
COUNCILMAN GREEN: Okay.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Domb.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you,
Council President.
These are easier. Would it be of help to you and the City -- this is just a question. In the business world, we get trained and schooled on how to negotiate. We have actually negotiation classes. Would it be helpful to have one
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person in the City who is the head negotiator basically, for lack of a better term, that departments would go to before they signed off on a contract and let that person actually negotiate the final details from a pricing and term standpoint?

MR. DUBOW: That's interesting.
I hadn't really thought about that before. The problem probably is that you wouldn't have one person who would be knowledgeable enough in each of the areas to be kind of the deal closer. The idea of training in negotiation $I$ think is really interesting, and that might be more helpful than having one person who was the closer.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Okay. That's just -- maybe you could look into that.

MR. DUBOW: Yeah.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: The other
question $I$ have is that we're going through this issue with the state and the federal government. Do you have any
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statistics on how much tax revenues we as a city contribute to the state percentage-wise?

MR. DUBOW: I actually do think I've seen that. I don't have it on hand. I think I've seen that, but I'll check to see -- I'm not 100 percent sure, but I think --

COUNCILMAN DOMB: The figure I have that we receive from the state is we account for 12 percent of the state's budget. And I guess what I'm looking for is, how much do we contribute percentage-wise to the state's budget?

MR. DUBOW: Oh, you mean we account for 12 percent expenditures?

COUNCILMAN DOMB: They send us of the state's budget, we get 12 percent, but are we giving them 15 or 20? Are we giving them 8?

MR. DUBOW: Let me see whether
we can put that together.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I think that
was it for now. You're getting off
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light. Thank you.
Thank you, Council President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman. There's always callbacks.

The Chair recognizes Councilman
Henon.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you,
Council President.
So Office of Property Data.
MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN HENON: I love the
concept from several years ago. How long
have we been funding the Office of
Property Data? This year's Five Year Plan shows '16 --

MR. DUBOW: Six years.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Six years?
And what is the rate -- so in '16, FY16,
it's 223,000, '17 is 461,000, and '18 it's moving up to 509,000, which is fine.

I don't have a problem.
MR. DUBOW: And part of that is
filling vacancies.
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COUNCILMAN HENON: I don't have a problem with that.

MR. DUBOW: All of it is
filling vacancies.
COUNCILMAN HENON: What was the funding for the first three years? And I want to ask because this year I want to clarify the goals for the record. We're going to have two completed recommendations and a 25 percent completion of a third, and then FY19 you'll have -- or '18 you'll have -- or '19 you'll have another project. So who makes the recommendations and what are they? And do you have the funding levels of the first three --

MR. DUBOW: We're asking Saskia Thompson, who is the Executive Director of the office, to come up and talk to you about the addressing program.
(Witness approached witness
table.)
COUNCILMAN HENON: How are you?
MS. THOMPSON: Hi. Saskia
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Thompson, Office of Property Data within Finance.

So the recommendations come
from a study that we commissioned. We had a consultant come in and work with all of the departments that have some various role in addressing, and come up with the recommendations of how we can improve the quality of the data and transfer information between departments better. At the end of that report, we had a series of 11 recommendations, here are the things that we think need to be done in order to make our addressing data better. And since that time, we've been working through those recommendations and trying to implement them as we go along. So the recommendations that you're looking at are the ones that came from that study, and we're just working through them as we -- that's what we're doing.

```
        COUNCILMAN HENON: And I think
it's critical that we work through
```
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recommendations and actually have a
timeline for implementation and/or
launching of data that are merging
between -- because that's why I was
excited about the CAO, because in theory
it's doing what you're doing on a
systems --

MS. THOMPSON: Right. And when
I say we're implementing those, that means my office, the Office of Information Technology, and all of the other departments that have a role in addressing, we all have a role in implementing those.

COUNCILMAN HENON: So when was this study commissioned and when was it completed?

MS. THOMPSON: I believe we did
the report in 2015. I'd have to check just to be sure, but $I$ think we completed that in the fall of 2015, and we've been working on the recommendations since then.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Okay. So
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where are we with recommendations -- so recommendations $I$ guess started in '16? MS. THOMPSON: Yes. And some of them -- yes. So some of those recommendations have been ongoing. There are also a couple that -- so one of the recommendations is when we come up with new addressing standards, which we have done, that you build those in to new systems, which we are doing, and that you also -- whenever you're replacing a legacy system, that you use those, you require those new systems -- those new standards to be used. So some of those recommendations are we're looking at outlying years. We improve the data as we improve the systems, and that has been in full conjunction with the Office of Information Technology.

COUNCILMAN HENON: And so we have two this year. It will be three, four FY19. And I guess you'll incorporate as legacy programs go away, right, with new technology?
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MS. THOMPSON: Right.
COUNCILMAN HENON: To put it bluntly.

So how many projects in total
have we done?
MS. THOMPSON: I would say
there's probably four that are active right now that have some role in that. And CAMA, for example, also has an addressing component. So as we implement CAMA, we will be doing it in a way that improves addressing standards as we go forward.

COUNCILMAN HENON: What was the
budget -- or can you provide to the Chair -- I don't want to put anybody on the spot now --

MR. DUBOW: The first three years?

COUNCILMAN HENON: For the first three years what kind of investments, did we spend the money, and how we -- what programs or how we spent --
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MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN HENON: -- for the
Office of Property Data? Because I think
it really is vital to -- we've been
hearing for years and years and years that it became more of a buzz word, the silos that we operate on, but it's true, and I think this helps --

MR. DUBOW: The big part of
what --
COUNCILMAN HENON: -- every
employee of the City of Philadelphia deliver efficient and effective services --

MR. DUBOW: Thank you.
COUNCILMAN HENON: -- to the City.

All right. Well, thank you.
Is that -- can you share that recommendation study? Is that public?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN HENON: If you could provide that to the Chair, that would be great, and we can get that. And I'll
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catch you on the next round. Thank you.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: The Chair recognizes Councilman Domb.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you,
Council President.
I knew there was something
else.
This is for you to think about and get back to me. You don't have to answer this now. I just want to put it out there.

In 1960, the City's population was over 2 million, employees 28,000. In 2015, the City's population is $1,000,560$, employees 28,000. The question $I$ have is why and what can we do -- and maybe the answer is technology. I'm not sure, but I think it might be. What can we do to right-size the government?

MR. DUBOW: So we've looked at this a lot over time, and if you looked at the workforce back in 1960, it's very different from how it looks today, and a big part of the change is that we now
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have many more employees in county functions. So, for example, the Department of Human Services has more employees than it would have had back then. I think Prisons has more employees. On the other hand, some of the straight municipal functions, like Streets or Fairmount Park, have fewer employees. So there's been a real shift.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Would those other positions be handled through technology?

MR. DUBOW: Some would. So, for example, prison guard technology is not really going to help that much with that or --

COUNCILMAN DOMB: But the accounting could be.

MR. DUBOW: -- social worker not really going to help. We have a number of jobs like police officer, firefighter that are really kind of labor-intensive and that technology is not going to make a big difference in.
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COUNCILMAN DOMB: But is there any effort being done by the City to look at every department and say this is the goal of the department, how do we achieve the goal by embracing today's technology?

MR. DUBOW: Not as much as it should. I understand your point, and it's a good point.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: We can talk about it.

MR. DUBOW: Okay.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you.
Thank you, Council President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Henon.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you, Council President.

Mr. Dubow, last year -- this is
a follow-up from last year.
MR. DUBOW: It started with
Rob. It seems like something has gone wrong.

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. COUNCILMAN HENON: My colleague said Rob. I was going to say Robby. But last year -- this is a follow-up. So there was a $\$ 23$ million grant secured from FEMA for 160 new Fire Department employees. Do you recall that?

MR. DUBOW: The SAFER Grant? COUNCILMAN HENON: I believe so. So my question to that is, have we -- is that reflected in the Five Year Plan? Which I assume it is.

MR. DUBOW: I think for the SAFER plan, the funding for the year that's covered by the grant would be shown in the Plan. COUNCILMAN HENON: Okay. That's fine.

So it's to hire 160 Fire
Department employees. Have we hired 160 Fire Department employees or is that for the last year's and this year's and any out year, I guess, recruits for new classes?
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MR. DUBOW: I think it's
hiring -- sorry. I think, yes, it's for
hiring. I think the way it works is, you hire up kind of above the complement that you had before you got the grant. So that's reflected.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Are we going to be able to sustain that funding when the grants --

MR. DUBOW: We've gotten that a couple of times, so I would think if the grant still exists, we'll keep trying to get that grant to help us sustain the program.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Okay. All right. No further questions.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Jones.
COUNCILMAN JONES: Yes. Very quickly. Thank you, Mr. President.

On my colleague's question, who is a dedicated supporter of fires, does
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this mean the end of brownouts?
MR. DUBOW: I think brownouts
have been ended, yes.
COUNCILMAN JONES: So we will
never see brownouts again?
MR. DUBOW: I can't say never.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Not
this year.
MR. DUBOW: We don't do them
now.
COUNCILMAN JONES: All right.
Thank you so much,
Mr. President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
You're welcome.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Gym.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Thank you
very much, Council President.
I had just one more quick
clarification. The budget says that CAMA
is expected to be operationalized by
December 2019. You're saying that it's now 2021?
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MR. DUBOW: When it's
operationalized by December '19, that means that the first reassessment will really be used for is the FY21 reassessment.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: But you do believe that it will be in operation by 2019?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILWOMAN GYM: Okay. All
right. I mean --
MR. DUBOW: Because the first
reassessment after December '19 is for FY21. So that's why those two sound so different, but they're really saying the same thing.

COUNCILWOMAN GYM: NO; I
understand that. I'm just wanting to make sure that we stay on target, and if we allocate any additional money, it's got to come under like some pretty serious questions about making sure that we're on target for 2019.

MR. DUBOW: Understood.
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
That concludes the testimony
for now, Finance, and thank you,
Mr. Dubow and Ms. Paster.
(Thank you.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Is
the Treasurer here?
MR. DUBOW: She's here.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I
saw her. I think she walked out.
MR. DUBOW: I'll go get her.
She's coming in. There she is,
like magic.
(Witness approached witness
table.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Good
afternoon.
MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Real quick. I don't know if you should be the one that I should ask this question on the borrowing of the money for the preservation program. And I see
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Mr. Dubow still here. My question was -there were two parts. One was the -- and I know you're handling the borrowing for the grant program we've done with PIDC. MS. JOHNSON: That's correct. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: But the second part was the loan program, that I understand that there were some concerns raised by the Administration, and I'm not sure if it was from your office or from the Finance Department. MS. JOHNSON: I can tell you I am working with tax counsel and Greg Heller --

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Bring that a little closer.
MS. JOHNSON: I'm sorry.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
That's okay.
MS. JOHNSON: I've been working with tax counsel, outside tax counsel, and Greg Heller on the loan program, the loan portion of it, to figure out the best way and the cheapest way for the
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City so we can figure out how to lay it out.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: So are we moving towards coming up with a -MS. JOHNSON: We are working on it, yes.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Not trying to figure out why it can't happen. MS. JOHNSON: Not why it can't happen, but how, the cheapest way that we can actually make it happen, yes.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: All right. Okay. I'm sorry. I just wanted to ask that question before Mr . Dubow left, because $I$ wasn't sure who would be able to --

MS. JOHNSON: We can ask him to have a seat if you want.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: All
right. That's fine. No. I'm good. So
I'm sorry. Please proceed with your
testimony, ma'am.
MS. JOHNSON: I'm sorry. We
were pricing a bond deal.
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: It's all good.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, good
afternoon, Council President Clarke and members of Council. I'm Rasheia Johnson, City Treasurer. Joining me today is Christian Dunbar, Deputy City Treasurer, and Matthew Bowman, Executive Director of the Sinking Fund Commission. I'm pleased to provide my testimony on the City Treasurer's Office and the Sinking Fund Commission for Fiscal Year 2018 Operating Budget.

The proposed Fiscal Year 2018
General Fund budget totals $\$ 1.2$ million, an increase of $\$ 14,771$ over Fiscal Year 2017 estimated obligation levels. The increase is driven by raises for DC 33 and exempt employees and a restoration of the Class 200 to the original budget levels.

Under debt management, the CTO continues to maximize the value received for new finances while reducing the

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. City's debt service payments with continuous monitoring for refunding opportunities. CTO plans to issue debt through six to seven transactions in FY17 and FY18. Those transactions include the proposed Philadelphia Water Department new money, which we priced today, as well as next week we'll plan to price the Philadelphia Municipal Authority refunding for savings. In FY18, the proposed debt transactions include a general obligation new money, Gas Work revenue bonds, as well as the PAID affordable housing program, the BSRP, and the PAID Rebuild Community Infrastructure program. That's assuming that PBT litigation is resolved, as well as the tax and revenue anticipation note. The City continues to be in compliance in all material respects with regards to a continuing disclosure for prior obligations issued. CTO plans to continue the regular review, update, and implementation of new policies,

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. procedures to ensure the City's continued compliance with all SEC and IRS regulations.
CTO plans to implement a
comprehensive investor outreach program.
The goal is to better inform the investor community about the City and its goals and initiatives. Based on our experience, we believe improved relationships and a better understanding can result in lower interest costs for the City's bonds. The City's expanded investor outreach program aims to increase the number of investors in the effort to lower the City's cost of debt by increasing demand for the City's bonds.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { The CTO manages the City's } \\
& \text { credit relationships with the three major } \\
& \text { credit agencies. The City recently } \\
& \text { received negative outlook changes from } \\
& \text { two of the three rating agencies. In } \\
& \text { explaining these negative outlooks, the } \\
& \text { rating agencies stressed the City's }
\end{aligned}
$$

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. continued challenges with its relatively low fund balances, and currently the City is rated A in all three categories by the three agencies.

In FY 2016, CTO with the assistance of the City's Payroll Department began to reduce the number of weekly payroll checks distributed by the introduction of a new debit payroll program and a campaign to enroll more City employees into the direct deposit program. Since the start of the program, City employees, inclusive of DC 33 and those employees in exempt and non-represented classes, have been successfully converted into either direct deposit or payroll card programs. During this program, approximately 2,478 employees have converted from paper checks to either direct deposit or the payroll card program. During FY18, the program will focus on those employees who have not yet made the conversion to electronic payments.
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Also in FY18, CTO will be working with the Office of Innovation and Technology on the procurement and implementation of a treasury management system. A TMS will provide the CTO with the ability to automate and add more control around the cash management process that are highly manual and spreadsheet dependent. Another key benefit of a TMS is a centralized, secure, and standardized system for administering approximately 300 bank investment accounts that the City holds. This centralization will ensure that the authorized users of the accounts are routinely updated and monitored and would allow the City to provide a more in-depth review of commercial banking fees and ensuring the City is being provided services at beneficial pricing and also allow for more timely audit of fees charged versus negotiated fees.

In addition, the Sinking Fund Commission oversees the time of repayment
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of the bonds' principal and interest on the City-related debt, service agreement, and lease obligation. The City currently has $\$ 7.5$ billion of outstanding debt as of February 28th, 2017. The total Fiscal Year 2018 debt service budget is \$702.7 million, which is an increase of $\$ 63.4$ million, or 9.3 percent, over the estimated obligations for FY 2017.

I appreciate this opportunity
to provide testimony regarding the proposed Fiscal Year 2018 budget for the Office of Treasurer and Sinking Fund Commission, and I'll be happy to answer any questions that Council may have at this time.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you very much for your testimony. A couple questions. Page 3 of your testimony you show an M/W/DBE contract participation goal of 30 percent.

However, your participation rate in '16
ended with 22 percent and '17 shows 19
percent achieved so far. So we're on
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this downward trend. So is there a plan to not only slow the decline but to enhance your numbers?

MS. JOHNSON: The 19 percent is
as of -- for $F Y$-- for this fiscal year is as of December 31st, and there were some -- for our office, outside of contracts, a lot of our participation comes at the bond deals, and because of what happened with the post election, some of our bond deals were pushed back into this calendar year. So, like I said, we just priced one today. We have another one next week. So that will -the participation in those bond transactions will now be counted as we move forward. So that will help that number to go up, yes. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: How high?

MS. JOHNSON: How high? I will
have to get you the --
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Yeah. I need to know that.
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MS. JOHNSON: I will get you
the --
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: It
would have to be a significant
transaction in terms of participation, MBE, WBE, and DBE, to get to your projected goal of 30 .

MS. JOHNSON: And that's
another thing we're looking at, that number of 30 percent. But, no. We are definitely monitoring it to make sure that we can get that number improved.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Right, but the question is, if you don't reach -- if you come in with the numbers and it's 22, is there a plan to increase it?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. We are
looking at our contracts. Just, for example, we had one contract that we just had to re-RFP that did not have --
historically did not have an MBE/WBE component to it that we just added to one of our contracts that we just --
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
You're working with OEO and --
MS. JOHNSON: That's correct.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: --
the Office of Diversity?
MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. The City has been warned -- and we've talked about it today -- about its current trajectory, leaving them open to a credit downgrade based on our numbers. Can you tell me how a credit downgrade could potentially impact our ability to issue bonds?

MS. JOHNSON: A credit downgrade, because we are in an $A$ category, we will -- if we are downgraded a notch or so below, we will be -- it will cost us more. And right now, rough estimates, for every notch would be approximately about $\$ 1.5$ million in additional debt service per year in actual dollars that we would have to pay based upon a $\$ 100$ million borrowing if we
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are downgraded.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: So
that puts more emphasis and importance on
the subsequent questions that $I$ know
Councilman Domb will ask about our
downgrade in ratings, so I'll leave that
to him, the details of that.
One last question. We
anticipate changing the institution that handles our payroll?

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. We put out an RFP, with the hopes of having an ordinance introduced, yes.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: All
right. And the basis for that change?
MS. JOHNSON: Well, there were several prongs. Pricing was a factor in that and saving money.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: All
right. I mean, it's always a good thing,
right, we're saving money.
MS. JOHNSON: Yeah, saving
money.

```
                                COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: You
```
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can talk about it. I mean, I checked. They said it was okay to bring it out publicly. So we did an analysis --

MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: --
of institutions and we got a good
price --
MS. JOHNSON: That's correct.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: -on our payroll contract. So we're going with the best price?

MS. JOHNSON: We're going with the best price that could provide the same, if not better, quality of work that we've been receiving historically, yes.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. All right.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Jones.
COUNCILMAN JONES: Thank you,
Mr. President.
And Madam Treasurer and
Deputies, welcome. A couple of things. One, you deal with the money managers
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that handle our investments, correct?
MS. JOHNSON: That's correct. COUNCILMAN JONES: Is it safe to say in the last Administration we lost a lot of money by way of some of those transactions?

MS. JOHNSON: Well, the money managers that handle our cash, no, because the one thing we do is try to protect and preserve principal, and for the City's cash, we do deal in a lot of short-term durations, so --

COUNCILMAN JONES: That's
separate?
MS. JOHNSON: That's separate from the pension, yes.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So you
mention we had 300 accounts.
MS. JOHNSON: Yes.
COUNCILMAN JONES: A couple of years back, time flies, before you were there, we did a resolution looking at how we deposit in our overnight sweeps. You mentioned we had 300 accounts. Have we
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automated that to do more direct deposit of those accounts so that we maximize our short-term interest?

MS. JOHNSON: Mm-hmm.
COUNCILMAN JONES: So could you
elaborate on how we've done that.
MS. JOHNSON: I would have to get those numbers as far as -COUNCILMAN JONES: I mean just systems. I don't need exact numbers.

MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. Those are our systems. Those are kind of things that we've put in place that allow -- on the bank systems. Those aren't our internal systems. The TMS would be our internal system, so we can work in the bank portals automatically instead of right now what we do is take information from the bank portals and their system and then we have to dump it into Excel and do a lot of manual calculation with regards to things.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So generally
when the Revenue Department gets money,
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are we looking to them to maximize the transfer of money? So, for example, the state reimburses us for DHS. That's a considerable amount of money and a considerable amount of interest that we can earn. How are we maximizing those kinds of opportunities so that our balance stays right and we get a rate of return for our deposits? MR. DUNBAR: So typically -COUNCILMAN JONES: Say your name. MR. DUNBAR: Thank you. Christian Dunbar, Deputy City Treasurer. So typically our con cash account is where we receive most of our deposits. It's sort of our catch-all account, and within that account, any access we have in operating funds are automatically invested, you know. So we're actively managing our cash. Now, because we have such a short duration portfolio and liquidity is a big issue with the City, the returns
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aren't great, but because of the vast amount of money that we do have just in terms of operating cash, we end up earning some funds on it, but --

COUNCILMAN JONES: Just round figures, on any given day what is our available cash on hand?

MR. DUNBAR: So as of February 28th, our cash on hand in terms of operating cash is about 680 million.

COUNCILMAN JONES: And that
fluctuates so quickly that we don't get -- so is there a standard that you guys look for to make sure we're -because I've been around long enough to, when I was Deputy Finance Director, have to figure out on Monday who we're going to pay on Tuesday when it was tight. Have we gotten past those days? How are we managing our operating dollars?

MS. JOHNSON: What we do is, we work closely with the Budget Office and we do -- we have monthly cash flows that Budget works up, and we work closely with
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them, and then we take those internally and we break those down to weekly based upon payrolls and all the various things, and we try to invest based upon that to make sure that we have enough dollars in-house to pay all the necessary payments that we have to make and made all of our obligations as well as what's being invested, so what's being invested can reap the benefit of earning some, you know, interest on it without having to be liquidated too early.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So to an extent -- and I won't belabor it -- I'd love to hear how you do it at some point, not today. But is there a way to work with the Budget Office to say if we're paying our fuel cost on the first of the month and we know that peaks and valleys of our cash flow occur at that same time, that that's a good thing or can we adjust certain payments so that we don't take big peaks and valleys? Do you consider that?
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MR. DUNBAR: We do do cash flow projections.

MS. JOHNSON: Our cash flow is based on revenues and expenditures based upon what you're specifically talking about, whether there's certain things that are paid. We know that there's certain payments that we have to make and from Revenue what -- certain times of the month various monies come in.

COUNCILMAN JONES: I just want to thank you. I just wanted to get a sense of that. I remember there was an occasion where we received close to a million dollar check and it sat on a desk, before you were there, for close to a year, and $I$ just -- that nightmare in my mind of lost earnings is the thing that I will hopefully try to avoid and maximize our opportunity to get it in the bank, get short-term overnight sweeps and do what we can. All right?

Thank you, Mr. President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
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Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman Green.

COUNCILMAN GREEN: Thank you. Thank you, Council President.

Good morning, Ms. Johnson and the rest of your staff. I wanted to publicly thank you for the assistance you provided my office and also last year when we did a briefing for members of Council on some of the issues that come up in front of this body. Also based on your years of experience both from working at PFM and Siebert, which is now, I think, Siebert Cisneros Shank, and Luke Capital, you provide a unique perspective having worked for minority-owned investment banking firms, also working for a very prominent FA like PFM and your past experience as City Treasurer. So I want to thank you for your assistance you provided to my office.

In addition, I know we've spoken about an initiative that I'm
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working on to work with the National
Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials and the National Association of

Securities Professionals to put together a conference for elected officials in the region to learn more and dive in deeper regarding some of these issues. So thank you for your support in that regard. Looking at your budget testimony, I just had a question. I know this year all of the major credits of the City are going to be doing debt transactions. However, I did not see the Airport listed in your testimony. It's my understanding they are doing a significant transaction this year. Am I correct in that regard?

MS. JOHNSON: That is correct.
They are doing a transaction. It's new money as well as a refunding.

COUNCILMAN GREEN: Right. So
earlier in another meeting I asked for this information. I just want to kind of reiterate this for the record. I wanted
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to get a perspective -- and you provided some of the information here regarding the proposed debt transactions for FY17 as well as FY18. I wanted to know -- I know you internally have this information. I wanted to know if you can provide that information regarding for each of those credits for those that you've already identified teams, who the team is on that transaction, and also when you anticipate going to market on these offerings. And then for proposed transactions, when do you anticipate putting together those teams and also when do you anticipate going to market on those projects as well. If you can provide that information.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, I can.
COUNCILMAN GREEN: That would
be helpful, because I think it would also provide information, especially for the teams you've already identified, and then for the proposed teams, I know you use a rotational process for both counsel and
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also investment professionals, different institutions that also could be good, because that will give a better perspective I think for this body of the diversity of firms that you anticipate using now that you're fully into your position as City Treasurer.

And then one last comment. I know I spoke to Christian Dunbar in your office earlier, and previously we had meetings regarding the concept of a public bank. I look forward to looking at that information so we can review it in more detail and look at this concept going forward.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay.
COUNCILMAN GREEN: Thank you. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Thank you.
Just for the record, we're kind of consolidating Sinking Fund and Treasurer testimony and questions. So if there are any questions with respect to the Sinking Fund, we can ask these
4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC.
questions with this panel.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Blackwell.
COUNCILWOMAN BLACKWELL: Thank
you, Mr. President. I certainly want to thank the Treasurer, her Deputies. We work with Christian Dunbar, and he's a member of our Commission as well. And I want to thank her for briefings that she's provided to me, and my questions included like if we -- you kind of asked, if our rating goes down.

But you talk, Madam Treasurer, like you try to do different things to bring it up.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, what we've been doing in conjunction with the Director of Finance, Rob Dubow, as well as with Anna Adams, every time something comes out, whether it's a quarterly manager's report, the Five Year Plan, Operating Budget and Brief, whatever comes out, we have ongoing, even away from transactions, have ongoing
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conversations with the rating agencies to help them understand some of the initiatives that we're putting in place and some of the -- and what our end result and our goals are. So when things like that come out, we have just the ongoing dialogue to help them to understand better so they just don't get the numbers that are on the paper but the plan that's actually behind it. So I think that's one of the things that's been helpful to us moving forward as we look to issue the various debt that we have planned.

COUNCILWOMAN BLACKWELL: That's good. Well, we want to say thank you again. Thank you all again. MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN BLACKWELL: Thank you, Mr. President.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilwoman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman Domb.
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COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you,
Council President.
And good afternoon.
MS. JOHNSON: Good afternoon.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I have a
couple questions for you, but first I just want to acknowledge your department, and I see Anna and Rob here. I didn't realize this, that the Government Finance Officers Association gave us a Distinguished Budget Presentation Award last year. So congratulations to you guys on that. I didn't know this budget was so distinguished, but $I$ saw them upon us now.

So let me just ask you a few questions about -- we got a slightly negative rating reduction, $I$ guess, in September of this past year. What was the specific reason for that?

MS. JOHNSON: Well, in the
write-up, what was mentioned was basically the pension, unfunded balance, as well as the our low fund balance. So
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those -- it's not one specific thing, but just kind of an ongoing trend. And it's not just Philadelphia, but a lot of large cities across the U.S.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: But those were the two main issues?

MS. JOHNSON: That's correct.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: If I recall,
Council President, we had a financial meeting. I don't remember when it was, maybe September or October, where actually Matt Stitt did a great presentation comparing our ratings to other cities across the country, and if I recall, we were at the second or third from the bottom in many of those categories and it was because of fund balance and pensions. So I know all other cities have had issues. I think our issues are maybe more severe in that analysis comparing us to other cities. So whatever we can do to improve that bond rating, we have to do. It's like crucial.
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In that light, $I$ want to make
sure I understand. On Page 75 of the Five Year Plan book, there's a chart that shows six different agencies, I guess, and it shows the debt -- or actually I guess it's the interest and principal of each agency. I want to make sure I understand this chart correctly. Just go to the top. It says 2018 GO Bonds. Is that the payments or is that the actual balance? I believe it's the payments. MS. JOHNSON: This is the debt service payment.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: That's the payment?

MS. JOHNSON: That's correct.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: So what this chart is showing is, we have six different places where we owe money, and this is the amount of principal and interest we are paying every year. And it's reducing down, but it doesn't show the new borrowings blended in.

```
MS. JOHNSON: Right. This is
```
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just our current outstanding.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Is there a
way to add to this chart the current principal balance, the interest rate, and the term?

MS. JOHNSON: Yeah. What we have and we can put together is based upon our planned future financings to add to that what it would look like.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: If you were paying $\$ 445$ million a year, you would want to know what your principal balance is, your interest rate, and the term of that loan. So I think if we can get that chart, I would love to see that chart. MS. JOHNSON: Well, what we can break out for you is the principal, the interest. The rate is kind of a blended rate. So of course each maturity has a different rate, but $I$ can show you what the interest is per year and break it out for existing as well as projected.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Let me back up for a minute. The GO bonds that were
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paid 141 million in 2018, how much do we owe in total, is what I'm questioning? What's the total outstanding obligation? You don't have to give it to me now. I'm asking for it in a chart form.

MS. JOHNSON: Sure.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I'm asking
you to add some columns that say we owe $\$ 100$ million, this year we're paying \$3 million down, so next year we'll owe 97. So I'd like to see the outstanding principal, the interest rate, and the term of that loan.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: The other question $I$ had is, in the Five Year Plan there's a page that talks about a summary of -- General Fund summary tables. Can you explain to me in Fiscal Year '16 -MS. JOHNSON: What page are you on?

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Sorry. Page 329. MS. JOHNSON: Okay.
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COUNCILMAN DOMB: Is this under your department, the debt service?

MS. JOHNSON: That's under the
Sinking Fund, that's correct.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: So the debt
service, Class 700, in Fiscal Year '16 is 132 million, and in Fiscal Year ' 22 , it goes to 220 million, which is a 68 percent increase?

MS. JOHNSON: That's --
COUNCILMAN DOMB: What's
causing that? Because I understand the bonds for Rebuild are up in contracts and leases.

MR. DUNBAR: I'm sorry. What
are you looking at?
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I'm looking
at Class 700, Fiscal Year '16, 132 million, and when we go out to 2022, it's 220 million. It increases 68 percent.

MS. JOHNSON: What that is is a combination of new debt now. In the Class 700 is inclusive of Airport as well as Water. That's all that debt, as well
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as the GO debt, excluding any lease obligations and service agreements. So, again, included in that is the future debt and then we have some debt that was layered on that does not start amortizing until the 2020 fiscal year. So there's several things that make that number jump like that, but we can break that out for you as well.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: I'd like to see the analysis, because when you look at it as a number, it seems like it's going up dramatically. Dramatically. 68 percent increase in six years.

MS. JOHNSON: We can break that
out for you.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: The other
question $I$ have, in the City's debt service policy that we have as a city, our target maximum is 15 percent for tax-supported debt service, plus long-term obligations as a percentage of General Fund expenditures. However, in Fiscal Year '15 it was 22 percent, 7
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points higher. Do you know what our ratio is in Fiscal '17 and what the target is for '18?

MS. JOHNSON: No. I can get what ' 17 is, but -- we can get what '17 is, but that's one thing that we're currently looking at, our debt policy, to make sure, one, we are in compliance, and if not, maybe we should, you know, start to look at updating our debt policy to make sure that we're in compliance with it.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Okay. Thank
you. Thank you very much.
Thank you, Council President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
I see the pension brigade just
came in. I'm impressed.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Reynolds Brown.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you.
Good afternoon. I simply
wanted to go on the record to say that I
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do appreciate and join my members who watch carefully to see what you're doing, appreciate the fine work you've done already, and to my issue of pay equity and the like, my appreciation that you recognize that and have tried to be fair across your department in that way. It doesn't go unrecognized.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you very much.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Domb.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you,
Council President. I have another question. I want to get your opinion. You're our Treasurer for the City of Philadelphia. Are you concerned that the debt service is going up 68 percent in the next six years? Have you looked at what all that's for, and are you
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concerned about that?
MS. JOHNSON: Well, again, you're looking at the Class 700, but I look at each credit separately. So it shows a little different picture, and we'll break that out for you how it looks, each individual credit versus holistically and explain. And under each credit within all of our debt, 50 percent of our debt rolls off within the next ten years. So at this point, no, not too concerned about how it's layered in, but --

COUNCILMAN DOMB: But if 50 percent layers off, it's still going up 68 percent. The bottom line is it's going up 68 percent. We're incurring 68 percent more in debt than we had in 2016.

MS. JOHNSON: We're not really -- some of that debt is already existing, but it just doesn't start to amortize until later. So it's not that we're incurring all of this debt right now.
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COUNCILMAN DOMB: So getting us the schedule will be helpful on that.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes. I was going
to say, the schedule will lay it out for you a little better.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Having that information to anyone making a decision about borrowing is very important.

Because if we're going to put the City into debt further, we should know what our obligations are for principal payments in later years out so we can make an educated decision as to do we want to even borrow more knowing this principal is coming to hit us in the next couple years.

MS. JOHNSON: Fair enough.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you.
Thank you very much. Thank you.
MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you,
Council President.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
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That concludes the questions, and I want to thank you very much for your testimony.

MS. JOHNSON: Thank you.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Next
up we'll have Pensions.
(Witnesses approached witness
table.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Good
afternoon.
MR. BIELLI: Good afternoon.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: You
can proceed with your testimony.
MR. BIELLI: Okay. Good
afternoon, Council President Clarke, members of City Council. I am Francis Bielli, the Board's Executive Director. Joining me today are Deputy Pension Director Shamika Taliaferro to my right, to Shamika's right Christopher DiFusco, Chief Investment Officer, and other members of our executive staff and the Chair of the Pension Board, Mr. Rob Dubow.
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Before I read my summary of the submitted testimony, I'd like to thank those of you to whom I've met during the past year for your input and ideas on strengthening the pension plan.

While our budget request is slightly higher than FY17 estimated obligation levels, it remains lower than the amount requested in six of the past 11 years. This funding will maintain staffing at its optimal level and covers fringe benefits as well as a scheduled 3 percent raise for the Board's District Council 33 represented staff.

The demographics of our staff is 75 percent female, 61 percent African American, 3 percent Asian American, and 2 percent Hispanic. Our current executive staff is 50 percent female and 50 percent African American.

The plan's funding percentage
remains relatively flat, decreasing from 45 to 44.8 percent as of July 1st, 2016. In February 2017, the Board voted to
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again reduce the assumed rate of return to its current 7.70 percent, a total reduction of 1.05 percent over the past nine years. Per the Board's actuary, while the funding ratio may appear to reflect lack of progress in funding, the decrease in the assumed rate of return represents improvement of the fund's risk profile, improving the likelihood of achieving the assumptions in the future. The fund's investment return for the fiscal year, the current fiscal year through March, is 9.26 percent net of fees versus our policy index, which is 8.77 percent. The fund's portfolio was restructured following the Board's decision in Fiscal Year 2016 to divest from hedge funds and many of our illiquid distressed debt vehicles. The redemption of these high fee, actively managed investments is almost complete, resulting in a dramatic reduction in investment fees paid by the Board from $\$ 33.5$ million, which is a 0.69 percent ratio in
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FY14, to $\$ 16.3$ million, which is a 0.38 percent investment ratio in FY16, which is an overall reduction of 51 percent during that timeframe.

Passively managed investments, otherwise known as indexing, now accounts for approximately 51 percent of the fund's assets, up from approximately 29 percent just three years ago in December of 2014 .

Using our investment manager database, the Board once again conducted a utilization study to determine the universe of diverse investment managers that meets the fund's criteria, which is having a three-year track record and at least $\$ 100$ million in assets under management. The results are that 8.6 percent of the firms and 4.6 percent of the products had greater than 50 percent minority or women ownership. The fund's current lineup of investment managers includes 36.7 percent diversity managers, far surpassing the universe that the
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utilization study revealed and outpacing the fund's FY16 showing of 28 percent.

The Board continues to seek out high quality, diverse, local, and emerging managers for allocations across all asset classes.

Board members and staff
continue to participate in the Mid Atlantic Plan Sponsors, the National Association of Securities Professionals, and other non-profit organizations that are proponents of diversity investment professionals. In February 2017, Trustee Carol Stukes-Baylor was honored by being elected into the NASP Hall of Fame as a result of her advocacy on behalf of diversity investment managers. The Board is a member of a national association called the Thirty Percent Coalition, which is an organization committed to the goal of increasing women participation on corporate boards. The Board also continues to support proxy initiatives
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promoting issues such as inclusive corporate boards, equal pay, and other important social issues. In addition to selecting

Marquette as its general consultant and TorreyCove as its private equity consultant, the Board has chosen Nationwide to serve as the third-party administrator of the City's deferred compensation plan at fees significantly lower than those of the incumbent. The transition to Nationwide is underway and will be complete by the end of May 2017, including a full-time certified financial planner who will be available on location daily to all plan members.

The 457 plan allows employees to contribute a portion of their earnings into a pre-tax defined contribution program and to self-manage the investment of these contributions within the available options. Participation in the 457 plan is encouraged as a way for employees to create retirement income in
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addition to their accrued defined benefit pension. There are currently 20,329 employees participating in the 457 plan, representing 73 percent of those eligible to participate. As of February 2017, this plan has exceeded $\$ 1$ billion in total assets.

The Board continues to provide retirement education sessions to system members, annually reaching thousands of employees through in-house training as well as visits to various operating departments and participating in seminars for members of the Police and Firefighters Unions. The Board also participates in the Personnel Department's two-day on-boarding seminar for new employees. As of the close of Fiscal Year '16, membership in the pension fund has surpassed 66,000 members, and the number of benefit recipients, which is greater than 35,000 , and the annual rate of pension payments, which is approximately
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\$748.8 million, excluding DROP payments, both reached all-time highs.

We respectfully request that you approve our budget, and we'd be glad to answer any questions. Thank you. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Thank you, sir.
Let me ask a couple of
questions. On Page 8 of your testimony, you list a few highlights achieved by the Pension Board in FY17, including achieving in your testimony 8.5. I understand that's now 9 percent.

MR. BIELLI: The market keeps going up.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Awesome. A certain person in Washington
I'm sure is going to take credit for this too, stock market issues, but anyway.

Return net fees to date and reducing the assumed rate of return to 7.7. Does the Board have a goal of how much lower the assumed rate of return should be? We keep driving it down.
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MR. BIELLI: I think the Board's stated goal is to continue to gradually reduce the assumed rate of return going forward. There are a number of public pension funds out there. We actually had our consultant take a look at public pension plans valued between $\$ 2$ and $\$ 9$ billion, and the average assumed rate of those plans was 7.60 percent. So we're not far off the average with our current 7.70 but, again, the stated goal of the Board is to continue to try to gradually reduce.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. Kind of a goofy question. So a few years back there was a big developer down here -- and I don't know if I talked to you -- that was trying to get the City's pension fund to invest in a real estate deal in Center City. Right now given what's happening in the real estate market, I think it may have been a good approach to that investment. And there were some back and forth. Ultimately the
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pension fund opted not to go to that
direction. So my question is, is
there -- and I'm assuming there is -- a set of parameters around what type of investments the City's pension fund can get engaged in? As an example, like there have been some people who made some suggestions because they personally invested in the cannabis fund, and I got to believe that's going to blow up real soon. I'm just being real. People are going to start smoking weed and somewhere down the line it will be recreational I believe in the State of Pennsylvania, but is there like a limit on what we can get engaged in? I understand we have to have low risk investments, but to what degree is that?

MR. BIELLI: So we do have an investment policy statement, which does provide parameters as to the amount of assets and the years of experience that an investment manager must have in order
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for us to be involved with that manager.
Concerning real estate, we take a similar approach in that many new funds or new companies that are initially starting out their investments, we try to see at least a track record first before we get involved in them, and that would have been applicable to the situation that you're referring to from a couple of years ago.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: They had a couple of big buildings down here.

MR. BIELLI: They do, and we subsequently interviewed that same company and that individual who -- it was the Ritz Carlton actually.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Right. I wasn't going to say the name, but okay.

MR. BIELLI: But we interviewed them on another project and we went through due diligence, we went through our consultants, and it just -- it wasn't a good fit for other reasons, but not
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because of their investment acumen. But there are other aspects of investments that we look at.

So concerning venture capital
type of investments, we do invest in private equity, in the area of private equity, and some of the private equity managers could invest in up-and-coming companies such as the company you referred to.

## COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

## Cannabis.

MR. BIELLI: We would not
invest directly. We don't do angel
investing or things like that. That has not worked out so well in the past to do small angel investing, but we don't prohibit our -- I don't believe there's a prohibition against our investment managers getting involved in businesses such as that.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. Is there any potential conflict if the government; i.e., the municipality,
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takes an action that would enhance the company that we would -- that we potentially may invest in? So I'm sorry to keep bringing up cannabis, because I'm telling you, that thing is going to be like -- to some degree, we have some governing authority over placement of operations of those type of entities. Is there a conflict if we invest? Because I see these people -- there's some discussion about certain elected officials that took votes and they bought stock in particular companies that are now rising, and they have a direct ability as a legislator to impact some of the operations of that particular company.

MR. BIELLI: So because the Board itself makes all the investment decisions, the individual members of whatever legislature it is, whether it's City Council or state legislature or some other legislature, they do not have a direct vote on the investments. So
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there's no specific conflict. However, there are rules in state law that prohibit us from investing or even having them have those people solicit investments from us who are political donors to local political candidates. That's under Act 44 of the state law. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Okay.
MR. BIELLI: The federal
government has different rules concerning the legislature's ability to be involved in investments. But, no, I would say no particular conflict. However, we do have a full-time compliance officer, a lawyer who is a compliance officer on staff at the Board of Pensions, and we would look at any situation on a case-by-case basis and we do vet, we vet and our consultants vet every possible investment very closely before being presented to the Board.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. All right. Thank you.
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The Chair recognizes Councilman Domb .

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you, Council President.

Good afternoon.
MR. BIELLI: Good afternoon, Councilman.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: I have a couple questions. I just wanted to make sure I understood. One is that your request for 402,000 is about 6 percent on your budget, roughly.

MR. BIELLI: Okay.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: And the wage
increases are 3 percent. What are the other 3 percent and where is that going?

MR. BIELLI: Fringe benefits
for those wages.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Are your
fringe benefits in Class 100?
MR. BIELLI: Class 100,
correct.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: So your
department includes fringe benefits in
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Class 100?
MR. BIELLI: Correct. I'm going to have to check for clarification with Dave Fegan.

Yes. The answer is yes.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: So if I'm
looking at your budget and it says Fiscal Year '18 proposed appropriations, it's 7,644,000?

MR. BIELLI: As Mr. Dubow just pointed out, we're different than the General Fund, because our fringe benefits do show with the Class 100 as opposed to other operating departments.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: So you show
it right.
MR. BIELLI: Yes.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: That's good.
MR. BIELLI: It's a true
indication of the cost.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I'm glad to hear that, by the way. That's good.

So that means that your budget
is pretty much fully loaded except for
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maybe overhead of the City, but all the fringe benefits are in there.

MR. BIELLI: We rarely go over
budget. Usually go under in Class 100. COUNCILMAN DOMB: And I guess the reason why it's 3 percent for wage, another 3 percent is because, as we've said before, for every dollar of wage, it's close to 87 to 90 cents of benefits. MR. BIELLI: That's right. I think we've discussed that previously.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Do you have an idea of the return on the pension the last five years and the last ten years, ball park return? MR. BIELLI: Yes. Our CIO has those numbers.

MR. DiFUSCO: Good afternoon. COUNCILMAN DOMB: You want to state your name for the record. MR. DiFUSCO: Chris DiFusco
from the pension fund.
The one-year return -- I'm
quoting from February. Our numbers are
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through February of 2017. The one-year return was 15.76 percent.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: What were the
dates of that return, 15.6?
MR. DiFUSCO: 15.76. That's
from February of '16 to February of '17.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: That's
phenomenal, by the way.
MR. DiFUSCO: The three-year
return is 3.52 percent.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: That's not
too good.
MR. DiFUSCO: The five-year
return is 6.34 percent. And the
inception to date return, which goes back
to the late 180 s , is 7.44 percent.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Do you have a
ten-year return?
MR. DiFUSCO: I'm sorry. I
skipped over that. I apologize. 4.63
percent.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: 4.6 in the
last ten years?
MR. DiFUSCO: Correct.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. } \\
& \text { COUNCILMAN DOMB: So do you } \\
& \text { think based on these numbers that it's } \\
& \text { prudent for us to keep the assumed rate }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\text { of } 7.7 ?
$$

MR. BIELLI: Just one caveat to
those return numbers before we specifically answer that question is that a drag on those returns have been the portfolio prior to a year ago and over that two- to three-year period where the large reliance on hedge funds and distressed debt really acted as an anchor on our returns, and you can see as that's been removed over the last year, the returns have really started to do well, and it's not just because the stock market has been doing well. And the fees were cut in half.

So I think if you look at the inception to date, which is 1988, and the return is approximately 7.4 percent, including those anchor years, I think we are getting closer to being in the ball park for that assumed rate of return.
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In addition, our consultant,
who looks at our assumed rate of return looking out ten years, assumes that we will return greater than 7.70 over a ten-year period.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: So do you
think in the Administration's plan to fund the pensions, which is over the next 13 years, that the assumed rate we're using for 13 years is achievable?

MR. BIELLI: I think it's
achievable. I think it would be -clearly it would be more achievable if the assumed rate was less. However, even if we don't get to 7.70 percent and don't reach 80 percent funding, if we achieve 7.6 percent, we're going to achieve 75 percent funding or somewhere in that neighborhood, which is a big plus over where we're at right now. So in that respect, the plan is a positive.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: What might be helpful for this body is to give us the analysis for that 13 -year plan showing
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what you're assuming now but showing the impact if it's 7, 6, and 5.

MR. BIELLI: Okay.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I don't think
it's going to be a big impact, but at
least let me see what it is.
MR. BIELLI: Okay.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: The last
question for this round is that I've been told I think by -- I know Rob has told me this, 90 percent of our pension problem occurred, I think, from 1967 to 1987. MR. BIELLI: That's right. The 1967 plan is generically known, that's right.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: So do we know the average age of the people that are in that pension plan?

MR. BIELLI: That is in the actuarial report, and $I$ can get you that information. But, yes, we know the average age. We know the number of people.

```
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I'd like to
```
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know the average age, because that's going to tell us a lot, because once that disappears to a degree, it's going to put less of a strain on this whole pension issue.

MR. BIELLI: Yeah. The demographic page in the actuarial report actually has a breakdown on all of the ages of each of the people that are still active and retired in those ' 67 plans.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: You're welcome.

Good afternoon.
MR. BIELLI: Good afternoon.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN:
Councilwoman Maria Quinones-Sanchez.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Thank
you.
I just want to kind of echo what Councilman Domb was saying. I know that if we reduce our expected rate of
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return, we have to pay more money into it, but 7.7 is still pretty aggressive and considering we have no history of it. So I know that's what you guys are going to stick to, but you're setting yourself for aggressive numbers. So next year when you don't meet them, Councilman Domb and others are going to pressure you for that.

I had a little question around your status of your employees. You're budgeted for 73, but you only have 57. Why?

MR. BIELLI: So we have, I think -- as of now, it's 60. Quite frankly, I think we've -- I've been there now a number of years, and I think the number of employees probably wasn't optimal when I got there. It was actually lower than 73. I think we're probably somewhere close to the optimal number.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: And then

```
let me -- we had this conversation
```
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yesterday. Please keep an eye on your salary gaps between minority, white, and female. You have a huge gap in that, and as you look to hire up, because you have vacancies, bear that in mind, because it's really drastic.

I wanted to talk about your minority participation numbers, because you've remained -- your $M / W / D$ numbers continue to stay at 15 percent even though you're reporting in year '15 and '16 that you got 18 percent and 28 percent. Why are your goals still lower?

MR. BIELLI: So our goals are discussed each year with the folks at OEO, and because of that utilization study, the universe of managers is only 8.6 percent. We're at 37 percent, far surpassing that. And I think that's the reason that the goal was adjusted to 15 percent.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: But you're getting 36 percent.

MR. BIELLI: We are.
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COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I want
to ask you that, because then in your Page 11 in your contracting experience in your portfolio, none of these have any minority participation numbers. So I wanted to know where do you get your 37 percent if on your contracting experience all of these say zero?

MR. BIELLI: So the 37 percent is over the people who manage money for the pension fund, which is where the fees come from. So of a percent of the fees that the pension fund pays out, which was 16 point some million dollars, 28.11 percent of that go to diverse managers. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: So why
is the total of contracts on Page 4 different than the ones on Page 11? MR. BIELLI: Because we have contracts that are not for investment managers, such as the actuary, such as the -- we have a contract for an OIT technology provider and other contracts that are not investment related.
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COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: In the
contracting experience one, these say investment managers, Blue Harbor, Apollo Franklin, Causeway, Avenue Coppers, and all of them have no participation.

MR. BIELLI: Right. They are
investment managers. They're specifically investment managers, some of which have been terminated by the Board and will not show up going forward.

> COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Okay.

So you told me that the professional services are your money managers, but these say investment managers also. So who are your minority managers? MR. BIELLI: I'll let Chris answer that. He has a list of -- and we provide that each month in our -COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: You can provide it to the Chair. It's just the numbers don't jive for me. So I just want to make sure that I'm looking apples to apples -MR. BIELLI: Yeah. We'll
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provide that.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: -- as it relates to that.

So in light of the fact that you're claiming almost 36.7 percent, why isn't your goal changing?

MR. BIELLI: We'd be happy to change our goal. We're achieving 36 percent.

> COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I want
to congratulate you for that, but why keep your goal at 15 percent?

MR. BIELLI: I think because of
the universe of managers that are out there. That was seen to be double of what the universe is out there. But we've been very, very aggressive over the last -- well, since I've been there, we've been very aggressive trying to achieve that.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I know
there's, what they call, emerging
financial managers. There's a national
group, New America, all those other
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folks. This has always been a sticking point with us, because we've heard over and over that those folks weren't out there. I attended a pension fund training, and the room was full of brown people who do this stuff. So I'm glad to see that we found them.

MR. BIELLI: Yeah. You're
right, and people will tell you -- we went three years ago -- in fact, Chris went. It was an emerging manager conference in Chicago.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: New America sponsors them. They do Chicago, LA.

MR. BIELLI: And we went there. We aggressively went out there to network and to find good diverse managers. And the industry in general would like you to believe that that does not exist, but it's not true. It's just not true. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Well, thank you. Congratulations on that. MR. BIELLI: Thank you.
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COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: I'll say
thank you and congratulations as well, because that's not -- your response is the exception and not the norm. And there is a real continued interest from members of Council and I might argue on the second floor that we grow a government at the executive level that looks like the City of Philadelphia. There are folks in those departments with the qualifications and the capacity and the will and the work ethic, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So to the extent that we can have the executive offices reflect our city, it's great. MR. BIELLI: Yes. I know
Councilwoman Sanchez mentioned it, but one thing $I$ should mention is that -- I don't know how many people would say this, but myself and the CIO, our salaries tend to skew the average, quite honestly. Our executive staff is quite diverse and quite even. In fact, you can look at the room. We are. And if you
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would throw out our salaries and look at everyone else, everyone is largely equal in that area.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Well,
continue to stretch across casting the net wide for opportunity.

I am curious to know --
President Clarke said with tongue and cheek, the members of your brigade. So I would like for you to introduce them all and the role they play in your department, starting with the lady to your right.

MR. BIELLI: So this is the Deputy Director of the pension fund, Shamika Taliaferro.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay. You want to tell us what you do? MS. TALIAFERRO: Hello. I'm pretty much responsible for managing the operations of the benefits. We handle the payments and the processing of the applications for service, disability, and death benefits on the benefit level.
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COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: How long have you been in the department?

MS. TALIAFERRO: I've been in the department for 16 years. I've been in this position for about three years.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Okay.
Thank you very, very much.
Please, sir.
MR. DiFUSCO: Thank you.
Christopher DiFusco, Chief Investment
Officer for the Fund responsible for the oversight of the plan, making recommendations to the trustees about investment strategies, managers, et cetera. I've been with the City a little over 14 years and with the Pension staff about four years.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: About?
MR. DiFUSCO: Four years.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: And if you could just introduce the members on the back row back there.

MR. BIELLI: Sure. That's
Teresa Gray. She's an administrator for
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the Board of Pensions. She's also currently spearheading the One Philly project for the Board of Pensions and, like Shamika, Teresa has been with the Board of Pensions for many years.

Next to Teresa is Stacey White, and Stacey is also an administrator handling -- she supervises the counselors and handles all of the work of the counselors and the benefits, the applications, and processing the benefit payments. Stacey has also been at the Board of Pensions many, many years.

Anna is not with us.
Dave Fegan, he's an executive officer with the Board of Pensions and also acts in a human resources role and the contract administration role.

And we have James Kasanis (ph), and James is a lawyer. He was with the Law Department for many years and in private practice, and Jim is our Chief Compliance Officer, and he's been with us for a little over a month now.
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COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Is that
right?
MR. BIELLI: Yes. And Erin
Bailey is a senior investment officer, and she came to us from Vanguard. She's been with us about two months now. COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Awesome.

MR. BIELLI: And that's
Kristin, and Kristin is an investment officer also, and she's been with us a little over two years now and, again, does a very good job.

That's Dominique Cherry, and Dominique is the most senior investment officer out of all the investment officers, and she's been with the Board of Pensions a number of years. She also previously worked at Vanguard, and her father is a retired Philadelphia police officer.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: WOW.
MR. BIELLI: That's Tyrone
Jordan. We like to call him the Rev, because he's actually a reverend. So he

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. keeps us honest, right? He keeps us honest. But he's a good man. He was the Finance Director previously in the City of Wilmington, worked in the Treasurer's Office and in the Borough of Yeadon. He's graduated from West Philadelphia High School, and he's been with us probably about eight months, Chris? Yeah, eight months. And that's Bernard Buckley. Bern spent the majority of his career at Janney Montgomery Scott. He's a local guy. He's a graduate of Saint Joe's Prep, and he's -- like myself, and he's a Deputy Director in the Investment Unit. So that's -- and, again, he's been with us a little over a year. So you can see our most recent hires is a well diverse group. And people like Shamika, who started out as a clerk at the Board of Pensions years and years ago, and I hired Shamika as the Deputy, and she's just a good example of the Board of Pension's -the staff is kind of like a family. Many
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people -- we still have people who retired come back every once in a while to visit people, bring their kids in, and people tend to grow at the Board of Pensions, and Stacey, Teresa, Shamika are all good examples of that.

We have another person here who came a little later. That's Shahied Lloyd. He didn't go to Prep, but he did go to Central, so he's a smart guy. But Shahied is a supervisor in our Active Services Unit. That's the unit where folks purchase time, purchase prior City time, military time. And Shahied is just very smart and just very good.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Well, your team reflects what Councilwoman Sanchez acknowledges, that when you have the opportunity to hire up, that you grow a diverse team, and I commend you for that. That should not go unrecognized. MR. BIELLI: Thank you. COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Thank you very, very much.
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MR. BIELLI: We try.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: We
appreciate your leadership. MR. BIELLI: Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Any other -- Councilman Domb.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you.
If I'm reading your budget
summary correctly -- tell me if I'm right or wrong on this -- there's a number of people -- the full-time staff says 57 and then civil service is an extra 12 on top of that.

MR. BIELLI: I'm sorry?
COUNCILMAN DOMB: On your budget testimony, it says the number of full-time staff is 57.

MR. BIELLI: Yeah. I think
that's now up to 60 since that was submitted with a certain deadline.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: And executive
is eight?
MR. BIELLI: That's about
right.
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COUNCILMAN DOMB: So when you
do the math dividing the budget out -- I tell this to every department, so don't feel bad. Everyone has the same problem. But it's averaging like $\$ 120,000$ per employee based on your budget, and when you include the overhead of the City, it goes to like 150,000. So I just want you to be aware of that. When you hire somebody for 50 , it's really 112. It's not 50 .

MR. BIELLI: Oh, no. Yeah. Because we're in the benefit business, we get it.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: True.
And the other thing I wanted to mention is that you and reserve funds, pensions and fund balance are our two biggest keys to bond rating. So you have a very big role here to help us fix this bond rating with the City. And so in that light, $I$ know Matt Stitt did a chart back in September, I think, showing us credit ratings for different cities
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across the country. Is there a chart that's similar that shows us cities similar to Philadelphia in the past 12 months, past three years, past five years, past ten years what their returns have been on their pensions?

MR. BIELLI: So there's various charts out there, and we looked at it, for example, in the fiscal year of the actuarial report, which ended June 30th, 2016 where we had a down year. We were down 3.2 percent, and that was before we started making changes to the fund. Prior to that, the fund was run by our previous CIO kind of like an endowment. It was similar to an endowment. And if you look at the endowment returns during that period of time, you know, the Harvard endowment --

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Let me stop
you for a second. What I'm referring to
is how did Philadelphia do compared to Chicago? How did Philadelphia do compared to Atlanta or Cleveland?
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MR. BIELLI: So we did --
during the fiscal year ending June 30th, 2016, we had our consultant look at public pension plans, defined benefit plans greater than $\$ 1$ billion in assets. Thirty-one of the 55 had negative returns. Now, we can get the specifics, but 31 of 55 had negative returns during that fiscal year. The endowments had even worse returns during that fiscal year.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: So that
information would be very helpful to myself.

MR. BIELLI: I can get you
that. And then to update that, through December of 2016, which is in the midst of a lot of the changes that we made, we were at plus 4.9 percent. The five -New York City pension funds are divided into five different funds. The range of their returns were 4.24 to 5.67. So in the midst of starting to make some of the changes, we were in the ball park with

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC.
all of those funds. And now I think we're probably higher than or at least in the mainstream with other public pension funds, but we'll get you that data.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: You should
get that out there, because that will help your case, is what I'm saying.

MR. BIELLI: Okay.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: And the other
question $I$ had for you is, have we looked at best practices of other cities and how they're managing pension departments like yours to see if there's any ideas that we could maybe utilize in Philadelphia that have been used by other cities?

MR. BIELLI: So from a benefit perspective, yes, we have done that, and a large part of that will be the completion of the One Philly project, which will give the members more of a self-serve option to the benefit aspect.

From an investment perspective, we always are looking at other public pension funds, and that's one of the
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things that our consultants bring to us, because they not only advise other public pension funds, but they're at conferences all the time and our trustees often time go to conferences and bring back information that provide best practices. COUNCILMAN DOMB: Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much for your testimony.

MR. BIELLI: You're welcome.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you,
Madam Chair.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: You're welcome.

Any other questions, comments, observations from members of the Committee?
(No response.)
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: We thank you very much.

MR. BIELLI: Thank you.
COUNCILWOMAN BROWN: Until next
time.

```
MR. BIELLI: We'll see you.
```
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Council budget hearings will stand at recess until 2 o'clock.
(Short recess.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
We're going to reconvene. Thank you.
So next up is OPA.
(Witnesses approached witness
table.)
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. Good afternoon.
MR. PIPER: Good afternoon, Council President Clarke and members of City Council. I am Michael Piper, Chief Assessment Officer. Joining me today are James Aros, Jr., Deputy Chief Assessment Officer, and Delicsha Wilds, OPA's Administrative Service Director. I am pleased to provide testimony on the Office of Property Assessment's Fiscal Year 2018 Operating Budget.

The Office of Property
Assessment is responsible for determining the value of all real property in
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Philadelphia and is dedicated to doing so in a fair, accurate, and understandable way. OPA's primary goal through ongoing assessments is to improve the accuracy and uniformity of all property values and to instill confidence in Philadelphia taxpayers regarding the fairness of the property tax system as well as the competency and professionalism of Philadelphia's assessment office.

$$
\text { For tax year } 2018, \text { OPA recently }
$$

completed a reassessment of the entire City that focused on all commercial, industrial, and institutional properties, with the goal of not only ensuring that assessed values more accurately reflect sales and market forces, but also reducing the value inequities among comparable properties. This involved a thorough analysis of some of Philadelphia's most complex and high valued parcels, including hotels, office buildings, apartment buildings, all retail properties, from shopping centers
4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC.
and malls to big-box establishments, department stores and corner grocery stores, as well as restaurants, movie theatres, warehouses, commercially zoned vacant land and those properties with multiple uses.

Since assessment increases have been proposed for many of these parcels and because many of the increases are on high valued properties, many of these property owners will likely file formal appeals, and OPA expects to spend much of Fiscal Year 2018 providing property-specific reports in defense of the proposed revisions at market value appeal hearings. However, due to the extensive research and analysis conducted by OPA's evaluation staff and statistical modeling experts in producing the proposed 2018 assessments, and thanks to the additional outside resources provided to OPA at Council's recommendation, we are confident that the final product will represent a substantial improvement to
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the accuracy and uniformity of the City's assessment rolls.

Additionally, OPA will continue
to pursue the goal of assessment accuracy and uniformity for all classifications of property throughout the City of Philadelphia through ongoing and regular assessment efforts. During Fiscal Year 2018, our reassessment project will include a comprehensive review of the entire universe of residential, commercial, and industrial real estate in the City, with the immediate goal of tying assessments to actual values based on an analysis of the market through time-trended accounting of sales over the past several years. This reassessment, effective for tax year 2019, is necessary in order to enhance the relationship between market values and assessments.

As part of our overall goal of increasing the quality of property tax assessments through accurate assessments that are fair to all property owners, OPA
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seeks during the upcoming fiscal year to engage with other City agencies as well as City Council, large institutional property owners of the City's many hospitals and universities, and the non-profit community at large to seek a better way to accurately assess the many statutorily exempt properties as they relate to both value and taxable status. Finally, OPA hopes to begin the initial stages of implementation of the long-awaited computer assisted mass appraisal, or CAMA, system. This will involve not only many hours devoted to technical issues such as data integration and consolidation and/or elimination of existing redundant data silos, but also extensive process modification that will ensure that the City of Philadelphia realizes the full value potential of an off-the-shelf, state-of-the-art CAMA system.

So the proposed Fiscal Year
2018 General Fund budget totals
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$\$ 13,923,826$, which is an increase of
\$1,035,294 over Fiscal Year 2017
estimated obligation levels. This
increase is primarily due to the
anticipation of reaching recommended staffing levels and preparing for appeals associated with the commercial, industrial, and institutionally owned parcels. The budget that the Office of Property Assessment is requesting for Fiscal Year 2018 will allow the department to ensure that it reaches its goal of fair and equitable assessments for all property owners using methodologies that employ industry standards.

We thank you for the
opportunity to testify before Council this afternoon. My staff and I will now be available and happy to answer any questions that you may have.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you. Thank you so much for your testimony.
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I got a couple of questions. As everybody noticed, the $\$ 118$ million figure has been thrown out with respect to commercial assessments, and any more money is always a good thing, except for the people that may have to actually pay the taxes. But we're not here for that.

Do you anticipate any
additional reassessments for FY18 at all?
MR. PIPER: We do. There's some, I would say, smaller sub-universes of properties or something having to do with the properties we've already assessed that property owners will probably see some additional assessment notices on within a couple months of the ones that we're sending out in April. This is because we actually completed the assessment and noticed that there was some problem with some of our numbers, that we felt it wouldn't be responsible for us to send out numbers that we saw problems and know were wrong. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Do
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you anticipate up or down in terms of reassessment?

MR. PIPER: In terms of the
assessments themselves?
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Yes.
MR. PIPER: It's hard to say.
I will say that we're not talking about a lot of properties, maybe a few thousand, maybe 3,000 or 4,000 , and they're not necessarily high valued properties. They are components of existing properties; for instance, billboards and cell towers, that need to be accounted for because it's part of the real estate that we need to make some corrections on.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. And I know you've been talking to members of the tech staff with respect to the tax credit housing. MR. PIPER: Yes.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: That apparently there's some discussion about increasing the taxes on low-income housing.
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MR. PIPER: Well, we did the
same thing for multi-family housing that
we did for all other commercial
properties. We took a look at what the values were that we had on them and we made the adjustments that the market pointed us towards.

Now, there's a little different
method of valuing low-income properties, in that what the market indicates we should be valuing the properties at, we are permitted and have actually discounted that to take into account the rent restrictions and deed restrictions on these properties.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Correct.
MR. PIPER: Nevertheless, we discovered that the assessments that we had on them, even taking into account those restrictions, were very low. They were low before AVI, and even though -they remain low, and I think if we're looking to be fair across the board with
4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC.
all commercial properties, we have to look at those also.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Well, when you say they remain low, that's because the rents continue to remain low. They actually have gone down in terms of their cap in terms of the allowable increases. So it's not like the property owners that are bound by law to only rent to a certain income level. They have the ability to recapture that through the increase in rent. It's actually going the other way.

So my question is, you've taken that into account initially about the cap and the restrictions on revenue raised from those residents. Why do you think that it should go up?

MR. PIPER: We've taken into consideration the caps. I believe there's some additional information that Council's representatives have shared with us today, and we are going to have our assessment staff take a look at that
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Okay. All right. We got to get stuff on the record sometimes. Before you have a real fight, you got to like lay out the basis for the fight.

MR. PIPER: That's what we want to avoid.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Yeah. All right. Thank you.
In terms of -- I'm not going to ask this question. I know Mr. Domb is going to do that.

So are -- maybe I shouldn't ask
that question either. I'm just looking at questions that $I$ know my colleagues are going to ask. You know what, there are a couple of questions I wanted to ask, but I'm not going to ask them because I know my colleagues are going to ask those questions, so I'm going to leave you alone for this moment.

MR. PIPER: Okay.
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COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: And
I'm going to call on Councilman Jones. COUNCILMAN JONES: So I'm not going to ask all mine because I know that -- I want to just ask some basic questions.

So if I read that correctly, you're looking to get 66 new staff, assessors?

MS. WILDS: 17.
COUNCILMAN JONES: 17?
MR. PIPER: 17 additional, right.

COUNCILMAN JONES: And have you had a problem finding people to do appraisals, and how are you dealing with that?

MR. PIPER: So we've had a problem historically in trying to get folks that are qualified to come into our office and even take the exam for assessor. Part of that is because it's a very specialized field and there are only so many people that are qualified to do
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it that live within the City.
We did a couple years ago have conversations with the Civil Service Commission, in which they granted for the time being a ten-year residency waiver for us to be able to recruit folks that live outside the City. And ten years meaning they have ten years to be able to move into the City, but they can come to work as an entry-level evaluator. That has helped solve the problem a little bit. We still struggle. I think a lot of it is also just a matter of people that have retired and some of the same problems that other departments face. COUNCILMAN JONES: So of your staff, you have a full complement of appraisers now?

MR. PIPER: We are about 17 short.

COUNCILMAN JONES: Those are
the 17 you're looking for?
MS. WILDS: Yes. Correct.
COUNCILMAN JONES: Okay.
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Second thing, we put aside, I believe it was, 30 million for appeals in the initial year of AVI. Was it 30 million or 20 million? For those people we put -- it was 32 million aside for appeals; is that correct?

MR. DUBOW: I think that's correct.

COUNCILMAN JONES: And so how many people appealed and are we putting away money for appeals again this year?

MR. PIPER: So to answer the last part of the question, yes. That is a good bit of what we've requested in terms of an increase in our budget. We anticipate appeals because of what we did for fiscal year -- for tax year 2018, yes.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So how many people appealed last year? How successful was those appeals? Because there's a dynamic that you have to go before -- so I get that dynamic. And so how successful were the appeals and what
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do you anticipate coming next?
MR. PIPER: When you say "last year," I'll refer to last year's tax year 2017.

COUNCILMAN JONES: That will
work for me.
MR. PIPER: So 2017, we are
less than halfway through the formal
appeals, BRT appeals. I can get you the exact numbers in terms of how many have been denied by the Board and how many we have been totally successful on. But as a matter of fact, our attorney is here.

COUNCILMAN JONES: That's an
important barometer.
MR. PIPER: Yes.
COUNCILMAN JONES: That's an
important barometer, and it's an
important fiscal barometer for us to see if we need that big of -- if you're only going to do a couple of thousand properties this year, do we need that big of a pool set aside for appeals?
MR. PIPER: When you say "this
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year," you mean tax year 2018?
COUNCILMAN JONES: Yes.
MR. PIPER: Tax year 2018 is
going to involve a project that will probably see revisions on about 60,000 properties, number one. Number two, a lot of these tend to be the higher valued properties. So the appeals that come in will look different.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So maybe you need more, maybe you need less, but how much did you spend before, is the question before me. How many of the $\$ 32$ million people actually received an adjustment that we were able to draw from that pool of $\$ 32$ million we set aside? What is the accurate number for that?

MR. PIPER: How many people saw an adjustment in their assessment based on the appeal they filed?

COUNCILMAN JONES: You said my property is worth 200,000 . I said it's worth 175,000. And based on that, because they were paying that tax, it was
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MR. PIPER: Right.
COUNCILMAN JONES: So --
MR. PIPER: So to answer your
question, on the one hand we do keep very good statistics on what happens as a result of the appeal. In fact, we put together a report every week, and it says how many were denied, how many were adjusted somewhat. So a taxpayer may have not gotten exactly what he was looking for but --

COUNCILMAN JONES: What was the total?

MR. PIPER: But the bad news, I don't have it at the top of my head, because it's always changing. It changes every week because of the hearings.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So pick a beginning, pick an end date. How much? And so if you will get that to the Chair and the rest of Council.

MR. PIPER: Sure.
COUNCILMAN JONES: Because that
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is an important number. As we do
budgeting for you, we need to know that. MR. PIPER: I understand.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So you
mentioned that there was 118 billion, I believe, with a B, taxable real estate in Philadelphia now, correct?

MR. PIPER: The 118 million, I
think it is, was not a reference to the real estate.

COUNCILMAN JONES: Is it 118
million?
(Witness approached witness
table.)
COUNCILMAN JONES: That doesn't seem right.

MR. DUBOW: So your question is
about the additional revenue? COUNCILMAN JONES: No. Of all
of the buildings in Philadelphia, what is the assessment of everything?

MR. DUBOW: So taxable I think
is 111 billion.
COUNCILMAN JONES: With a B.
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MR. DUBOW: For taxable, yes.
COUNCILMAN JONES: So it's 111
billion.
MR. DUBOW: Taxable.
COUNCILMAN JONES: Which is up
from when we first did AVI, I think it was 99 billion.

MR. DUBOW: It was in the 90's, yes.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So what does
that say? What real estate is more
valuable? We're looking good. Is that a good thing?

MR. DUBOW: Yes. I mean --
sorry. Go ahead.
MR. PIPER: It's a good thing.
It says that we're capturing the value of real estate that we needed to capture to keep up with the market. We did some of that for AVI in 2014 and we did some more in each of the subsequent years, particularly this year when we looked at the commercial and industrial properties. COUNCILMAN JONES: So I'm sure
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some of my colleagues will disagree about that, particularly on the commercial and residential high end, but I'll leave that for them.

Keeping our pencils sharp -- so if we had -- my final question is, we used to have a tradition. I think it was three-fourths of the fair market value was the appraised value. So this actual value, how actual are we getting?

MR. PIPER: We're looking to --
COUNCILMAN JONES: I'm setting up for you.

MR. PIPER: We're looking to come as close as we can to a defendable value.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So how do we
measure ourself? If I say it's worth 200 -- you say it's worth 200,000; I say
it's worth 100. What is the measuring stick that says, oh, $I$ was closer to right than you? So comparable sales?

MR. PIPER: Right, comparable
sales. We look at, for commercial
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COUNCILMAN JONES: So if we were three-fourths before, honestly, how close are we getting now?

MR. PIPER: We're looking to get as close as actual value. The three-fourths, as you said, was sort of a tradition maybe, but it wasn't based on anything other than truthfully the fact that we hadn't done a real reassessment in years, and this is what we're doing now.

COUNCILMAN JONES: So in areas where you've given an assessment, does sometimes the market prove you wrong and say, ooh, $I$ didn't know it was worth that much, look what they got, and does that happen often?

MR. PIPER: Sure.
COUNCILMAN JONES: All right.
I'm done.
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COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Okay.
Thank you, Councilman.
Councilman Domb.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you, Chairman Greenlee.

And good afternoon.
MR. PIPER: Hi, Councilman.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I want to follow up on Councilman Jones' question. The information I have -- I just want to make sure this is accurate. I think this might answer your question.

In 2017, the residential values were about 62 billion, and they're going in 2018 to -- 62.4. They're going to 63.4. They're going up 887 million, roughly, the increase in value.

MR. PIPER: Correct.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: In hotels and apartments, it was 12.8 million. It's going to 18 million.

MR. PIPER: Correct.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Almost a 50
percent increase.
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MR. PIPER: Right.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Stores with dwellings went from 3 billion to 3.5, and commercial went from 14 billion in 2017 to 19.6 billion. That's where the big increase is. So there's value and there's dollars we collect. The values totaled were 97 -- what we could bill, by the way. Not the total assessment, but what we actually bill was 97 billion in 2017. What we'll be able to bill in 2018 is about 111 billion.

MR. PIPER: Correct.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: And so in
revenue, that difference goes from
billing 1.359 billion to 1.556 billion, of which we get 45 percent and the School District gets 55 percent. I think those are the numbers, just to have it for the record.

Here's my question: If CAMA
was in place today, would you need the additional resources of employees if we had CAMA today?
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MR. PIPER: We would. We would
still need them. The acquisition of a CAMA system, just so you understand, is not something that we're looking to bring in to replace people. It's a way in which we can, number one, have the people that are currently working and the additional people we're bringing on work more efficiently, but also it will allow us to change some of our processes so that the entire system is administered more efficiently.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: So are you
saying that with the CAMA system and using technology, we're not going to save any money?

MR. PIPER: What I'm saying is
we'll be able to do our job more efficiently. And the way we do it now without a CAMA system, it's -- I mean, it's comparable to you having to walk across the City versus to you having to drive across the City.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: That's my
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point. If I walk, it's going to take me a lot longer, and if I drive, I'll do it a lot quicker, which means I can do more volume and might not need as many people, is my question.

MR. PIPER: Our goal with the CAMA is not that we're doing more volume. It's that we're doing regular ongoing assessments annually looking at everything and not having to worry about, for instance, the backlog of appeals and how long it takes to get decisions to the Department of Revenue, which hinders when people get their tax bills. The new CAMA system --

COUNCILMAN DOMB: What will be helpful to this body, I think, if you could research for us and tell us other cities that use CAMA the number of properties and the number of appraisers they have by using CAMA. Then we have some sort of a benchmark so we know where we are.

```
MR. PIPER: Sure. We can do
```
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that.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: So we did these commercial assessments. How many properties were actually assessed?

MR. PIPER: Close to about 60,000. I think there were a number closer to $42,000,43,000$ that we're sending out notices on in April.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: And we put
out an RFP back in the summer, I believe, to hire a commercial firm to assist us?

MR. PIPER: Yes.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Did they do these assessments or were these done in conjunction with them with the people in your office?

MR. PIPER: They were done in
conjunction with the people in our office.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: And so this
is just a thought process on my part. If
we want to support the residential portion of our values, which are more than double the other ones, okay, would
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it not make sense instead of hiring new people, that when we put CAMA in -- I wasn't sure if we'd be able to still maintain them. Would it make more sense to go and follow what we did with such success in the residential arena and copy what we did in the commercial arena by hiring an outside firm and using them to support the residential assessments for this: Your increase of $\$ 750,000$ roughly in your budget, when you add in and layer in the 87 , it's like 1.7 million. So just something for you to think about, because it might be -- if you said to us, hey, I need $\$ 1.7$ million to go and hire outside residential appraisers, I really thought that by the time we'd have CAMA, we may not need those extra 13 people. So rather than have to lay them off, if we just for the next four years utilized an outside service to get us to that point where we have CAMA, I thought it might be a better decision by us.

```
    MR. PIPER: I think your
```
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recommendation that more resources, outside resources, would be helpful going forward, I think we can't disagree with that.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Because one
of the biggest benefits of outside resources is knowledge of the market, which we don't have access to. So when you go outside, they have all this access to information that our guys don't have access to on the inside. So that's, I think, one of the benefits of going outside. They have all the comps, they have all the appraisals, they have all the information. It's very, very powerful, especially when they go in for appeals.

> MR. PIPER: That's what the outside consultant brought to the table. And you're right. In terms of the establishment of the values, that's where they were the most helpful, but going forward with the appeals $I$ think is where we're going to get our money's worth,
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because the knowledge that we have, I need to have someone who can kind of verify that, but I also need to have someone go before the Board that the Board would respect because they have that knowledge.

We have knowledge, but a lot of what we do is just based on putting together models based on what we see in the market, but an outside consultant has actual knowledge of specific properties.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Chair.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Thank
you, Councilman.
Councilman Henon.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Piper, how are you doing?
Last year in the budget process
in the hearings, you said that every year you look at the whole City to find parts in the City where you believe that the
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model can be improved. So what parts are you looking at critically and what are you looking at now and where is the model most inaccurate?

MR. PIPER: So what we did -and you're right. I said we would look at different parts of the City, but when I say "parts," I don't mean physical locations, and I can see how that's misleading, but what I'm saying is we're looking at different parts of our assessment and we need to figure out which parts of the assessment need improvement.

So, for instance, in 2016, we looked at specific neighborhoods in which our measures of uniformity were a little high. This past year we looked at areas -- we looked specifically at the land allocation, land to total market value, to see where we needed to make some corrections. And then finally this year what we did for tax year 2018 is, we looked at primarily the commercial and
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industrial inventory.
So going forward for tax year '19, what we're looking at is again everything, all types of properties, but the neighborhoods where we see -- we haven't kept up with the market will probably see more changes than the neighborhoods in which they've been stabilized and our values reflect what's there. And same thing with the types of properties. We just did a commercial reassessment, so if our numbers were pretty good, I wouldn't expect to see a lot of changes for the subsequent year in that type of property. COUNCILMAN HENON: So many condo units in my district were reassessed, and in many cases the land value was increased, as you know. We've had this conversation over the last year. And in some cases it was offset by the decrease in the actual property tax reduction that they have. MR. PIPER: Correct.
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COUNCILMAN HENON: Or the
building value, however you want to classify it.

Were the condos identified as a subgroup of priorities that needed to be reassessed?

MR. PIPER: Not necessarily. We knew what we saw with the condos -and the land allocation issue with condos is a little different, because condos tend to be in buildings in which there's one footprint and you have to make an allocation based on what the market would determine, not necessarily based on like a footprint of the land itself.

So what we did for AVI overall
I think was a thousand percent
improvement, but $I$ think for the condos, we needed to take a closer look at the land allocations. In some instances, the total market value, because a lot of the condo units were newer and the values that were put on, even if we got them a little wrong at one point, we weren't
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hearing much appeal because they were all
under abatement. A lot of them were.
Maybe not necessarily the ones up in the
Northeast, but --
COUNCILMAN HENON: Certainly
not the ones in my district and the ones that I'm speaking about.

MR. PIPER: We did hear from
them.
COUNCILMAN HENON: You may
continue.
What other categories might
face a similar reassessment, if you
recall?
MR. PIPER: Going forward?
COUNCILMAN HENON: In the
future.
MR. PIPER: Again, right now --
and we're just kind of starting off on the ground floor of what we're doing for tax year 2019. In fact, we're really just finishing up tax year 2018's
assessment. So I can say we're looking at the entire City. What in specific --
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if you mean what type of property or what area we would expect to see changes, we won't know until we finish our research.

COUNCILMAN HENON: And I have a
few more questions in the line of the condos. Were the condos reassessed as a group?

MR. PIPER: The condos were not the only properties reassessed. Again, because I think if you looked in the Northeast even, you would see there were other residential properties that saw changes, not just in the land allocation but in the market values.

COUNCILMAN HENON: So in the condos that were reassessed -- I'm going to stick with the condos because they're a big issue to my constituents -- they're not -- they're the older condo facilities that have been around for a while.

MR. PIPER: I'm familiar with
those.
COUNCILMAN HENON: And they're not condos in Northern Liberties or
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Center City. So how did the condos in my district in Northeast Philadelphia fare to the condos in the reassessment and how their land values were, I guess, looked at or viewed at from a new condo association like you're saying, like new condos, and the ones up in my district? MR. PIPER: We looked at them the same way as we would as the newer ones, although the land allocation would probably look different because they're older units.

COUNCILMAN HENON: So you did
take a look at the land value differently?

MR. PIPER: We didn't look at it different. We assessed them based on what the market showed us.

To give you an example, the ones in the Northeast that are older and that have been developed already, you would tend to see lower values on the improvement in general than you would, say, something in Center City that's
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newer where more of the value would tend to be on the improvement itself because it's a newer improvement. So, therefore, the land value would -- the land allocation would tend to be a little higher in some of the ones that are older.

COUNCILMAN HENON: And do you have an accurate count -- so some condos were high value on their property and their land was lower value based on the market assessment, from what you're saying.

MR. PIPER: Right.
COUNCILMAN HENON: So do you have an accurate account of where that would zero out for a net value in your reassessments?

MR. PIPER: Which ones didn't see any change in the market value?

COUNCILMAN HENON: See any change in the market value at all, where their increase -- their decrease in their property value, the value --
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MR. PIPER: Where it evened
out?
COUNCILMAN HENON: Where it evened out.

MR. PIPER: We can get that.
COUNCILMAN HENON: And I just
have a couple more questions and then I'm going to have to -- if $I$ can have a little special privilege on this.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Oh, why
not. You asked so nicely.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Well, thank
you. Because $I$ got to leave for an appointment.

Can a condo association submit
an appeal to OPA with a single entity?
MR. PIPER: If the condo
association is looking to represent or file on behalf of individual condo owners, they can, but we need separate appeal applications, unfortunately, for each of the units because the units are individually owned and the values may be different and the issue may be different
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because the values are different.
We get this question all the
time, and our answer is what can we do to make it more convenient for the individual owners, but unfortunately we need something for each unit that wants to file.

COUNCILMAN HENON: So what could we do moving forward -- and we've had this issue, because when you have an entire association of condos, not everybody is going to take the time out to appeal or anything like that and they are represented by a third-party management as an association, which is recognized by the City. So what can we do in the future to really narrow down just at least the filing of an appeal with details leading up to the appeal date just to get in the timeline, in the queue for an appeal as far as the process?

MR. PIPER: Well, for the
first-level review are you talking about,
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for the FLRs? I think we're -- we give a little bit of leeway in terms of time and whatever we can, because that's a much less formal process, whereas the BRT filing process, a lot of that is mandated by law. Okay? But with the FLRs, we have to be careful in -- we want to make it convenient for property owners and at the same time there's always a risk when you file an appeal, particularly an FLR in which there was a change, and that risk is your value as a result of your filing may point out something that indicates that we got it wrong and you need to be increased. So that's very rare. Very rarely does that happen, but if we were to consider an application on behalf of property owners who did not actually submit one, we would risk actually harming someone who didn't even enjoin in the appeal process.

COUNCILMAN HENON: Can I
request for courtesy in the future when you have these subset groups that you're
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looking to assess a little closer, looking at their assessments a little closer, to let Council know in advance. MR. PIPER: We can.

COUNCILMAN HENON: That instead of hearing a tremendous amount of calls about everybody's property taxes going up, even though it was the land value. We were not aware of it, and I'm just asking that for those of us who are servicing our constituents on the front lines and going to their community groups, going to their condo association groups and the senior groups, that we're made aware ahead of time that this is going to be coming so we're not blind-sided.

MR. PIPER: Sure. No problem.
I think we work with someone in your office all the time who is very good with --

COUNCILMAN HENON: But it was more of a reactionary type of situation. We do have a good working relationship,
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but I'd like to ask for a courtesy in advance in the future.

MR. PIPER: Sure. We can.
COUNCILMAN HENON: Thank you.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Thank
you, Councilman.
Councilman Squilla, please.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
Good morning -- or good
afternoon, Mr. Piper --
MR. PIPER: Good afternoon,
Councilman Squilla.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: -- and
staff.
The CAMA system up and running,
do we have a date that it would be?
MR. PIPER: So it looks like we
have an agreement, a recent agreement, but in terms of -- here's someone that can speak a little bit better to it, but in terms of an actual date, $I$ don't know that we have a date. I think we have a timeline that has not changed, and that
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timeline is about two and a half years.
(Witness approached witness
table.)
MR. PIPER: I'm going to ask
Saskia Thompson form OPD to speak to this, because she's been spearheading negotiations.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Just
identify yourself for the record again. MS. THOMPSON: Yes. Hi.

Saskia Thompson, Office of Property Data within Finance.

So we have an agreement in
place. We anticipate having that
contract signed in the very near term.
The full project will kick off in October of 2017, although between now and then we will be doing a whole data reconfiguration project in-house to make sure that full project goes more smoothly, and we expect to go live in October of 2017 with the majority of the components of that system, and all components should be live by December of
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2019. I'm sorry; go live in October of 2019 .

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: We've been hearing about CAMA for quite some time, and we really do want a system that works and not generated on individual assessments. I mean, we still see out there properties being sold and transactions where the property is sold for $\$ 12$ million even after the new assessment recently assessed for like $\$ 9$ million and still can't understand how that works, but -- and I understand as we go through these lists, we try to forward and we'll forward to you guys some of them so you can take a look at them. But is it true that the actual value of the sales is not the value of the assessment, correct?

MR. PIPER: It's true that
sometimes the sales information that you see in the paper or even on the deed itself is not necessarily telling the whole story. That is true.
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COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: So that if
a person pays more than what it's worth, it would be something that -- how do you take that into account?

> MR. PIPER: Well, that's one
example, and that's a common example, for instance, with residential property, but with commercial property, lots of times there's a lot more that goes into the reported sale price that has nothing to do with the real estate and we can't assess anything but the real estate, and sometimes it has to do with the fact that what's reported is not indicative of the sale of the real estate itself. It's just a sale that took place between two companies. And I know a lot of that was reported in the papers as something companies --

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Hopefully
we fixed that or attempted to fix it. We'll see how they get around it now. MR. PIPER: I think that was a good measure in fixing part of that
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problem, but it goes to -- it speaks to the fact that lots of times what's reported is not telling the whole story and we have to look strictly at the real estate.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Now, once
CAMA is in place -- when AVI was first implemented, it was said that assessments would be done every year citywide. Is that still something that is planned to be done?

MR. PIPER: That's something that we plan on doing even prior to CAMA being fully implemented, and we would like to be able to do it starting this year every year.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: So
starting 2018 you would start to reassess all properties citywide?

MR. PIPER: We've done
something every year, except the first year after AVI, because we couldn't do anything because of the record number of appeals that were filed. But to answer
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your question, we do want to look at the entire City every year. The more frequently we do it and for a wider swath of properties, the less traumatic you would expect the changes of assessment to be .

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: We agree.
I agree with that. It just seemed like it was very difficult from the start of AVI. I know the intent was to do that and understandably weren't able to do it. To be able to look at the whole City every year, it seems like a really gigantic task to do that. And would we be better -- and I know we spoke about this the last three years, four years. Would it be better to take the City into quarters and knowing that you're going to reassess every four years in those quarters of the City so that you could actually pin down and nail down accurate assessments in those specific areas? MR. PIPER: What that tends to do -- I mean, certainly if we could do it
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like that, which we really can't without getting ourselves in trouble, because the section of the City that's being looked at this year would have a problem, whatever this year happens to be. But the issue is, there's -- if we divided the City into quarters, there's always going to be three-quarters of the City that's being ignored, and some of those folks may actually be entitled to revisions that indicate a downturn in the market. So they're not -COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: We heard that all in the beginning. We heard that in the beginning. That's a big lie. MR. PIPER: It remains true. COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: I mean, you could say that all you want. We know what happens when the reality of it is. To sell AVI, that was part of the mission to sell it, and I understand that and everybody was saying that we got to do this because people are really paying too much. But knowing what has happened, I
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think we're almost at a point where I think we have AVI accurate.

MR. PIPER: Right.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Which
takes probably four years as projected.
But now that we know you're doing the commercial and we know the wherewithal of the people who are assessed, property owners that are being increased, even though they would -- I would say to them as they call our office that their assessment now has been more accurate now than it was before and they've been really getting a break for a lot of years, they're still going to most likely appeal these, at least what they're saying.

MR. PIPER: We've been getting the phone calls already and the notices haven't even gone out yet. So I would have to agree, yes.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: So knowing that they're going to appeal and they're going to have attorneys in there and so
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forth and so on -- and I'm glad we went through the proper channels. You had consultants doing these. So I believe that we have a strong background of defending these assessments. MR. PIPER: Correct. COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: But knowing that these assessments, there's going to be a lot of time and effort being put in by OPA also during this assessment process, $I$ would believe. MR. PIPER: True. COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: So wouldn't that then slow down the next process moving forward for assessments in the following years?

MR. PIPER: What we take into consideration each year in terms of what it is that we're tasked with doing and have to do is, yeah, answer appeals, but also work on the following year's reassessment project. That's all part of what we have to do. We have to respond to taxpayer complaints. We have to

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC.
answer appeals. We have to speak with representatives from Council. It's part of our job. So to say it slows it down, we don't look at it as something that slows us down. It's part of the job. COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: We understand that, but knowing that we weren't able to assess the following year after the major first initial AVI, I'm not going to say you're going to have as many appeals this year, but these are going to be more complicated appeals.

MR. PIPER: That's true, but it's key that we don't expect to get as many ever again as long as we do this on a regular basis, and because we're bringing in outside consultants, I think we'll do a better job of managing these more complicated appeals.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: And I know talking about bringing in additional revenue over and above what was expected in the Five Year Plan -- and maybe this is for Rob, but we should definitely have
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some of those resources set aside for appeal losses. And I don't know what the number is. Somebody mentioned earlier, but are you looking for an actual number that's going to be set aside for that? MR. DUBOW: In the numbers that we talked about last week, we built in a 20 percent appeal loss, which is actually higher than we've seen over the last few years. We've seen more in the 15 percent range. So, yes, we have built in appeal loss.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: But
knowing that this is not residential and more, you're going to have more high-end people defending the other side.

MR. DUBOW: That's why we're using the higher percent. But we also, unlike with residential, we have the outside consultant helping us defend these appeals.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Which I think will be very beneficial to us. They're going to be doing that as part of
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the consulting?
I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. MR. DUBOW: Yes.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: They're going to be doing that as part of the consulting fees?

MR. DUBOW: Yes.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: I'll come
back for additional questions.
COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Okay.
Thank you. Thank you, Councilman.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I'm going to take those privileges too.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: I knew you were going to come up with personal privilege. I knew that.

Councilwoman Sanchez.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Good afternoon.

Real quickly, so when we went to AVI, one of the sectors that was impacted the most because we had not done assessment was our small commercial corridors and centers. How are they
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impacted with this new assessment, and when would that data be available to all of us at a district level, the AMIs?

MR. PIPER: The data is
available now, and it's just kind of a question of what exactly are you looking to see. Now, we broke down the project into types of commercial properties. Well, we broke down the project into our six categories of properties anyway. So that's available, and we have it by Council district. If you'd like to see, we have something that indicates the changes in percentage and in assessment dollars, but if you really want to dig underneath to find out how it affects like a specific type of property, then -COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I want to look at it. I'm representing an area -- Councilman Squilla and President Clarke and I share that. Many times the comps that are used are Northern Liberties and Fishtown, and I have Norris Square and some of the corridor. And
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what we saw last time when we updated the data, some of those places were impacted severely. And so I just want to be able to look at that pattern, and then using that basis, I'm very concerned as we enter the residential assessment for the similar reason.

So I'll give you an example. On my block, 2200 block of Howard, three new tax-abated properties went up. They sold for 319, right? My other neighbor had a house listed and he had to sell it for 125 because the conditions were dramatically different.

So how are we going to account for that on the residential side so that I'm not faced with people fleeing at the sticker shock that they're going to get on the residential side?

MR. PIPER: What you just
explained, Councilwoman Sanchez, is exactly the kind of information that we look for when people file the first-level review. This is an indication that we

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. saw something that wasn't there or we missed something that we should have seen. So those are kind of obvious things. If the two properties are in the same condition or similar and we have vastly different values, that was something that we missed.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: But in this case, it's justified because we have a situation where we have folks who are kind of over-housed, big houses, you know, hefty preservation dollars. I mean, some of these big houses. So I'm concerned, because most folks don't know until they file an appeal.

So I want to know, what is it
that we're going to do in those neighborhoods, again, where the comps are out skyrocketing, because it's the abated properties in Fishtown and Northern Liberties, how are we going to make sure that in those blocks everybody doesn't get this huge hike? I don't want Point Breeze No. 2. I'm keeping it real real.
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That Norris Square section is all over the map. So what can we do now to make sure that doesn't happen to me?

MR. PIPER: The only thing we can do in the assessor's office is show what the market indicates the values should be. And you're saying --

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Again,
listen to me. You're using comps of Northern Liberties and Fishtown, which is unrealistic.

MR. PIPER: No, no, no. So if that's what we've done and there are better comps, then that's something we need to see that we've missed.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Again, so as we enter this residential, we need to talk through a plan. So one of the things we found as we were looking -- and I'm trying to be the first district totally remapped. One of the things that we saw as we were looking at the remapping, that the zoning is very high also for these properties. How is the
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MR. PIPER: So we take into
consideration zoning classifications. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: So what about if stuff is zoned incorrectly? So what I'm finding is, $I$ have a lot of non-compliant issues. So the
classification is wrong, the disparity. And so I want to be as proactive as I can, and so I need some guidance around how we're going to handle this, because it's bad enough everybody is going to get sticker shock in the middle of our primary, but I'm trying to be as preventive as possible, because I know the comps are just not real.

MR. PIPER: Okay. Where you see a value that we've put out that you don't believe reflects the comps that we should have used --

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Well, I don't want to wait to get there. I want us to proactively, before you go out
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there and start assessing, that we identify some of those characteristics so that, whether you do it internally or you sub this out, people are aware of it, because it's drastically different. So is this going to be walked? Are we doing this via LIDAR, the residential assessments? How are they going to get done?

MR. PIPER: Every resource we have available. Most of the time we'll have someone conduct an external visual inspection. We will look at Pictometry, LIDAR. We'll look at whatever we have, whatever information we have that comes into the office in terms of sales, whatever local and regional trends indicate. We'll look at everything. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: I mean, and I'll follow up with this in writing. I just want -- I can tell in this neighborhood it's going to be crazy and it's not going to be real, and it's really unfair for longtime residents. I
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now understand what Councilman Johnson is going through, because they're just sticking up these abated houses in there and it's just going to throw everything off, because you're going to see six good houses, but everybody else, I can tell you, the internal conditions of their homes are nowhere comparable. And so I'm going to outline some areas. We're trying to remap as quickly as we possibly can to bring some of that zoning classification down. I have a bunch of RMXs and these small blocks with no parking. I'm trying to get there, because I saw it. I just want to be as proactive as possible.

MR. PIPER: Sure. And what
we -- when I say we look at whatever resources we have, but that's a resource. You bringing information to us that you think we may not have, that's a resource, so we would value that.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
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COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Thank
you, Councilwoman.
I think that is important,
because sometimes a couple blocks could make a big difference, you know, and sometimes it's thought of as, say, Fishtown or Northern Liberties, but that one or two block north makes a big difference in the value of the property, I would think.

MR. PIPER: The boundaries, I
will say the boundaries that we look at when we do particularly residential reassessment, one of the first things we do in our directive modeling -- Kevin Keene is here. He can confirm this -is, we look to see if the boundaries need to be redefined, because sometimes the market points us in a different direction, and we always redefine the boundaries.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Okay.
All right. Very good. Thank you.
Councilman Jones.
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COUNCILMAN JONES: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
To reiterate what my colleague said, you think on a different time clock than we do. You think about values, when can we get this done, what type of apparatus and personnel. We also think with the political side of our hemisphere, that 2019 we do have to run, and it is very difficult running on a platform of, hi, I'm Councilman Jones and I just raised your taxes again. So for particular, Councilman Squilla, Councilman Clarke, Sanchez, and I want you to understand, Blackwell and I have pockets where that is happening too. If you look at the 38 th Ward in what was paradise Allegheny West, because of the East Falls property values, they are going up. And so you have long-term residents that are right next to abated properties.

So I guess this is the lead-up to that question. The LOOP, all of the
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different acronyms that we have, are we still pushing them? As you start to do new assessments and you see these crazy jumps in property values, are you making residents aware of their options? Because if not, we're going to have to take a look at where we give these abatements to, because abatements are supposed to be areas where we're trying to stimulate economic development. It is not supposed to be in places that are already on fire. And so there has to be some -- my question to you, twofold. Are you pushing these programs and letting people know their options or when they expire, keeping them aware? And then number two, do you have a map where you can provide for us, Council, where neighborhoods are beginning to react statistically trending upward and that we need to be aware of?

Now, we should know them,
because I kind of do, but you can
probably statistically see where it's
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So an example is, Brewerytown has now moved over across the bridge to 40th and Girard. You're starting to see the development pick up there. If you look at East Falls again, when you move down into Allegheny West and other areas, you're starting to see folk actually almost in a predatory manner going after seniors and saying, hey, I got a boatload of cash for you right now, give me that house.

A developer told me -- and I said, well, how do you know what properties you're going to go after?

He said, just look up at the second floor, look at the ones that don't have -- that still have air conditioning units in them and don't have central air. That's how we know which people to go after.

So we're being besieged by communities that are catching fire, but we don't have the fire equipment to at
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least control the rapid incline.
MR. PIPER: So I think what I'm hearing you say and also what

Councilwoman Sanchez also said is in some areas, property values are going up because you see the sales, you see developers going after them. And in our efforts to try to accurately capture that, which is what we're tasked with doing, it also has the effect of creating some angst with property owners who now have to pay more in property taxes, and I understand your concern. I wanted to kind of just let you know that I'm hearing what you're saying. In terms of what the City is doing for folks in those areas, I know we're still, especially when we're doing anything that's residentially based, which is what we're going to do for 2019, we still will be pushing the idea that there's programs available, the homestead exemption. I think we've kind of made that message available to everyone, and
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there may still be some folks who haven't taken advantage of it. I don't think very many that are eligible, but I think when we do something residentially, we need to make sure that's something people understand.

COUNCILMAN JONES:
Mr. Chairman, we also should periodically just mail to areas, and where you see these statistical anomalies, just say, by the way, the good news is you can borrow more on your house, bad news is you're going to pay more in taxes and here's some options for you. And if we mail that out periodically and try to get people -- and also another is helping with technical assistance, such as tangled title. In a lot of these old neighborhoods, particularly I'm going to guess in your district, Councilwoman Sanchez, you have generational conveyance of property unofficial. And so great-grandma had that house, bought it in the turn of the century, never
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transferred it over to the daughter or the son, who is now transferring it or needs to transfer it to the grandson and so, therefore, they're not eligible for some of these things. We have to be sensitive to that. You did. You grandfathered some people to give them time --

MR. PIPER: Correct. COUNCILMAN JONES: -- to
untangle those titles. We appreciate that. It does not go unnoticed, but tangled title to them is, no, it's grandma's property, and we have to help our long-term residents along with the technical aspect of changing a deed or a title.

MR. PIPER: Yeah. I know -COUNCILMAN JONES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

> MR. PIPER: It's a serious
issue, and $I$ know we've done a few outreach programs on behalf of probably your office, $I$ know in Council President
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Clarke's and Councilwoman Parker's
office. The tangled title issue is something that $I$ got to say Council has been pretty proactive in trying to explain that to community groups, and we've been a part of that. So that's going to continue.

COUNCILMAN JONES: Thank you, Mr. President or Chairman, whichever is appropriate.

COUNCILMAN GREENLEE: Whatever,
yeah. Thank you, Councilman.
Councilman Domb.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
A few more questions I'm going
to ask. I just wanted to make a comment on the abatement. I heard the abatement, my ears opened up.

COUNCILMAN JONES: I was
looking right at you when $I$ said that.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: I know. I saw that.

There's a report that came out
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recently. I'll just give you the statistics without giving an opinion, but I think the statistics are interesting. On the abatement, it said, from statistical information, 2.8 percent of all abated properties in the City of Philadelphia were over a million dollars, 2.8 percent, 67 percent were under 400,000, and 25 percent were workforce housing, which, by the way, I think that abatement has done tremendously for the City, tremendous. And it also said that in the surrounding counties since '99, housing starts are 11 percent, but Philadelphia 376 percent. I wasn't here then, but whoever was here did a great job.

COUNCILMAN JONES: I was here. COUNCILMAN DOMB: You were here, okay. Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Can I
just get a point of information, since we're getting to data. I think it's usually important, though, for you to
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understand that as we reassess residential, you could potentially inflate the value for other folks, and that's what happened in Point Breeze. And I want to put out all the cautionary notes, because if we're not careful in looking at all of that and it's very difficult, as Councilman Johnson continuously says over here, is to explain to folks that this person is buying a $\$ 400,000$ house in a block where the average house is $\$ 100,000$. Okay? That's an inflated value and then one that disproportionately impacts the working poor in those neighborhoods. So that person is only paying on land and everybody else is paying the full freight.

And so when we assess properties, I think we have to be careful notwithstanding the value of the development. The BIA did that report, but it still only said 25 percent of those were workforce and affordable in a
4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC.
city where we have deep poverty and 70,000 people waiting for housing subsidies at PHA. So we have some challenges, and this can make or break and, in my estimation, destabilize accessible neighborhoods for poor working Philadelphians.

COUNCILMAN JONES: And to the fact that on those same blocks, banks won't lend to these long-term residents. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Exactly. COUNCILMAN JONES: So, therefore, they can't make the same improvement on the equity found in their houses. That is fundamentally unfair. He's back. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Okay.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: Can I get
my --
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ:
Councilman Domb, we took all his time.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I've
been told that people are using the Rizzo
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rule in here.
COUNCILMAN JONES: You walked away.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Councilman, I'm sorry.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: So I have a couple of quick questions.

Have we looked into parking
operations of our non-tax paying entities in the City such as hospitals, universities where they have commercial operations of parking as far as real estate taxes on those operations?

MR. PIPER: We are looking at them right now, yes.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Okay. And the other question $I$ had, in your testimony it provides for $\$ 716,000$ to cover expenditures associated with printing and the mailing of, I guess, notices to taxpayers. And I know we've talked about this for the past year about automating real estate tax bills and automating the water and sewer bills, and
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I think the estimate was between $\$ 4$ to $\$ 5$ million in savings. Have you pursued any of that automation for this mailing? MR. PIPER: Some of that automation would come about as the result of what we would do when we implement the CAMA system. Right now I think we're doing it pretty much the most efficient way, but unfortunately there's probably some room for some savings going forward with this.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: When you have appeals, I know OPA for the commercial properties, the current commercial firms can only assist you with those appeals. Have you decided which properties you're going to have them assist you with? For example, those properties that have a market value differential of greater than a million dollars, which will be $\$ 14,000$ of taxes for us, might be worth it for the commercial appraiser to get involved in versus properties under a million. MR. PIPER: Well, to answer

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. your question, we will prioritize, but we need to wait to see what type of appeals come in before we start making that decision.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Because I
would think most appraisers who stand up for the appeals, the minimum cost is going to be 2,500 , it could go to 3,000 or 4,000 to defend it.

MR. PIPER: I will have to say
we expect that there will be quite a few appeals that will come directly as formal appeals to BRT, and in those instances, the appellant is going to be required to submit an appraisal. That's the BRT's rule. So that is actually going to be helpful to us.

In instances where there's some information out there that we don't have, we don't have access to, the appraisal that comes in from the other side actually may be beneficial to the City in terms of having information that we need to be able to defend our value.
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COUNCILMAN DOMB: Let me switch
to CAMA. Does the City have a signed contract as we sit here today?

MR. PIPER: A signed contract
with a CAMA vendor? Not yet.
COUNCILMAN DOMB: And when do you anticipate that happening?

MR. PIPER: I am going to ask Rob to come up and speak to that, because there's some very recent developments around that.
(Witness approached witness table.)

MR. DUBOW: So our notice of intent has been posted. So I think we're just kind of going through the finalizing steps. So it should be within the next couple of weeks we'll have the contracts signed.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: That's good.
Okay.
And in March 29th, I think it was Jane Slusser from the Mayor's Office said in her testimony before Council, for
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Fiscal Year '19 and beyond, once a new CAMA system is in place, OPA will be able to complete a full reassessment annually. Is that the goal for '19 or is that the goal for ' 20 or is that the goal for '21?

MR. PIPER: That's the goal for '19, and it was mentioned in conjunction with our new CAMA system, again, because while we're doing it for 2019, obviously it's going to look a lot different when we have a full CAMA system. We're doing it now the way we've been doing it. COUNCILMAN DOMB: Is there anything -- now that we have this contract on board, it sounds like it's going to get signed. Is there anything we can do to help get the CAMA system expedited and the implementation sooner than the date we're talking about?

MR. PIPER: You mean have the CAMA system up and running sooner? I don't believe there is anything different we can do. I think in discussions with
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the vendor, we wanted an honest assessment of when they would be able to have it up and running. We did not want them to inflate -- we didn't want an optimistic assessment that wasn't going to be realistic, because if it didn't happen, then they were going to say, well, we tried to make it happen and you didn't do something right. I think they were honest with us. I think the negotiations were very up front, and I think the City's side as well as the vendor's side were honest in that assessment.

COUNCILMAN DOMB: Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Council President.
Thank you very much.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes Councilman
Squilla.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: I'm sorry. And I do want to say,
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Mr. Piper, I usually start off by saying how great your office is with working with our office. I didn't do that last time.

MR. PIPER: Thanks, Councilman.
We know you meant to.
COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: You guys and your staff do a tremendous job on a lot of our concerns and questions from our staff, so we really do appreciate that. But moving forward, as the now residential is basically done and it's going to be continued now to be upgraded yearly, the commercial -- after this year, the commercial should be land values and improvements should also be done. So that gives us probably until the end of next year trying to figure out the appeals and all. So the CAMA system coming in '19 would almost coincide perfectly with doing the full year valuations like Councilman Domb had just asked, but if we do the full year assessment, that's going to guarantee
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everybody, every property, and every resident, every commercial business is going to be looked at every year?

MR. PIPER: That will ensure we look at everything every year, correct. That doesn't mean that everything is going to change every year. What it's probably going to look like is, you'll see a lot of properties see some change, but it will be almost inconsequential at some point because we'll have kept up with the market. That's the goal.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: And will
that make it easier with some of the questions our colleagues had with the, I guess, different type of property values on the same block? Normally you see some of these houses, even the ones that are building new two-story homes on blocks that are worth more than the older two-story homes on the same block. Is that going to be able to be better assessed to know that difference?

```
MR. PIPER: That's a measure of
```
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uniformity, and uniformity again along with accuracy is what we're looking to see increase, yes.

COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Because uniformity is going to be difficult in those cases. You're going to have people claim that you have -- if the same street has the same house, it's built the same time, uniformity is easier, and that's how the City is built out, but some of these new areas where they're building in lots and things like that, even though some of them have four-story homes and a two-story home, it's obvious to tell, but there are some other two-story homes that are being built that are worth more than the older homes that are on that block. So I guess the uniformity then could be sort of swayed a little bit in that these are newer homes compared to -- I guess you talk about the front of a property being new and, therefore, assessed more than the other properties.

```
                                I just think it's going to be a
```
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concerted effort. I don't know if the CAMA system is going to be able to pick those things up without the person actually looking in these areas to be able to do that.

MR. PIPER: When we look at residential, it's a little simpler to understand even for us. When we look at residential, we're looking at just some very basic attributes, the location, which is not something you can dispute, the size, the age, and the condition. Now, if there's something else someone wants to point out to us; for instance, the interior of the house, we wouldn't typically know that, and I know you mentioned that, Councilwoman Sanchez. We wouldn't typically know that because we're not being invited to come take a look to see the inside of your house has been damaged because of a fire or something like that. But what a CAMA system does also help us with is point us to additional attributes or factors that
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maybe we should take into consideration that were not. COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: So
hopefully we're here in '19 and we could be asking those questions once the CAMA system is up and running and you'll be here to answer them all.

MR. PIPER: Let's hope so. COUNCILMAN SQUILLA: Thank you. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Thank you, Councilman.
The Chair recognizes
Councilwoman Quinones-Sanchez.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Thank
you.
And to continue the
conversation around zoning, because I
think -- again, $I$ think zoning is a
characteristic that could help us around -- not get around uniformity, but really better capture the utilization in light of the fact that we push so much weight on the physical structure versus the land on our assessment situation.
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So my dilemma is -- you know, I
represent, along with President Clarke, ten El stops, right? And so one of the things that we're trying to encourage with transit-oriented development is more density, right? But at the same time, you want to keep some affordability. You get on the El. All second, third stories are closed. I'm in an aggressive campaign working with some of the owners to figure out some flexibility in our zoning designation to allow some folks where you're not going to have commercial density go back and forth between residential and commercial just to get them to invest in the second and third stories, because if he can't rent out the first floor, he's not fixing the second and third. They tell me, you know, Maria, we're not even there, because $I$ can't rent out the first floor. And so the part of the conversation in some of these work groups is, all right, if I give you more density opportunities

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. outside of the corners, allow you to go back residential -- I'm calling it CMX-2.75. I'm waiting for the Planning Commission to give me the definition that they'll authorize.

But one of the things is, when you're zoning for density, that's part of your equation for value, right?

MR. PIPER: Correct.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: And so I
may be hurting them in addition to allowing them to do density so they can do redevelopment, right?

MR. PIPER: There's a few
different things that you take into consideration when you look at the market and what you're looking at trying to encourage in your area, and I understand what you're saying. We're looking at, from what we see, what is. And, again, we can't necessarily predict the future, but part of our job is to try to predict values based on some trends, and that's the only thing we look at, actual
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historical factual data.
COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: And I
say this because, again, one of my
concerns is when I look at your
commercial evaluations, they fell really
hard disproportionately on small commercial corridors, and along the El, again, the comparables become Frankford Avenue, Fishtown, and Northern Liberties, and it's like totally different. Once you walk off of -- President Clarke and I live nearby. Once you walk off of Berks, it's a totally different world, those two blocks. And so my concern is, in our quest to do community development and create incentives, we also don't want to disproportionately impact those small businesses.

And so, again, I'm pointing this out, not because you have an answer, but I think we need to figure some of this stuff out, because right now one of the reasons it's underutilized on my side is the zoning. If $I$ create a zoning

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. designation to allow and incentivize, I'm also impacting their bottom line at the same time. So one may not wash out the other, is what I'm saying. MR. PIPER: Right. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: And so I'm in a quandary around on the one hand we're getting some creative developers who are coming in, who are looking at giving us some affordability and stuff. On the other hand, their comps, depending on how you establish their AMI, I could be killing them.

MR. PIPER: I will tell you the
commercial corridors that you're referring to and not just those -Germantown Avenue, Frankford Avenue, 52nd Street, we spent a lot of time figuring out how we were going to assess what we call mixed-use properties, properties with stores or offices on the first floor and perhaps residential or nothing on the upper floor or floors. And we spent a lot of time figuring out what we wanted
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to call comparable and group those type of properties together in the assessment. So it's a conversation that going forward I think we're in a good place to be able to have.

COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: And so,
again -- and we'll memorialize this in writing, because, again, we're doing specific public infrastructure investments in the area, because the reason all those second, third-story buildings have been empty for a long time is between our tax and our zoning, we've killed people. I mean, we've limited the capacity. We have an opportunity to open that up. I don't want to create a scenario where long-term owners who weren't able to take advantage of what they had because of our zoning and other things, that then they can't afford to fix it, because other folks are going to come in and buy it up, and the private market is going to do what the private market is going to do. But for the
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longtime folks, I'm having this discussion.

I'm trying to do York and
Dauphin as B corp capital. I'm having
that discussion between the long-term folks and the folks that I'm getting in to come in and buy, right? And it's this constant pull -- plug and pull. So I'm going to need OPA to really look at those AMIs, what is real comparable, so that it's not Front and Girard or Northern Liberties. It's a real comparable. Because then otherwise we're going to displace businesses the same way we've been displacing people. MR. PIPER: Sure. COUNCILWOMAN SANCHEZ: Thank you. Thank you, Council President. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:

Thank you, Councilwoman.
Listening to the Council, I have one question I've always wondered about with respect to zoning. Zoning

4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. variances or ordinances traditionally upgrade the value of the property; am I correct?

MR. PIPER: It depends on what
the zoning variance is for, but in general I would say you're correct, yeah. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Right. So do you take that into account when you do an assessment of the property prior to the final development? And by that I mean, as an example, a lot of people, they get these properties. They either come in to us or they go get zoned and upgrade for whatever, and it immediately increases the value of the property. And they'll sit on it for three, four years, and they don't ever get reassessed with the new zoning classification, and we're actually losing money on that, I believe.

MR. PIPER: What we do -- and I
think part of it is, we've had this conversation over the years about the idea that there's a zoning classification
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that may not reflect what something can be zoned for. So we recognize that. We look at the zoning classification. We also look at whatever trends in the area are telling us there's a likelihood that that zoning could be changed because of development that's coming. We can't value --

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I'm saying the zoning -- I'll give you an example. So there was a warehouse half a square block, used to sell beer or something out of it, a distributor or whatever. Basically there was nothing going on in there. They came in, they got an ordinance and they rezoned it for 60,70 units of townhouses. MR. PIPER: An upgrade. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: And the value of that area over there is going up like through the roof, right? And they're sitting on it until they maximize the opportunity, but yet that value is so high, they're not being
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reassessed based on the increased value of that zoning classification.

Do you think that there should
be -- that should be taken into account when these people get these enhanced zoning classifications and basically don't have to pay any additional taxes, although their value went up dramatically?

> MR. PIPER: I can't speak to
how the zoning classification or variance should be -- the decision on that should be made, but $I$ can say that --

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Why
not? Why can't you speak on that? If the value of the property based on the zoning classification is clearly enhanced, why can't we --

MR. PIPER: We can only speak on the value. Okay? What goes into that decision is --

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: So
if the value -- I mean, you just
indicated sometimes it has to do with the
4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC. area and what's going on, and you're speculating.

MR. PIPER: What we see, right.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: You
do that now.
MR. PIPER: Yes.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: So
I'm saying if the old warehouse gets rezoned and five years in succession everything around there has gone up dramatically, how can you not know that that value is increasing on --

MR. PIPER: No, no, no. I'm sorry. I must have misunderstood the question.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: You did.

MR. PIPER: Because we do take a look at that, and our value assessment is based on what the zoning change is and what everything around there indicates it's going to be.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: So that was my original question.
4/5/17 - WHOLE - BILL 170195, ETC.

MR. PIPER: Yes.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: Do we take into account properties that have been zoned either through ordinance or --

MR. PIPER: Yes, we do.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: --
variance --
MR. PIPER: Yes.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: --
upgraded in value?
MR. PIPER: Sure. We have
to --
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
That's your answer?
MR. PIPER: Yes. We do, yeah. COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: All right. I'm sorry. I cut you off. You were getting ready to elaborate?

MR. PIPER: We have to because, again, we can't necessarily predict the future. And you're right, sometimes a developer will buy a piece of ground and sit on it for years, but we are tasked into taking into consideration local and
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regional trends. So if the trend indicates or something we see in the neighborhood indicates this is what's going to happen, we have to take that into consideration when we value.

Otherwise, we're missing something.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: All
right. So you know what I'm going to do?
You know I'm going to go look at those properties that I'm talking to you about and I'm going to see if the assessments have increased over a period of time.

MR. PIPER: Okay.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
That's why I'm asking you are you sure.
MR. PIPER: Okay. Yeah. I
won't say that this is specific property that we --

COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE:
There's more than one.
MR. PIPER: Bring them to my
attention, please.
COUNCIL PRESIDENT CLARKE: I will do that.
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| accessible | 166:21 | 132:4,9 | 77:23 | 106:5 129:4 | 199:16 | 141:21 | 111:15 |
| 250:7 | achieved | 133:9 | 196:16,20 | 129:5 | 220:16 | AMI 265:13 | 147:6 155:6 |
| accomplish | 111:25 | 207:12 | adjustments | 136:24 | aims 108:14 | AMIs 233:4 | 158:8 |
| 74:20,21 | 147:11 | added 113:24 | 189:7 | 140:11,12 | air 243:19,20 | 267:11 | 165:18 |
| accomplishi... | achieving | adding 16:18 | administered | 140:16 | Airport | amortize | 186:21 |
| 76:20 | 142:11 | addition 6:10 | 204:12 | 154:6,7 | 124:15 | 138:23 | 194:13 |
| account | 147:13 | 20:15 | administeri... | 156:19 | 134:24 | amortizing | 197:5 |
| 58:18 88:12 | 166:9 | 110:24 | 110:13 | 161:17,18 | aligned 51:10 | 135:6 | 202:13 |


| 218:4 | 228:17,24 | 70:21 71:10 | April 1:7 | aspect 179:22 | assessments | 220:14 | 3:6 66:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 225:25 | 231:3,9,12 | 252:23 | 187:18 | 246:17 | 10:24 19:2 | assume 12:7 | 110:16 |
| 229:21 | 235:16 | appraisers | 206:9 | aspects 151:3 | 19:3 24:12 | 80:10,13 | automate |
| 230:2 | appealed | 19:18 20:14 | 274:11 | assess 185:8 | 27:8 28:9 | 99:13 | 110:7 |
| 252:25 | 20:5,8 | 20:19 | arduous 45:7 | 220:2 | 28:15 32:2 | assumed 26:4 | automated |
| 261:8 | 194:11,21 | 193:19 | area 20:16 | 224:13 | 70:19,23 | 142:2,8 | 118:2 |
| 264:21 | appeals 12:5 | 205:21 | 33:4 151:7 | 230:9 | 71:3 182:5 | 147:22,24 | automatical... |
| 272:15 | 19:19 21:25 | 207:17 | 169:4 214:3 | 249:20 | 183:21 | 148:4,9 | 118:18 |
| anticipate | 70:19 71:2 | 253:7 | 233:21 | 265:20 | 184:15,21 | 158:4,25 | 119:21 |
| 24:15 26:8 | 183:13 | appreciate | 263:19 | assessed 20:3 | 184:24,24 | 159:3,10,15 | automating |
| 26:9 115:10 | 186:7 194:3 | 111:11 | 266:11 | 32:3 182:17 | 186:14 | assumes | 251:24,25 |
| 125:12,14 | 194:7,12,17 | 137:2,4 | 269:5,21 | 187:15 | 187:5 188:5 | 159:4 | automation |
| 125:16 | 194:22,25 | 175:4 | 271:2 | 206:5 | 189:20 | assuming | 252:4,6 |
| 126:6 187:9 | 195:10,10 | 246:12 | areas 32:25 | 215:18 | 205:10 | 12:9 107:17 | available |
| 188:2 | 195:24 | 257:11 | 87:13 | 223:12 | 206:4,15 | 149:4 160:2 | 120:8 |
| 194:17 | 196:9 | appreciation | 201:17 | 228:9 | 207:10 | assumptions | 145:16,23 |
| 195:2 | 205:12 | 137:6 | 210:20 | 258:24 | 220:3 223:8 | 142:11 | 186:21 |
| 222:15 | 208:18,24 | approach | 226:23 | 259:23 | 225:9 | Atlanta | 233:3,6,12 |
| 254:8 | 225:25 | 31:14 | 239:10 | assessing | 226:23 | 177:25 | 238:12 |
| anticipated | 229:21 | 148:24 | 242:10 | 238:2 | 229:6,9,16 | Atlantic | 244:23,25 |
| 61:3,10 | 230:2,12,13 | 150:4 201:3 | 243:8 244:6 | assessment | 238:9 242:4 | 144:10 | Avenue 165:5 |
| 62:4 | 230:20 | approached | 244:18 | 22:22 23:8 | 273:12 | attempted | 264:10 |
| anticipatio | 231:22 | 4:6 90:22 | 245:10 | 28:17 75:13 | assessor | 224:22 | 265:18,18 |
| 107:19 | 252:14,16 | 103:16 | 259:12 | 181:16,17 | 192:23 | attendance | average 34:8 |
| 186:6 | 253:3,8,13 | 140:8 181:9 | 260:5 | 181:24 | assessor's | 54:6 | 35:14,16 |
| antiquated | 253:14 | 198:14 | arena 19:1 | 182:11 | 236:6 | attended | 148:9,11 |
| 57:10 | 257:20 | 222:3 | 207:7,8 | 183:8 184:3 | assessors | 85:10 167:5 | 160:18,23 |
| anybody 20:9 | appear 142:6 | 254:13 | argue 168:7 | 184:5,9 | 71:4 192:10 | attention | 161:2 |
| 94:17 | appellant | appropriate | Army-Navy | 186:11 | asset 144:6 | 5:18 32:24 | 168:22 |
| anyway 10:8 | 253:15 | 60:22 65:8 | 63:23 | 187:16,20 | assets 49:14 | 37:24 | 249:13 |
| 75:10 78:18 | apples 165:23 | 66:14 | Aros 181:17 | 190:25 | 143:9,18 | 273:23 | averaging |
| 147:20 | 165:24 | 247:11 | Art 64:16 | 196:20 | 146:8 | attorney | 176:6 |
| 233:11 | applicabl | appropriat... | 65:5,7 | 198:22 | 149:24 | 195:14 | AVI 189:23 |
| apartment | 150:9 | 60:19 61:22 | articulated | 201:18 | 178:6 | attorneys | 194:4 199:7 |
| 182:24 | application | appropriati... | 23:11,13 | 203:10 | assist 206:12 | 228:25 | 199:21 |
| apartments | 219:18 | 66:19 | Asian 141:18 | 210:13,1 | 252:16,18 | attributes | 212:17 |
| 202:21 | application | appropriati... | aside 72:18 | 213:24 | assistance | 260:11,25 | 225:8,23 |
| Apollo 165:4 | 169:24 | 5:5,6 | 194:2,6 | 216:13 | 109:7 123:9 | audit 82:4,7 | 226:11 |
| apologize | 171:12 | appropriati... | 195:24 | 223:12,19 | 123:22 | 110:22 | 227:21 |
| 157:21 | 217:22 | 60:10 67:14 | 196:17 | 226:6 | 245:18 | Auditor 82:5 | 228:3 |
| apparatus | apply 74:4 | 155:9 | 231:2,6 | 228:13 | assisted | August 29:17 | 230:10 |
| 241:8 | 275:21 | approval | asked 24:4,9 | 229:12 | 185:13 | 29:19 | 232:22 |
| apparently | appointment | 2:19 | 39:3 49:21 | 232:24 | associated | authority 3:4 | avoid 122:20 |
| 188:23 | 217:15 | approve | 124:23 | 233:2,15 | 7:25 11:3 | 3:4,10 | 191:10 |
| appeal 12:5 | appraisal | 147:5 | 127:12 | 234:7 237:3 | 21:16 186:8 | 77:12 78:8 | Award |
| 12:10 71:9 | 19:5 185:14 | approved 3:7 | 217:12 | 256:3,6,15 | 251:20 | 78:23 83:20 | 129:12 |
| 183:17 | 253:16,21 | approximat... | 257:24 | 257:25 | association | 107:10 | aware 69:18 |
| 196:21 | appraisals | 109:19 | asking 34:2 | 261:25 | 124:4 | 152:8 | 176:10 |
| 197:8 213:2 | 192:17 | 110:13 | 90:18 133:6 | 266:3 | 129:11 | Authority's | 220:10,16 |
| 217:17,22 | 208:15 | 114:22 | 133:8 | 268:10 | 144:11,20 | 81:19 | 238:5 242:6 |
| 218:14,19 | appraised | 143:8,9 | 220:11 | 271:20 | 215:7 | authorize | 242:17,22 |
| 218:20,22 | 200:10 | 146:25 | 261:6 | Assessment's | 217:16,19 | 263:6 | Awesome |
| 219:11,22 | appraiser | 158:22 | 273:16 | 181:21 | 218:12,16 | authorized | 147:18 |

Page 3

| 172:8 | balances | 269:15 | 110:11 | 236:15 | 150:13 | 76:1 77:1 | 182:1 183:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12:15 109:3 | 270:7 | 121:11 | 258:23 | 159:20 | 78:1 79:1 | 184:1 185:1 |
| B | ball 156:16 | basis 32:12 | 146:2,23 | 261:22 | 160:6 | 80:1 81:1 | 186:1 187:1 |
| B 22:16 23:5 | 158:24 | 36:20 48:16 | 169:25 | beyond 255:2 | 176:21 | 82:1 83:1 | 188:1 189:1 |
| 23:5,22,24 | 178:25 | 115:16 | 171:12 | BIA 249:23 | 195:21,23 | 84:1 85:1 | 190:1 191:1 |
| 24:4,5 | bank 41:18 | 153:19 | 176:14 | Bielli 140:12 | 203:6 | 86:1 87:1 | 192:1 193:1 |
| 198:7,25 | 41:22 42:12 | 191:8 | 178:5 | 140:15,18 | 214:19 | 88:1 89:1 | 194:1 195:1 |
| 267:5 | 42:15,18 | 230:17 | 179:17,22 | 147:15 | 227:16 | 90:1 91:1 | 196:1 197:1 |
| back 10:3 | 43:17 | 234:6 | benefits | 148:2 | 235:12,14 | 92:1 93:1 | 198:1 199:1 |
| 12:22 13:7 | 110:13 | battling 6:24 | 14:22 15:2 | 149:21 | 240:6,9 | 94:1 95:1 | 200:1 201:1 |
| 20:13,20 | 118:15,18 | 6:24 | 15:21 16:19 | 150:14,21 | big-box 183:2 | 96:1 97:1 | 202:1 203:1 |
| 26:12 28:11 | 118:20 | bear 163:6 | 17:8 51:17 | 151:14 | bigger 41:10 | 98:1 99:1 | 203:9,11,12 |
| 30:10 58:4 | 122:22 | beer 269:13 | 54:6 141:13 | 152:19 | biggest 5:2 | 100:1 101:1 | 204:1 205:1 |
| 67:23 68:3 | 126:13 | began 109:8 | 154:18,21 | 153:11 | 73:22 | 102:1 103:1 | 206:1 207:1 |
| 70:16 72:3 | banking | beginning | 154:25 | 154:7,14,18 | 176:20 | 104:1 105:1 | 208:1 209:1 |
| 77:17 84:7 | 110:19 | 31:6 197:21 | 155:13 | 154:22 | 208:7 | 106:1 107:1 | 210:1 211:1 |
| 86:6 96:10 | 123:19 | 227:15,16 | 156:3,10 | 155:3,11,18 | bill 2:9,13,15 | 108:1 109:1 | 212:1 213:1 |
| 96:23 97:5 | banks 250:10 | 242:20 | 169:22,25 | 155:20 | 3:1,8 4:1 | 110:1 111:1 | 214:1 215:1 |
| 112:12 | bargaining | behalf 144:17 | 171:11 | 156:4,11,17 | 5:1 6:1 7:1 | 112:1 113:1 | 216:1 217:1 |
| 117:22 | 15:5 74:17 | 217:20 | 208:7,13 | 158:6 | 8:1 9:1 10:1 | 114:1 115:1 | 218:1 219:1 |
| 132:24 | barometer | 219:19 | Berks 264:13 | 159:12 | 11:1 12:1 | 116:1 117:1 | 220:1 221:1 |
| 148:17,25 | 195:16,19 | 246:24 | Bern 173:12 | 160:4,8,14 | 13:1 14:1 | 118:1 119:1 | 222:1 223:1 |
| 157:16 | 195:20 | belabor | Bernard | 160:20 | 15:1,15 | 120:1 121:1 | 224:1 225:1 |
| 170:23,23 | base 72:9 | 121:15 | 173:11 | 161:7,18 | 16:1 17:1 | 122:1 123:1 | 226:1 227:1 |
| 174:3 | 75:4 | believe 92:19 | besieged | 162:15 | 18:1 19:1 | 124:1 125:1 | 228:1 229:1 |
| 176:24 | based 25:6 | 99:10 102:8 | 243:23 | 163:15,25 | 20:1 21:1 | 126:1 127:1 | 230:1 231:1 |
| 180:6 | 36:11 67:7 | 108:10 | best 19:17,17 | 164:10,20 | 22:1 23:1 | 128:1 129:1 | 232:1 233:1 |
| 206:11 | 67:17 78:13 | 131:12 | 51:14 53:25 | 165:7,17,25 | 24:1 25:1 | 130:1 131:1 | 234:1 235:1 |
| 232:10 | 108:9 | 149:12,16 | 58:19 71:10 | 166:8,14 | 26:1 27:1 | 132:1 133:1 | 236:1 237:1 |
| 250:17 | 114:12,25 | 151:19 | 71:10 76:10 | 167:9,17,25 | 28:1 29:1 | 134:1 135:1 | 238:1 239:1 |
| 262:15 | 121:3,5 | 167:21 | 104:25 | 168:17 | 30:1 31:1 | 136:1 137:1 | 240:1 241:1 |
| 263:3 | 122:5,5 | 190:21 | 116:12,14 | 169:15 | 32:1 33:1 | 138:1 139:1 | 242:1 243:1 |
| background | 123:13 | 194:2 198:7 | 179:12 | 170:24 | 34:1 35:1 | 140:1 141:1 | 244:1 245:1 |
| 33:19 229:5 | 132:8 158:3 | 206:11 | 180:7 | 172:4,9,23 | 36:1 37:1 | 142:1 143:1 | 246:1 247:1 |
| backlog | 176:7 | 209:25 | best-case | 174:23 | 38:1 39:1 | 144:1 145:1 | 248:1 249:1 |
| 205:12 | 184:15 | 229:4,12 | 8:15 | 175:2,5,15 | 40:1 41:1 | 146:1 147:1 | 250:1 251:1 |
| bad 49:11 | 196:20,24 | 237:21 | better 34:22 | 175:19,24 | 42:1 43:1 | 148:1 149:1 | 252:1 253:1 |
| 176:5 | 201:2,12 | 255:24 | 46:16 47:25 | 176:13 | 44:1 45:1 | 150:1 151:1 | 254:1 255:1 |
| 197:16 | 209:9,10 | 268:21 | 49:19,20,23 | 177:8 178:2 | 46:1 47:1 | 152:1 153:1 | 256:1 257:1 |
| 237:14 | 212:14,15 | bell $21: 4,6,8$ | 50:7,10 | 178:16 | 48:1 49:1 | 154:1 155:1 | 258:1 259:1 |
| 245:13 | 215:18 | benchmark | 51:10 58:23 | 179:9,17 | 50:1 51:1 | 156:1 157:1 | 260:1 261:1 |
| Bailey 172:5 | 216:12 | 205:23 | 62:678:16 | 180:11,22 | 52:1 53:1 | 158:1 159:1 | 262:1 263:1 |
| balance 6:13 | 244:20 | beneficial | 83:13,17 | 180:25 | 54:1 55:1 | 160:1 161:1 | 264:1 265:1 |
| 6:17,19 7:6 | 263:24 | 110:21 | 87:4 91:12 | big 15:8 18:6 | 56:1 57:1 | 162:1 163:1 | 266:1 267:1 |
| 11:17 12:3 | 270:2,17 | 231:24 | 91:16 108:7 | 54:6,25 | 58:1 59:1 | 164:1 165:1 | 268:1 269:1 |
| 42:21 43:2 | 271:21 | 253:23 | 108:11 | 59:5,24 | 60:1 61:1 | 166:1 167:1 | 270:1 271:1 |
| 72:8,9,10 | basic 192:6 | benefit 5:4 | 116:15 | 73:24 75:6 | 62:1 63:1 | 168:1 169:1 | 272:1 273:1 |
| 72:25 73:7 | 260:11 | 8:23 9:2 | 126:4 128:9 | 81:21,22 | 64:1 65:1 | 170:1 171:1 | 274:1 |
| 119:9 | basically | 13:13 14:14 | 139:6 185:8 | 95:10 96:25 | 66:1 67:1 | 172:1 173:1 | billboards |
| 129:24,25 | 42:19 75:21 | 15:10,13 | 207:24 | 97:25 | 68:1 69:1 | 174:1 175:1 | 188:13 |
| 130:19 | 79:4 87:3 | 16:15 48:19 | 221:22 | 119:25 | 70:1 71:1 | 176:1 177:1 | billed 75:15 |
| 131:12 | 129:24 | 69:11,19 | 226:16,18 | 121:24 | 72:1 73:1 | 178:1 179:1 | billing 203:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 132: 5,13 \\ & 176: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 257:13 | 79:15 | 230:19 | 148:17 | 74:1 75:1 | 180:1 181:1 | billion 4:25 |
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| 14:673:12 | 1:15 | 114:15 | bridge 243:4 | 175:3,6 | 207:12 | 59:16 | 80:22,23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73:13 75:14 | blow 149:12 | 131:10 | Brief 127:23 | 180:14,20 | 209:22 | calendar | 81:2,10,13 |
| 75:15 111:5 | Blue 165:4 | 132:25 | briefest 5:13 | 180:23 | budgeted | 50:22 | 81:15,17 |
| 146:7 148:9 | bluntly 94:4 | 134:14 | briefing | 181:2 | 162:13 | 112:13 | 190:8,16 |
| 178:6 198:6 | board 3:23 | bonds' 111:2 | 45:17,21 | brownouts | budgeting | call 166:23 | capacity |
| 198:24 | 22:3 140:24 | book 46:17 | 46:18 | 101:2,3,6 | 16:18,21 | 172:24 | 31:11 |
| 199:4,8 | 141:25 | 75:6,21 | 123:11 | BRT 28:12 | 21:14 53:8 | 192:3 | 168:12 |
| 202:15 | 142:24 | 76:7 131:4 | briefings | 195:10 | 54:19 55:7 | 228:12 | 266:16 |
| 203:4,5,6 | 143:13 | books 46:18 | 127:10 | 219:5 | 55:20 56:3 | 265:21 | capital 2:10 |
| 203:11,13 | 144:4,8,19 | 47:4,7,21 | briefly 7:13 | 253:14 | 56:7 57:13 | 266:2 | 2:14 3:16 |
| 203:17,17 | 144:24 | 76:16 85:21 | brigade | BRT's 253:16 | 58:14 60:5 | callbacks | 3:18,19 |
| bills 1:18 2:4 | 145:8 146:9 | Borough | 136:19 | BSRP 107:15 | 61:13,14,15 | 89:6 | 25:3,19 |
| 2:8 3:15 | 146:16 | 173:6 | 169:10 | bubbling | 198:3 | called 44:14 | 27:17 30:15 |
| 205:15 | 147:12,23 | borrow 17:4 | bring 18:24 | 38:6 | budgets | 144:20 | 30:19 45:16 |
| 251:24,25 | 148:13 | 17:18 | 65:4 75:10 | Buckley | 45:16,20 | calling 263:3 | 56:13,14,18 |
| binders 45:19 | 152:20 | 139:15 | 104:17 | 173:11 | 62:7,24 | calls 220:7 | 85:14,22 |
| 45:22 46:11 | 153:18,23 | 245:12 | 116:3 | budget 2:14 | build 11:17 | 228:20 | 86:2 123:17 |
| BIRT 75:17 | 165:10 | borrowing | 127:16 | 2:16 13:13 | 93:10 | CAMA 27:12 | 151:5 267:5 |
| 76:13,15 | 171:2,4,6 | 18:6 103:24 | 174:4 180:2 | 13:20 14:5 | building 6:16 | 27:24,25 | caps 190:21 |
| bit 47:17 53:6 | 171:14,17 | 104:4 | 180:6 204:5 | 19:15 23:21 | 54:17 72:24 | 30:4,6,10 | capture |
| 78:16 | 172:17 | 114:25 | 239:12 | 25:19 26:15 | 212:3 | 30:10,22 | 199:19 |
| 193:13 | 173:21,24 | 139:9 | 273:22 | 44:20 45:10 | 258:20 | 31:10 94:10 | 244:9 |
| 194:15 | 174:5 | borrowings | bringing 39:8 | 45:16,17 | 259:12 | 94:12 | 261:22 |
| 219:3 | 189:25 | 131:24 | 52:20 152:5 | 46:7,17,22 | buildings | 101:22 | capturing |
| 221:22 | 195:12 | bottom | 204:9 | 47:7,19,21 | 65:9 150:13 | 185:14,22 | 199:18 |
| 259:20 | 209:5,6 | 130:17 | 230:18,22 | 57:16 60:9 | 182:24,24 | 203:22,25 | card 109:18 |
| Black 124:3 | 255:17 | 138:17 | 239:21 | 62:10 63:9 | 198:21 | 204:4,15,21 | 109:22 |
| Blackwell | Board's | 265:3 | broad 50:6 | 63:20 66:14 | 212:12 | 205:8,15,20 | care 67:12 |
| 1:10 127:4 | 140:18 | bought | broke 233:8 | 70:25 71:5 | 266:13 | 205:22 | career 173:12 |
| 127:5 | 141:14 | 152:13 | 233:10 | 72:15 85:12 | built 231:8,12 | 207:3,18,23 | careful 219:8 |
| 128:16,20 | 142:5,17 | 245:24 | broken 5:12 | 85:17,20 | 259:9,11,17 | 221:17 | 249:7,21 |
| 241:16 | 148:3 | bound 190:10 | 38:2 | 86:3 88:13 | bunch 239:13 | 223:5 225:8 | carefully |
| blame 20:9 | boards | boundaries | brought 58:4 | 88:15,19 | business | 225:14 | 137:3 |
| blames 78:8 | 144:24 | 240:12,13 | 64:15 65:6 | 94:16 | 28:25 51:22 | 252:8 254:3 | Carlton |
| blended | 145:3 | 240:18,22 | 208:20 | 101:22 | 71:17 76:14 | 254:6 255:3 | 150:17 |
| 131:24 | boatload | Bowman | brown 1:15 | 106:14,16 | 86:22 | 255:10,13 | Carol 144:15 |
| 132:19 | 243:11 | 106:9 | 32:19,20,23 | 106:21 | 176:14 | 255:19,23 | carrying |
| blind-sided | BOBBY 1:13 | break 121:3 | 34:3,5,16 | 111:7,13 | 258:3 | 257:20 | 25:22,25 |
| 220:18 | body 22:17 | 132:18,22 | 34:25 35:4 | 120:23,25 | businesses | 260:3,23 | 26:9 |
| block 234:10 | 46:16 | 135:9,16 | 35:13 36:2 | 121:18 | 85:16 | 261:6 | carryover |
| 234:10 | 123:13 | 138:7 | 36:5,8 37:5 | 124:10 | 151:21 | campaign | 26:6 |
| 240:9 | 126:5 | 228:15 | 37:9,15,19 | 127:23 | 264:19 | 109:11 | case 179:8 |
| 249:12 | 159:24 | 250:5 | 37:22 38:2 | 129:12,14 | 267:15 | 262:11 | 235:10 |
| 258:18,22 | 205:18 | breakdown | 38:10 | 141:7 147:5 | buy 266:23 | candidates | case-by-case |
| 259:18 | bond 72:5 | 80:5 161:9 | 136:22,23 | 154:13 | 267:8 | 153:7 | 48:16 |
| 269:13 | 74:23 | breakout | 137:11 | 155:8,24 | 272:23 | cannabis | 153:19 |
| blocks 235:23 | 105:25 | 35:24 | 161:15,19 | 156:5 175:9 | buying | 149:11 | cases 211:19 |
| 239:14 | 112:10,12 | breaks 33:22 | 167:6 168:2 | 175:17 | 249:12 | 151:13 | 211:22 |
| 240:5 | 112:16 | Breeze | 169:5,18 | 176:3,7 | buzz 95:7 | 152:5 | 259:7 |
| 250:10 | 130:24 | 235:25 | 170:2,7,19 | 181:3,22 |  | CAO 92:6 | cash 110:8 |
| 258:20 | 176:20,22 | 249:5 | 170:21 | 185:25 | C | CAO's 51:10 | 117:9,12 |
| 264:15 | bonds 107:14 | Brewerytown | 172:2,8,22 | 186:10 | calculation | 52:12 | 119:16,22 |
| BLONDELL | 108:13,18 | 243:3 | 174:17,24 | 194:16 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 118:22 } \\ \text { calculations } \end{gathered}$ | cap 48:21 | 120:4,8,10 |
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| 120:11,24 | certain 72:16 | Chairman | charge 27:17 | CIO 52:2,6 | 168:10,16 | 35:22 | 137:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 121:21 | 72:17 85:13 | 44:10 202:6 | charged | 156:17 | 170:16 | 175:13 | 139:24 |
| 122:2,4 | 121:23 | 209:20 | 110:23 | 168:21 | 173:4 | 193:4 | 140:6,10,13 |
| 243:12 | 122:7,9,10 | 221:10 | Charlie 38:3 | 177:16 | 174:14 | claim 259:8 | 140:16 |
| casting 169:6 | 147:18 | 232:3 241:3 | chart 33:6,22 | circumstance | 176:8,22 | claiming | 147:7,17 |
| catch 96:2 | 152:12 | 245:9 | 36:22 75:6 | 10:16 | 178:21 | 166:6 | 148:15 |
| catch-all | 175:21 | 246:21 | 80:16 131:4 | Cisneros | 181:2,15 | clarification | 150:12,18 |
| 119:18 | 190:11 | 247:10,16 | 131:9,19 | 123:16 | 182:14 | 101:22 | 151:12,23 |
| catching | certainly | challenge 8:7 | 132:4,16,16 | cities 6:12 | 184:7,14 | 155:4 | 153:9,24 |
| 243:24 | 45:13 127:6 | 42:22 | 133:6 | 85:5 130:5 | 185:3,4,20 | clarify 43:20 | 169:9 181:6 |
| categories | 213:6 | challenges | 176:23 | 130:15,20 | 193:2,8,10 | 90:9 | 181:11,14 |
| 109:4 | 226:25 | 85:4 109:2 | 177:2 | 130:22 | 204:23,24 | Clarke 1:10 | 186:23 |
| 130:18 | CERTIFIC... | 250:5 | charts 33:2 | 176:25 | 209:24,25 | 2:2 3:11 4:4 | 187:25 |
| 213:13 | 275:2 | Chamber | 177:9 | 177:3 | 210:8 | 4:8,12 5:11 | 188:6,17,22 |
| 233:11 | certification | 85:11 | cheapest | 179:12,16 | 213:25 | 5:16 7:7 | 189:17 |
| category | 275:20 | chance 85:8 | 104:25 | 205:20 | 215:2,25 | 8:25 9:11 | 190:4 191:4 |
| 39:14,16 | certified | change 28:25 | 105:11 | city 1:2,6 | 218:17 | 10:14,18 | 191:11 |
| 41:25 | 145:15 | 36:20 50:13 | check 37:12 | 2:20,22 3:9 | 226:3,13,18 | 11:19,25 | 192:2 |
| 114:18 | CERTIFY | 52:12 96:25 | 82:23 88:7 | 3:22 5:14 | 226:21 | 12:11,13,21 | 233:22 |
| Cathy 4:15 | 275:3 | 115:16 | 92:20 | 5:20 15:14 | 227:4,8,9 | 20:22 21:3 | 241:15 |
| 52:2 53:22 | certifying | 166:9 | 122:16 | 27:9 40:6 | 244:17 | 21:7 22:5 | 250:18,24 |
| Caucus 124:3 | 275:24 | 204:11 | 155:4 | 40:14 43:8 | 248:7,13 | 26:19 32:16 | 251:5 |
| Causeway | cetera 75:19 | 216:21,23 | checked | 48:6 64:17 | 250:2 | 38:13 44:5 | 256:20 |
| 165:5 | 168:13,14 | 219:12 | 116:2 | 70:5 71:11 | 251:11 | 47:11 52:22 | 261:11 |
| causing | 168:14 | 258:8,10 | checks 109:9 | 72:20 74:23 | 253:23 | 63:17 64:5 | 262:3 |
| 134:13 | 170:16 | 271:21 | 109:21 | 76:18 77:17 | 254:3 | 64:14,19,24 | 264:12 |
| cautionary | Chair 12:23 | changed | cheek 169:10 | 78:11,19 | 259:11 | 65:3,17,25 | 267:21 |
| 249:6 | 22:6 26:21 | 61:12 | Cherry | 80:19,23 | City's 5:23 | 66:4,8,17 | 268:8 |
| caveat 158:6 | 32:18 38:15 | 221:25 | 172:14 | 81:2,12 | 8:7 17:3 | 66:25 67:10 | 269:10,20 |
| CBS 38:4 | 44:7 47:12 | 269:7 | Chicago | 82:2 83:2,4 | 42:10 79:17 | 67:19 68:2 | 270:15,23 |
| cell 188:13 | 52:24 60:10 | changes 2:24 | 167:13,15 | 83:14 85:4 | 96:13,15 | 68:5 77:5 | 271:5,8,17 |
| cent 15:13 | 68:7 77:7 | 29:6 74:3 | 177:24 | 86:21 87:2 | 107:2 108:2 | 84:17 86:14 | 271:24 |
| Center | 84:19 86:16 | 74:16 | Chief 52:6 | 88:3 95:13 | 108:13,13 | 89:4 96:3 | 272:3,7,10 |
| 148:21 | 89:7 94:17 | 108:22 | 140:22 | 95:18 98:3 | 108:16,17 | 98:15 | 272:14,17 |
| 215:2,25 | 95:24 96:4 | 177:14 | 170:11 | 105:2 106:7 | 108:19,25 | 100:18 | 273:8,15,20 |
| centers | 98:17 | 178:19,25 | 171:23 | 106:8,11 | 109:7 | 101:8,15 | 273:24 |
| 182:25 | 100:20 | 197:18 | 181:15,17 | 107:20 | 117:12 | 103:2,8,11 | 274:3,8 |
| 232:25 | 101:17 | 211:8,15 | choice 7:10 | 108:8,21 | 135:19 | 103:18,21 | Clarke's |
| central | 116:19 | 214:3,14 | chosen 145:8 | 109:3,12,14 | 145:10 | 104:7,16,19 | 247:2 |
| 174:11 | 123:3 127:3 | 226:6 | Chris 156:22 | 110:14,18 | 148:20 | 105:4,8,13 | Class 14:13 |
| 243:20 | 128:24 | 233:15 | 165:17 | 110:20 | 149:6 184:2 | 105:20 | 60:24 62:8 |
| centralizati... | 136:21 | changing | 167:11 | 111:4 114:9 | 185:5 | 106:2,5 | 62:11 63:21 |
| 110:15 | 137:16 | 51:21 | 173:9 | 119:15,25 | 256:13 | 111:18 | 106:21 |
| centralized | 140:24 | 115:10 | Christian | 123:21 | City-related | 112:20,24 | 134:7,19,24 |
| 110:11 | 154:2 | 166:7 | 106:8 | 124:13 | 111:3 | 113:4,14 | 138:4 |
| cents 8:2 | 161:14 | 197:18 | 119:15 | 126:8 | City-School | 114:2,5,8 | 154:21,22 |
| 14:22,24 | 165:21 | 246:17 | 126:10 | 135:20 | 80:4 | 115:3,15,20 | 155:2,14 |
| 15:15,16 | 180:13 | channels | 127:8 | 137:21 | City-sponso... | 115:25 | 156:5 |
| 69:6,12,19 | 197:22 | 229:3 | Christopher | 139:10 | 63:22 | 116:6,10,17 | classes 86:25 |
| 69:20,20 | 209:15 | characteristic | 140:21 | 140:17 | citywide | 122:25 | 99:25 |
| 156:10 | 239:25 | 261:20 | 170:11 | 148:21 | 225:10,20 | 126:19 | 109:16 |
| century | 256:22 | characteris... | chronic 9:15 | 152:23 | civil 33:13,14 | 128:22 | 144:7 |
| 245:25 | 261:13 | 238:3 | chunk 82:10 | 156:2 | 33:24 34:14 | 136:17 | classification |


| 237:2,10 | 15:10 16:24 | 139:16 | 111:15 | 177:25 | computer | 218:12 | consistently |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 239:13 | 69:17 | 195:2 | 127:9 193:5 | 259:21 | 185:13 | conduct | 6:8 69:24 |
| 268:20,25 | 191:18,22 | 220:17 | 263:5 | comparing | con 119:16 | 238:13 | consolidating |
| 269:4 270:3 | 200:2 | 257:21 | commission... | 130:14,22 | concept 89:14 | conducted | 126:22 |
| 270:12,18 | 258:16 | 265:10 | 91:5 92:17 | comparison | 126:12,15 | 143:13 | consolidation |
| classificatio... | collect 203:8 | 269:8 | commit 31:17 | 49:25 | concern 15:2 | 183:18 | 185:17 |
| 184:6 237:5 | collective | commend | 31:20 | compensati... | 25:5,7 39:2 | conference | Consortium |
| 270:7 | 15:4 74:17 | 174:21 | commitment | 145:11 | 59:5 244:14 | 124:6 | 85:14,22 |
| classify 212:4 | columns | comment | 83:14,16 | competency | 264:15 | 167:13 | 86:2 |
| clear 16:2 | 133:9 | 18:11 68:11 | committed | 182:10 | concerned | conferences | constant |
| clearly $37: 3$ | combination | 126:9 | 144:22 | complaints | 59:13 61:17 | 180:4,6 | 267:9 |
| 69:5 83:16 | 134:23 | 247:18 | committee | 229:25 | 63:10 | confidence | constituents |
| 84:4 86:8 | come 11:16 | comments | 1:3 2:4 3:14 | complement | 137:22 | 182:7 | 214:19 |
| 159:14 | 12:22 13:7 | 85:18 | 4:13 52:5 | 100:5 | 138:2,13 | confident | 220:12 |
| 270:18 | 13:25 20:20 | 180:16 | 52:19,20 | 193:18 | 234:6 | 183:24 | constitute |
| clerk 2:9 3:15 | 40:9 65:22 | Commerce | 180:18 | complete 74:2 | 235:15 | confirm 32:6 | 3:16 |
| 4:3 173:21 | 71:11 80:14 | 41:7,9 85:9 | 274:10,14 | 82:6 142:22 | concerning | 240:17 | consultant |
| Cleveland | 85:6 90:20 | 85:12 | common | 145:14 | 22:18 150:3 | conflict | 91:6 145:6 |
| 177:25 | 91:4,6,8 | commercial | 224:7 | 255:4 | 151:5 | 151:24 | 145:8 148:7 |
| clock 241:5 | 93:8 102:22 | 10:24 19:2 | communica... | completed | 153:12 | 152:10 | 159:2 178:4 |
| close 122:15 | 113:16 | 19:2,4,18 | 28:11 | 90:10 92:18 | concerns | 153:2,15 | 208:20 |
| 122:17 | 122:11 | 20:12 22:2 | communities | 92:21 | 22:17 60:5 | confused | 209:11 |
| 146:20 | 123:12 | 27:5 70:19 | 243:24 | 182:13 | 104:10 | 55:25 | 231:21 |
| 156:10 | 128:7 | 75:13 | community | 187:19 | 257:10 | congratulate | consultants |
| 162:22 | 164:13 | 110:19 | 65:12 71:20 | completion | 264:5 | 166:12 | 150:24 |
| 200:16 | 174:3 | 182:14 | 76:14 | 90:12 | concerted | congratulat... | 153:20 |
| 201:8,10 | 192:21 | 184:13 | 107:16 | 179:20 | 260:2 | 129:13 | 180:2 229:4 |
| 206:6 | 193:10 | 186:8 187:5 | 108:8 185:7 | complex 54:3 | conclude 5:9 | 167:24 | 230:18 |
| closed 262:10 | 196:9 | 189:4 190:2 | 220:13 | 182:22 | concludes | 168:3 | consulting |
| closely 54:22 | 200:16 | 199:24 | 247:6 | compliance | 103:4 140:2 | conjunction | 232:2,7 |
| 120:23,25 | 232:9,16 | 200:3,25 | 264:16 | 107:21 | condition | 93:19 | contained |
| 153:22 | 252:6 253:4 | 203:5 206:4 | companies | 108:3 136:9 | 235:6 | 127:18 | 13:13 275:5 |
| closer 59:14 | 253:13 | 206:12 | 150:5 | 136:12 | 260:13 | 206:16,19 | context 16:16 |
| 87:14,18 | 254:10 | 207:8 | 151:10 | 153:16,1 | conditioning | 255:9 | contingency |
| 104:17 | 260:20 | 210:25 | 152:14 | 171:24 | 243:19 | consider 3:15 | 65:21 |
| 158:24 | 266:23 | 211:12 | 224:18,20 | complicated | conditions | 72:2 73:6 | continue 3:13 |
| 200:22 | 267:8 | 224:9 228:8 | company | 54:7 230:13 | 234:14 | 121:24 | 107:24 |
| 206:8 | 268:14 | 232:24 | 150:16 | 230:20 | 239:8 | 219:18 | 144:9 148:3 |
| 212:20 | comes 40:13 | 233:9 | 151:10 | component | condo 211:18 | considerable | 148:13 |
| 220:2,4 | 44:23 61:3 | 251:12 | 152:3,18 | 94:11 | 212:23 | 119:5,6 | 163:11 |
| clunkier | 61:8 62:20 | 252:14,15 | comparable | 113:24 | 214:20 | consideration | 169:6 184:4 |
| 28:13 | 63:12 | 252:23 | 182:20 | components | 215:6 | 190:21 | 190:6 |
| CMX-2.75 | 112:10 | 257:15,16 | 200:23,24 | 72:6 188:12 | 217:16,18 | 229:19 | 213:12 |
| 263:4 | 127:21,24 | 258:3 | 204:22 | 222:24,25 | 217:20 | 237:5 261:2 | 247:8 |
| Coalition | 238:16 | 262:15,16 | 239:9 266:2 | comprehen... | 220:14 | 263:17 | 261:17 |
| 144:21 | 253:22 | 264:6,8 | 267:11,13 | 108:6 | condos 212:5 | 272:25 | continued |
| coincide | comfortable | 265:16 | comparables | 184:11 | 212:9,10,11 | 273:6 | 108:2 109:2 |
| 257:21 | 24:23 71:15 | commercially | 264:9 | comps 208:14 | 212:19 | considered | 168:6 |
| colleague | coming 23:9 | 183:5 | compare 49:6 | 233:23 | 214:7,7,9 | 57:21 191:3 | 257:14 |
| 99:2 241:4 | 24:11,18 | Commission | compared | 235:19 | 214:17,18 | considering | continues |
| colleague's | 41:19 83:18 | 3:23 65:5,7 | 50:5,8,10 | 236:10,15 | 214:25 | 14:21 162:4 | 39:23 |
| 100:24 | 103:14 | 106:10,13 | 79:19,20 | 237:18,21 | 215:2,4,8 | consistent | 106:24 |
| colleagues | 105:5 | 110:25 | 85:5 177:23 | 265:12 | 216:10 | 43:12 45:24 | 107:20 |


| 146:9 | 268:24 | 25:22 131:9 | 68:5,10 | 197:23 | 47:13 48:2 | 131:15,18 | 206:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| continuing | conversations | 175:10 | 72:3 74:16 | 220:4 230:3 | 48:4 49:3 | 132:3,11,24 | 208:6 |
| 107:22 | 128:2 193:4 | 192:8 | 77:4,5,10 | 233:13 | 49:24 50:12 | 133:8,16,23 | 209:13,16 |
| continuity | conversion | corridor | 77:18 84:17 | 242:19 | 50:17,21 | 134:2,6,12 | 209:17,18 |
| 51:8 | 109:24 | 233:25 | 84:22 86:14 | 246:25 | 51:2,6 | 134:18 | 209:19 |
| continuous | converted | corridors | 86:19 89:3 | 247:4 | 52:10,23 | 135:11,18 | 211:17 |
| 107:3 | 109:17,20 | 232:25 | 89:4,10 | 250:18,24 | 68:7,9,17 | 136:14,18 | 212:2 213:6 |
| continuously | conveyance | 264:8 | 96:3,6 | 251:5 | 68:24 69:10 | 137:16,18 | 213:11,17 |
| 249:10 | 245:22 | 265:16 | 98:14,15,20 | 254:25 | 69:16 70:2 | 138:15 | 214:5,16,24 |
| contract 87:5 | Cooperation | cost 13:13 | 100:18 | 256:18,20 | 70:9,15 | 139:2,7,19 | 215:14 |
| 111:21 | 3:4,6 | 15:13,24 | 101:8,15,20 | 261:11 | 71:6,16,25 | 139:22,25 | 216:9,16,22 |
| 113:21 | coordinated | 16:7,16 | 103:2,8,11 | 267:20,21 | 72:4,14 | 154:2,4,8,9 | 217:4,7,11 |
| 116:11 | 52:4,8 | 17:18,21 | 103:18,21 | 267:23 | 73:9,15,20 | 154:15,20 | 217:13 |
| 164:23 | Coppers | 18:4,7 | 104:7,16,19 | 268:8 | 74:6,10,19 | 154:24 | 218:9 |
| 171:19 | 165:5 | 21:16 31:3 | 105:4,8,13 | 269:10,20 | 75:8 76:6 | 155:7,16,19 | 219:23 |
| 222:16 | copy 207:7 | 108:16 | 105:20 | 270:15,23 | 76:10 77:2 | 155:22 | 220:6,23 |
| 254:4,5 | corner 183:3 | 114:20 | 106:2,5,6 | 271:5,8,17 | 84:19,21 | 156:6,13,20 | 221:5,6,7,8 |
| 255:17 | corners 263:2 | 121:19 | 111:16,18 | 271:24 | 86:7,13,15 | 157:4,8,12 | 221:9,14,15 |
| contracting | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { c o r p }} 267: 5$ | 155:21 | 112:20,24 | 272:3,7,10 | 86:16,18 | 157:18,23 | 222:9 223:4 |
| 164:4,8 | corporate | 253:8 | 113:4,14 | 272:14,17 | 87:19,22 | 158:2 159:7 | 224:2,21 |
| 165:3 | 144:24 | costs 5:4 6:14 | 114:2,5,8 | 273:8,15,20 | 88:10,18,24 | 159:23 | 225:7,18 |
| contracts | 145:3 | 6:14 7:8 | 115:3,15,20 | 273:24 | 89:5,7,9,13 | 160:5,9,17 | 226:8 |
| 112:9 | correct 10:17 | 14:14,15,15 | 115:25 | 274:3,6,8 | 89:19 90:2 | 160:25 | 227:14,18 |
| 113:20,25 | 41:17 45:3 | 15:2 16:15 | 116:6,10,17 | Council's | 90:6,24 | 161:12,24 | 228:5,23 |
| 134:14 | 70:7,8 72:9 | 18:2 63:24 | 122:25 | 183:23 | 91:24 92:16 | 162:8 175:7 | 229:8,14 |
| 164:18,21 | 73:19 104:6 | 81:24 | 123:6,12 | 190:23 | 92:25 93:21 | 175:8,16,22 | 230:7,21 |
| 164:24 | 114:4 116:9 | 108:12 | 126:19 | Councilman | 94:3,15,21 | 176:2,16 | 231:14,23 |
| 254:19 | 117:2,3 | Council 1:2 | 128:22 | 1:11,11,12 | 95:3,12,17 | 177:21 | 232:5,9,11 |
| contribute | 124:18,19 | 1:10 2:2,20 | 129:3 | 1:13,13,14 | 95:23 96:4 | 178:13 | 232:12,15 |
| 88:3,14 | 130:8 | 3:7,11 4:4,8 | 130:10 | 1:14,16 | 96:5 97:11 | 179:6,10 | 233:21 |
| 145:19 | 131:17 | 4:12 5:11 | 136:16,17 | 7:12 12:23 | 97:18 98:2 | 180:8,12 | 239:2 240:2 |
| contribution | 134:5 | 5:14,16 7:7 | 137:14,19 | 12:25 13:5 | 98:10,13,16 | 192:3,4,12 | 240:23,25 |
| 41:22 | 154:23 | 8:25 9:11 | 139:23,24 | 13:11 14:3 | 98:17,19 | 192:15 | 241:2,12,14 |
| 145:20 | 155:3 | 10:14,18 | 140:6,10,13 | 14:8,11,19 | 99:2,10,18 | 193:17,22 | 241:15 |
| contributions | 157:25 | 11:19,25 | 140:16,17 | 15:9,25 | 100:8,16,19 | 193:25 | 245:8 |
| 73:23 | 189:18 | 12:11,13,21 | 141:15 | 16:8,22 | 100:20,22 | 194:10,20 | 246:11,20 |
| 145:22 | 193:24 | 13:2 18:10 | 147:7,17 | 17:10,22 | 101:5,12 | 195:6,15,18 | 247:9,12,13 |
| control 34:24 | 194:7,9 | 20:21,22 | 148:15 | 18:8 20:24 | 115:6 | 196:3,11,22 | 247:14,15 |
| 35:8 110:8 | 198:8 | 21:3,7,11 | 150:12,18 | 22:6,8,12 | 116:19,21 | 197:4,14,20 | 247:21,23 |
| 244:2 | 202:19,23 | 22:5,9,12 | 151:12,23 | 23:3,17,25 | 117:4,14,18 | 197:25 | 248:19,20 |
| 275:23 | 203:14 | 24:14 26:18 | 152:23 | 24:7,25 | 117:21 | 198:5,12,16 | 249:9 250:9 |
| Controller | 211:25 | 26:19,24 | 153:9,24 | 25:21 26:7 | 118:6,10,24 | 198:20,25 | 250:13,20 |
| 85:2 | 223:20 | 32:16 38:13 | 154:5 168:7 | 26:17,20 | 119:12 | 199:3,6,11 | 250:23 |
| convenient | 229:7 | 38:18 44:5 | 181:3,6,11 | 38:15,17,22 | 120:6,12 | 199:25 | 251:3,6,7 |
| 218:5 219:9 | 246:10 | 44:10 47:9 | 181:14,15 | 39:18 41:8 | 121:14 | 200:13,18 | 251:17 |
| conversation | 258:6 | 47:11 52:22 | 185:4 | 41:13,24 | 122:12 | 201:6,17,24 | 252:13 |
| 30:9 40:24 | 263:10 | 60:16 63:17 | 186:19,23 | 42:4 43:16 | 123:2,3,5 | 202:2,3,4,5 | 253:6 254:2 |
| 43:15 | 268:4,7 | 64:5,14,19 | 187:25 | 43:19,25 | 124:22 | 202:8,9,10 | 254:7,21 |
| 162:25 | 275:8 | 64:24 65:3 | 188:6,17,22 | 44:6,7,9,13 | 125:20 | 202:20,24 | 255:15 |
| 211:21 | corrections | 65:17,25 | 189:17 | 44:13,19,22 | 126:18 | 203:3,15 | 256:16,21 |
| 261:18 | 188:16 | 66:4,8,17 | 190:4 191:4 | 45:2,25 | 128:24 | 204:14,25 | 256:22,24 |
| 262:23 | 210:23 | 66:25 67:10 | 191:11 | 46:7,25 | 129:2,6 | 205:17 | 257:6,8,23 |
| 266:4 | correctly | 67:19 68:2 | 192:2 | 47:5,6,8,12 | 130:6,9 | 206:3,10,14 | 258:14 |

Page 8

| 259:5 261:4 | 167:14,23 | 46:22 70:10 | credits | 95:4 179:5 | 107:2,4,12 | 15:6 | 15:17,20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 261:10,12 | 168:2,18 | 93:7 100:12 | 124:12 | 185:16,18 | 108:16 | deed 189:15 | 16:15,19 |
| Councilme... | 169:5,18 | 111:20 | 125:9 | 201:4 | 111:3,5,7 | 223:23 | 41:20 51:4 |
| 85:19 | 170:2,7,19 | 116:24 | crisis 6:24 | 222:12,19 | 114:23 | 246:17 | 60:8 67:15 |
| Councilwo... | 170:21 | 117:21 | 40:12,17 | 233:3,5 | 124:13 | deep 250:2 | 68:19 85:9 |
| 1:10,12,15 | 172:2,8,22 | 129:7 | criteria | 234:3 | 125:4 | deeper 124:7 | 97:4 98:4,5 |
| 1:15 26:22 | 174:17,18 | 139:17 | 143:16 | 248:24 | 128:15 | deeply 39:21 | 99:7,21,22 |
| 26:23 27:3 | 174:24 | 147:9 | critical 46:10 | 264:2 | 131:6,13 | defend 70:18 | 104:12 |
| 29:5,14,18 | 175:3,6 | 150:10,13 | 52:15 91:25 | database | 134:3,6,23 | 70:23 | 107:7 109:8 |
| 30:3,13,18 | 180:14,20 | 154:10 | critically | 143:13 | 134:25 | 231:21 | 118:25 |
| 31:7,24 | 180:23 | 187:2,17 | 59:17 210:3 | date 30:6 | 135:2,5,5 | 253:10,25 | 129:8 134:3 |
| 32:8,11,14 | 181:2 | 191:20 | criticized | 147:21 | 135:19,22 | defendable | 137:8 |
| 32:17,19,20 | 232:13,18 | 193:3 | 60:15 | 157:16 | 136:8,11 | 200:16 | 154:25 |
| 32:23 34:3 | 232:19 | 195:22 | crucial 6:17 | 158:21 | 137:23 | defending | 169:13 |
| 34:5,16,25 | 233:19 | 217:8 240:5 | 17:20 | 197:21 | 138:10,11 | 229:6 | 170:3,5 |
| 35:4,13 | 234:22 | 251:8 | 130:25 | 218:21 | 138:19,21 | 231:17 | 171:22 |
| 36:2,5,8 | 235:9 236 | 254:19 | CTO 106:23 | 221:18,23 | 138:24 | defense | 176:4 183:3 |
| 37:5,9,15 | 236:17 | course 33:3 | 107:4,23 | 221:24 | 139:11 | 183:15 | 186:13 |
| 37:19,22 | 237:6,23 | 36:9 54:23 | 108:5,19 | 255:21 | 142:20 | deferred | 205:14 |
| 38:2,10,14 | 238:20 | 55:17 77:16 | 109:6 110:2 | dates 157:5 | 158:13 | 145:10 | Departmen... |
| 52:25 53:2 | 239:24 | 78:13 | 110:6 | daughter | December | deficits 5:25 | 146:18 |
| 53:5,21 | 240:3 244:5 | 132:20 | curious 51:7 | 246:2 | 29:21 | defined | departments |
| 54:11,14 | 245:21 | courtesy | 169:8 | Dauphin | 101:24 | 145:20 | 16:21 26:6 |
| 55:24 56:8 | 247:2 | 219:24 | current 53:24 | 267:5 | 102:3,14 | 146:2 178:5 | 27:19 31:17 |
| 56:19,23 | 248:22 | 221:2 | 54:9 72:10 | Dave 155:5 | 112:7 | definitely | 31:22 54:16 |
| 57:8,20 | 250:12,22 | cover 23:23 | 114:11 | 171:16 | 143:10 | 31:19 37:2 | 54:22 55:2 |
| 58:6,9,13 | 260:18 | 24:5 251:20 | 132:2,4 | DAVID 1:14 | 178:18 | 41:16 48:24 | 58:16 60:11 |
| 60:2 61:5 | 261:14,15 | covered | 141:19 | day 120:7 | 222:25 | 63:7 113:12 | 60:19,23 |
| 61:11 62:13 | 263:11 | 99:16 | 142:3,13 | days 13:15 | decide 8:24 | 230:25 | 61:19 62:22 |
| 62:18 63:5 | 264:3 265:7 | covering 2:22 | 143:23 | 72:11,12 | 10:12 | definition | 87:4 91:7 |
| 63:14,18 | 266:7 | covers 141:12 | 148:12 | 120:20 | decided 65 | 263:5 | 91:11 92:13 |
| 69:3 77:8,9 | 267:18,22 | cram 47:22 | 252:15 | DBE 113:7 | 252:17 | degree 7:10 | 146:14 |
| 79:7,22 | counsel | crazy 238:23 | currently | DC 22:19 | decision | 149:19 | 155:15 |
| 80:9,12,18 | 104:14,22 | 242:4 | 109:3 111:4 | 24:21 | 72:20 139:8 | 152:7 161:4 | 168:11 |
| 81:4,7,14 | 104:22 | create 145:25 | 136:8 146:3 | 106:19 | 139:14 | delaying 25:9 | 179:13 |
| 82:3,24 | 125:25 | 264:17,25 | 171:3 204:8 | 109:14 | 142:18 | Delicsha | 193:16 |
| 84:4,13,16 | counselors | 266:17 | CURTIS 1:14 | deadline | 207:24 | 181:18 | dependent |
| 84:18 | 171:9,11 | creating | cut 9:13 | 31:18,20 | 253:5 | deliver 95:14 | 110:10 |
| 101:18,19 | count 216:10 | 244:11 | 40:10 | 175:21 | 270:13,22 | demand | depending |
| 102:7,11,18 | counted | creative | 158:19 | deal 87:14 | decisions | 108:17 | 15:16 |
| 103:3 127:4 | 112:17 | 265:9 | 272:18 | 105:25 | 152:21 | demographic | 265:12 |
| 127:5 | counterparts | credit 5:20 | cuts 23:21 | 116:25 | 205:13 | 161:8 | depends |
| 128:16,20 | 34:11 35:19 | 17:3,17,17 |  | 117:12 | decline 112:3 | demograph... | 10:15 268:5 |
| 128:23 | counties | 39:9,22 | D | 148:21 | decrease | 33:10 | deposit |
| 136:22,23 | 248:14 | 44:25 45:3 | D 1:15 | dealing | 142:8 | 141:16 | 109:12,18 |
| 137:11 | country | 85:15 | daily 39:6 | 192:17 | 211:23 | denied | 109:21 |
| 161:15,19 | 130:15 | 108:20,21 | 145:17 | deals 112:10 | 216:24 | 195:12 | 117:24 |
| 161:20,21 | 177:2 | 114:12,13 | damaged | 112:12 | decreasing | 197:10 | 118:2 |
| 162:24 | county 97:2 | 114:16 | 260:22 | death 169:25 | 141:23 | density 262:7 | deposits |
| 163:23 | couple 5:19 | 138:5,8,10 | DARRELL | debit 109:10 | dedicated | 262:15,25 | 119:10,18 |
| 164:2,17 | 6:7 28:5 | 147:19 | 1:10 | debt 25:4,6 | 100:25 | 263:8,13 | Deputies |
| 165:2,12,20 | 29:7,23 | 176:25 | data 89:11,16 | 25:13 | 182:2 | department | 116:24 |
| 166:3,11,22 | 38:24 44:15 | 188:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 2,10,15 \\ & 92: 493: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 106:23 | dedicating | 3:22 5:18 | 127:7 |


| Deputy 4:15 | 249:23 | 264:11,14 | disagree | 83:15,22,23 | 231:25 | 98:2,10,13 | 254:7,21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 53:23 106:8 | 262:7 | differential | 200:2 208:4 | 84:8 141:14 | 232:6 238:7 | 115:6 | 255:15 |
| 119:15 | 264:16 | 35:9,10 | disappears | 203:19 | 244:11,18 | 128:25 | 256:16 |
| 120:17 | 268:11 | 252:20 | 161:4 | 211:18 | 244:19 | 129:2,6 | 257:23 |
| 140:19 | 269:8 | differently | disappointed | 213:7 215:3 | 252:9 | 130:6,9 | Domb's 47:6 |
| 169:16 | developments | 60:4 215:16 | 53:10 | 215:8 233:4 | 255:11,13 | 131:15,18 | Dominique |
| 173:16,23 | 254:11 | differs 34:10 | disclosure | 233:13 | 255:14 | 132:3,11,24 | 172:14,15 |
| 181:17 | devil 46:18 | difficult | 107:22 | 236:21 | 257:22 | 133:8,16,23 | donors 153:7 |
| DEREK 1:11 | devoted | 84:14 | discounted | 245:21 | 266:9 | 134:2,6,12 | double 69:8 |
| deserve 40:5 | 185:15 | 226:10 | 189:14 | dive 124:7 | dollar 14:23 | 134:18 | 166:16 |
| designation | DHS 119:4 | 241:11 | discovered | diverse | 15:12 18:20 | 135:11,18 | 206:25 |
| 262:13 | dialogue | 249:9 259:6 | 189:20 | 143:15 | 41:9 69:7 | 136:14 | downgrade |
| 265:2 | 128:8 | DiFusco | discussed | 144:5 | 69:11 | 137:17,18 | 17:2 114:12 |
| desk 122:17 | difference | 140:21 | 156:12 | 164:16 | 122:16 | 138:15 | 114:13,17 |
| destabilize | 34:12,18 | 156:19,22 | 163:16 | 167:19 | 156:9 | 139:2,7,19 | 115:7 |
| 250:6 | 35:20,25 | 156:22 | discussion | 168:24 | dollars 8:2 | 139:22 | downgraded |
| detail 13:14 | 97:25 | 157:6,10,14 | 62:19 63:6 | 173:19 | 24:11,16 | 154:3,4,9 | 39:9 114:18 |
| 13:14,20,23 | 203:16 | 157:20,25 | 74:18 | 174:21 | 30:15,19 | 154:15,20 | 115:2 |
| 46:5 63:20 | 240:6,10 | 170:10,11 | 152:12 | diversity | 114:24 | 154:24 | downturn |
| 85:17,20 | 258:24 | 170:20 | 188:23 | 114:6 126:6 | 120:21 | 155:7,16,19 | 227:12 |
| 86:3,8 | different | dig 233:16 | 267:3,6 | 143:24 | 121:6 | 155:22 | downward |
| 126:15 | 33:25 43:13 | dilemma | discussions | 144:13,18 | 164:15 | 156:6,13,20 | 112:2 197:2 |
| detailed 31:5 | 54:4,15 | 262:2 | 51:13 | divest 142:18 | 203:8 | 157:4,8,12 | Draft 64:11 |
| 47:7 | 55:9,10,11 | diligence | 255:25 | divided | 233:16 | 157:18,23 | 64:17 |
| details 45:22 | 55:16,16 | 150:23 | disparity | 178:21 | 235:13 | 158:2 159:7 | drag 158:9 |
| 46:15,19 | 56:2 78:5 | direct 5:4,6 | 237:10 | 227:7 | 248:8 | 159:23 | dramatic |
| 87:7 115:8 | 78:24 82:23 | 64:6 109:12 | displace | dividing | 252:21 | 160:5,9,17 | 142:23 |
| 218:20 | 96:24 | 109:17,21 | 267:15 | 176:3 | Domb 1:11 | 160:25 | dramatically |
| determinati... | 102:16 | 118:2 | displacing | divisions 4:17 | 7:12 12:24 | 161:12,24 | 83:9 135:14 |
| 25:16 | 126:2 | 152:15,25 | 267:16 | dog 57:23 | 12:25 13:5 | 162:8 175:7 | 135:14 |
| determine | 127:15 | 275:23 | disproporti... | doing 12:17 | 13:11 14:3 | 175:8,16,22 | 234:15 |
| 143:14 | 131:5,20 | direction | 249:15 | 18:19 28:7 | 14:8,11,19 | 176:2,16 | 270:10 |
| 212:15 | 132:21 | 27:10 45:13 | 264:7,18 | 33:10 38:19 | 15:9,25 | 177:21 | 271:12 |
| determined | 138:6 | 149:3 | dispute | 38:21,22 | 16:8,22 | 178:13 | drastic 163:7 |
| 81:15 | 153:12 | 240:21 | 260:12 | 40:18 50:7 | 17:10,22 | 179:6,10 | drastically |
| determining | 155:12 | directive | distinguished | 50:9 57:16 | 18:8 20:24 | 180:8,12 | 238:6 |
| 7:18 181:24 | 164:19 | 240:16 | 129:12,15 | 58:22 91:23 | 22:12 46:3 | 191:14 | draw 196:16 |
| develop 62:7 | 176:25 | directly | distressed | 92:7,7 | 68:8,9,17 | 202:4,5,9 | drive 204:24 |
| developed | 178:22 | 151:15 | 142:20 | 93:11 94:12 | 68:24 69:10 | 202:20,24 | 205:3 |
| 215:22 | 189:9 | 253:13 | 158:13 | 124:13,16 | 69:16 70:2 | 203:3,15 | driven 106:19 |
| developer | 196:10 | director 4:14 | distributed | 124:20 | 70:9,15 | 204:14,25 | driver 14:18 |
| 148:17 | 210:8,12 | 4:16,18 | 109:9 | 127:18 | 71:6,16,25 | 205:17 | 81:21 |
| 243:14 | 212:11 | 18:15 28:20 | distribution | 137:3 | 72:14 73:9 | 206:3,10,14 | drivers 81:23 |
| 272:23 | 215:12,18 | 53:23 90:19 | 80:19 82:19 | 158:18 | 73:15,20 | 206:21 | 82:9 |
| developers | 217:25,25 | 106:9 | 83:18 | 182:2 | 74:6,10,19 | 208:6 | driving |
| 244:8 265:9 | 218:2 | 120:17 | distributor | 201:15 | 75:8 76:6 | 209:13 | 147:25 |
| developing | 234:15 | 127:19 | 269:14 | 205:8,9 | 76:10 77:2 | 247:14,15 | DROP 147:2 |
| 71:2 | 235:7 238:6 | 140:18,20 | district 11:20 | 209:21 | 85:19 86:17 | 247:23 | drops 12:6 |
| development | 240:20 | 169:16 | 77:20,24 | 213:21 | 86:18 87:19 | 248:20 | Dubow 4:3,5 |
| 43:22,24 | 241:5 242:2 | 173:4,16 | 78:12 79:6 | 222:19 | 87:22 88:10 | 250:20,23 | 4:11,13 |
| 65:12 | 255:12,24 | 181:19 | 79:16 80:5 | 225:14 | 88:18,24 | 251:7,17 | 5:15 6:7 |
| 242:11 | 258:17 | disability | 80:20 81:13 | 228:7 229:4 | 96:4,5 | 252:13 | 8:18 9:3 |
| 243:6 | 263:16 | 169:24 | 82:2 83:8 | 229:20 | 97:11,18 | 253:6 254:2 | 10:7,17 |


| 11:6,23 | 70:8,13,24 | 134:16 | efficiencies | employ | 110:20 | 150:3 | 275:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12:7,12,16 | 71:12,24 | duplicity | 61:16 | 186:16 | 182:16 | 184:13 | exact 24:16 |
| 13:4,9,23 | 72:13,24 | 52:17 | efficient | employee | entails 53:9 | 188:15 | 25:25 |
| 14:7,10,17 | 73:14,19,25 | duration | 28:10 48:22 | 58:5 70:6 | enter 234:7 | 198:7,11 | 118:11 |
| 14:25 15:18 | 74:9,12 | 119:24 | 55:2 95:14 | 95:13 176:7 | 236:18 | 199:12,19 | 195:11 |
| 16:6,17 | 75:7 76:3,8 | durations | 252:9 | employees | entire 182:13 | 224:12,13 | exactly 8:6 |
| 17:6,12 | 76:21 78:20 | 117:13 | efficiently | 33:9 74:4 | 184:12 | 224:16 | 197:12 |
| 18:3 20:25 | 79:10 80:8 | dwellings | 204:10,13 | 96:14,16 | 204:12 | 225:6 | 233:7 |
| 21:5,9 | 80:11,15,22 | 203:4 | 204:20 | 97:2,5,7,10 | 213:25 | 251:14,24 | 234:23 |
| 22:10,23 | 81:6,8,16 | dynamic | effort 98:3 | 99:7,21,22 | 218:12 | estimate | 250:12 |
| 23:14,19 | 82:20 83:25 | 194:23,24 | 108:16 | 106:20 | 226:3 | 53:25 54:9 | exam 192:22 |
| 24:3,22 | 84:6,15,23 |  | 229:10 | 109:12,14 | entities 52:9 | 65:21 252:2 | example 9:3 |
| 25:10,24 | 86:4,11 | E | 260:2 | 109:15,20 | 152:9 | estimated | 19:24 94:10 |
| 26:11 27:2 | 87:9,21 | earlier 13:22 | efforts 184:9 | 109:23 | 251:10 | 106:18 | 97:3,15 |
| 27:25 29:8 | 88:5,16,22 | 47:24 84:25 | 244:9 | 145:18,25 | entitled | 111:10 | 113:21 |
| 29:16,22 | 89:12,18,24 | 85:21 | eight 37:16 | 146:4,12,19 | 227:11 | 141:8 186:4 | 119:3 149:8 |
| 30:8,17,24 | 90:4,18 | 124:23 | 83:6 173:9 | 162:12,19 | entity 82:12 | estimates | 173:24 |
| 31:19 32:5 | 94:19 95:2 | 126:11 | 173:10 | 203:24 | 217:17 | 114:21 | 177:10 |
| 32:10,13,22 | 95:10,16,22 | 231:4 | 175:23 | empty 266:13 | entry-level | estimation | 215:20 |
| 33:21 34:4 | 96:21 97:14 | early 121:13 | either 40:3 | encourage | 193:11 | 250:6 | 224:7,7 |
| 34:13,17 | 97:20 98:7 | earn 119:7 | 64:21 71:24 | 262:6 | equal 34:20 | et 75:19 | 234:9 243:3 |
| 35:3,6,21 | 98:12,21,23 | earning 120:5 | 109:17,21 | 263:19 | 145:3 169:3 | 168:13,14 | 252:19 |
| 36:4,7,18 | 99:9,14 | 121:11 | 191:17 | encouraged | equals $78: 18$ | 168:14 | 268:12 |
| 37:8,11,17 | 100:2,11 | earnings | 268:14 | 145:24 | equation | 170:15 | 269:12 |
| 37:21,25 | 101:3,7,10 | 122:19 | 272:5 | ended 9:17 | 263:9 | ethic 168:13 | examples |
| 38:9,20 | 102:2,10,13 | 145:19 | El 262:4,9 | 101:4 | equipment | evaluation | 174:7 |
| 39:13 41:5 | 102:25 | ears 247:20 | 264:8 | 111:24 | 243:25 | 183:19 | exceeded |
| 41:10,21 | 103:6,10,13 | easier 55:2 | elaborate | 177:11 | equitable | evaluations | 146:7 |
| 42:2,20 | 104:2 | 86:20 | 118:7 | endowment | 186:14 | 264:6 | Excel 53:17 |
| 43:18,21 | 105:15 | 258:15 | 272:19 | 177:16,17 | equity $33: 4$ | evaluator | 118:21 |
| 44:4,12,17 | 127:19 | 259:10 | elected 124:3 | 177:18,20 | 38:5 137:5 | 193:11 | exception |
| 44:21,24 | 140:25 | East 241:20 | 124:6 | endowments | 145:7 151:7 | evened 217:2 | 168:5 |
| 45:23 46:5 | 155:11 | 243:7 | 144:16 | 178:10 | 151:8,8 | 217:5 | excited 10:22 |
| 46:24 47:3 | 194:8 | eaten 80:7 | 152:12 | engage 185:3 | 250:15 | event 64:13 | 92:6 |
| 48:9 49:9 | 198:18,23 | 82:11 | election 61:9 | engaged | Erin 172:4 | events 63:22 | excluding |
| 50:4,15,19 | 199:2,5,9 | eats 81:24 | 112:11 | 149:7,18 | especially | 63:24 64:2 | 135:2 147:2 |
| 50:24 51:5 | 199:15 | echo 161:23 | electronic | enhance | 14:20 40:11 | 64:9,10 | executive |
| 51:12 53:4 | 231:7,18 | echoing 47:6 | 59:16 | 112:4 152:2 | 45:9 74:23 | eventually | 33:23 36:13 |
| 53:19 56:5 | 232:4,8 | economic | 109:25 | 184:20 | 125:22 | 56:10 57:17 | 36:24 37:7 |
| 56:11,21 | 254:15 | 242:11 | eleventh | enhanced | 208:17 | 57:19 59:2 | 90:19 106:9 |
| 57:3,14,25 | due 36:15,16 | economically | 47:20 | 270:6,19 | 244:19 | everybody | 140:18,23 |
| 58:8,11,21 | 36:16 | 70:4 | eligible 146:5 | enhancing | establish | 16:2 34:14 | 141:19 |
| 60:21 61:7 | 150:23 | economist | 245:4 246:5 | 6:5 | 265:13 | 71:9 187:3 | 168:9,15,23 |
| 61:25 62:16 | 183:17 | 75:25 | elimination | enjoin 219:22 | established | 218:13 | 171:16 |
| 62:21 63:13 | 186:5 | eds 75:18 | 185:17 | enjoy 68:23 | 78:9 80:3 | 227:23 | 175:22 |
| 63:19 64:4 | dump 118:21 | 76:18 | embracing | enroll 109:11 | 80:21 | 235:23 | executives |
| 64:8,18,22 | Dunbar | educated | 98:6 | ensure 60:18 | establishme... | 237:14 | 36:11 |
| 65:2,16,19 | 106:8 | 139:14 | emerging | 108:2 | 208:22 | $239: 7$ | exempt 33:12 |
| 66:3,7,16 | 119:11,14 | education | 144:5 | 110:15 | establishme... | 249:18 | 35:6 37:20 |
| 66:20 67:6 | 119:15 | 146:10 | 166:23 | 185:20 | 183:2 | 258:2 | 106:20 |
| 67:16,24 | 120:9 122:2 | effect 244:11 | 167:12 | 186:13 | estate 75:12 | everybody's | 109:15 |
| 68:4,15,22 | 126:10 | effective | emphasis | 258:5 | 75:14 | 220:8 | 185:9 |
| 69:9,13,22 | 127:8 | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 14 \\ & 184: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 115:4 | ensuring | 148:21,22 | evidence | exemption |


| 244:24 | 20:10,11 | 115:18 | feel 31:12 | 90:5 | 56:17 | 133:20 | 73:5,8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| exempts | experts | factors 5:22 | 61:12 82:15 | final 11:5 | finishing | 134:7,8,19 | 262:13 |
| 33:22 34:17 | 183:20 | 260:25 | 176:5 | 87:7 183:24 | 213:23 | 135:7,25 | flies 117:22 |
| 35:3,25 | expire 242:17 | factual 264:2 | fees 48:19 | 200:7 | fire 99:6,20 | 136:3 | floor 168:8 |
| exist 30:23 | explain 16:23 | fail $59: 4,19$ | 110:19,22 | 268:11 | 99:22 | 142:13,13 | 213:21 |
| 167:21 | 34:12 78:15 | fails 59:9 | 110:23 | finalized | 242:13 | 142:18 | 243:18 |
| existing | 80:5 85:24 | failure 59:14 | 142:15,24 | 11:10 | 243:24,25 | 146:20 | 262:19,22 |
| 132:23 | 133:20 | fair 137:7 | 145:11 | finalizing | 260:22 | 155:8 | 265:22,24 |
| 138:22 | 138:9 247:6 | 139:18 | 147:21 | 254:17 | firefighter | 177:10 | floors 265:24 |
| 185:18 | 249:11 | 182:3 | 158:18 | finally 185:11 | 97:23 | 178:3,10,11 | flow 121:21 |
| 188:12 | explained | 184:25 | 164:12,13 | 210:23 | Firefighters | 181:21 | 122:2,4 |
| exists 100:13 | 234:22 | 186:14 | 232:7 | Finance 3:22 | 146:16 | 183:14 | flows 120:24 |
| expand 16:10 | explaining | 189:25 | Fegan 155:5 | 4:14,16,18 | fires 100:25 | 184:9 185:2 | FLR 219:11 |
| 16:20 | 108:24 | 200:9 | 171:16 | 5:5 28:22 | firm 19:5 | 185:24 | FLRs 219:2,7 |
| expanded | explanation | Fairmount | fell 264:6 | 51:4,19 | 70:20 71:7 | 186:3,12 | fluctuates |
| 108:13 | 78:24 | 97:9 | felt 187:22 | 53:12,13,23 | 206:12 | 194:18 | 120:13 |
| expanding | extensive | fairness | FEMA 99:6 | 59:22 91:3 | 207:9 | 195:20 | fluctuating |
| 72:8 | 183:18 | 182:8 | female 35:17 | 103:5 | firms 19:17 | 255:2 | 83:8 |
| expect 32:3 | 185:19 | fall 28:4 | 35:18 36:10 | 104:12 | 123:19 | Fishtown | focus 39:20 |
| 211:14 | extent 121:15 | 29:15 92:22 | 36:13 | 120:17 | 126:6 | 233:24 | 109:23 |
| 214:3 | 168:14 | falls 27:19 | 141:17,20 | 127:19 | 143:20 | 235:21 | focused |
| 222:22 | external | 241:20 | 163:4 | 129:10 | 252:15 | 236:11 | 182:14 |
| 226:6 | 238:13 | 243:7 | Fenerty's | 173:4 | first 3:25 4:15 | 240:8 | folk 243:9 |
| 230:15 | extra 18:4 | Fame 144:16 | 77:21 | 222:13 | 17:6 21:9 | 264:10 | folks 42:9,14 |
| 253:12 | 69:6,10 | familiar | fewer 97:9 | finances | 28:16 44:15 | fit 150:25 | 163:16 |
| expected | 175:13 | 214:22 | field 192:24 | 106:25 | 49:25 53:23 | five $2: 2111: 2$ | 167:2,4 |
| 101:23 | 207:19 | family 173:25 | fight 191:7,8 | financial 2:21 | 59:12,20 | 45:15,20 | 168:11 |
| 161:25 | eye 163:2 | FAMIS 55:21 | figure 55:5 | 8:22 9:8,9 | 63:12 68:11 | 46:21 75:7 | 174:14 |
| 230:23 |  | 56:9,11,15 | 88:10 | 10:9 56:12 | 78:11 90:7 | 89:16 99:12 | 192:21 |
| expecting | F | 57:17,18 | 104:24 | 57:10 70:3 | 90:17 94:19 | 127:22 | 193:7 |
| 47:18 | FA 123:20 | 58:24 | 105:2,9 | 72:19,25 | 94:22 102:4 | 131:4 | 227:11 |
| expects | face 11:13 | far 25:17 | 120:18 | 82:4 130:10 | 102:13 | 133:17 | 235:11,15 |
| 183:13 | 23:23 | 111:25 | 187:4 | 145:15 | 121:19 | 156:15 | 244:18 |
| expedited | 193:16 | 118:9 | 210:13 | 166:24 | 129:7 150:7 | 177:5 | 245:2 249:4 |
| 255:20 | 213:14 | 143:25 | 257:19 | financially | 199:7 225:8 | 178:20,22 | 249:11 |
| expenditures | faced 6:15 | 148:11 | 262:12 | 8:16 | 225:22 | 230:24 | 262:14 |
| 7:9 81:19 | 234:18 | 163:19 | 264:22 | financings | 230:10 | 271:10 | 266:22 |
| 81:22 88:17 | facilitate | 218:22 | figures 120:7 | 132:9 | 236:21 | five-year | 267:2,7,7 |
| 122:5 | 58:15 | 251:13 | figuring | find 36:15 | 240:15 | 46:17 | follow 22:10 |
| 135:24 | facilities | fare 215:3 | 265:19,25 | 42:2 167:19 | 262:19,22 | 157:14 | 40:2 69:2 |
| 251:20 | 214:20 | father 172:20 | file 183:12 | 209:24 | 265:22 | fix 74:24 | 84:23 |
| expenses | fact 27:18 | feature 38:5 | 217:20 | 233:17 | first-level | 176:21 | 202:10 |
| 61:23 80:15 | 166:5 | February | 218:8 | finding | 218:25 | 224:22 | 207:6 |
| 82:9 | 167:11 | 111:6 120:9 | 219:11 | 192:16 | 234:24 | 266:22 | 238:21 |
| expensive | 168:24 | 141:25 | 234:24 | 237:8 | fiscal 2:11,14 | fixed 6:13 7:8 | follow-up |
| 70:5 | 195:14 | 144:14 | 235:16 | fine 77:2 | 2:16,22,25 | 83:15 | 43:15 98:22 |
| experience | 197:8 | 146:6 | filed 196:21 | 89:22 99:19 | 3:17,19,20 | 224:22 | 99:5 |
| 108:10 | 201:13 | 156:25 | 225:25 | 105:21 | 7:23 8:7 | fixing 224:25 | following |
| 123:14,21 | 213:22 | 157:2,7,7 | filing 218:19 | 137:4 | 10:19 14:12 | 262:19 | 8:17 61:18 |
| 149:24 | 224:14 | federal 11:14 | 219:6,14 | finish 12:16 | 106:13,15 | flat 141:23 | 142:17 |
| 164:4,8 | 225:3 | 23:21 87:25 | fill 61:2 $62: 23$ | 23:20 57:2 | 106:17 | fleeing | 229:17,22 |
| 165:3 | 250:10 | 153:11 | filled $62: 25$ | 214:4 | 111:6,13 | 234:18 | 230:9 |
| expertise | $\begin{gathered} 261: 23 \\ \text { factor } 7: 19 \end{gathered}$ | fee 142:21 | filling 89:25 | finished | 112:6 | flexibility | footprint |
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| forces 182:18 | 170:18,20 | fully 21:14 | 41:18 43:10 | 110:2 125:5 | 265:9 267:7 | 136:25 | 225:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| foregoing | 207:21 | 33:14 77:25 | 43:17 60:19 | 187:10 | 272:19 | 137:9 149:2 | 270:21 |
| 275:7,20 | 226:17,20 | 82:6 126:7 | 60:22 61:22 | FY19 90:12 | gigantic | 156:4,5 | going 6:25 |
| forget 19:25 | 228:6 | 155:25 | 74:11 78:9 | 93:23 | 226:15 | 164:16 | 9:4 11:22 |
| 46:2 | 268:18 | 225:15 | 80:2 89:15 | FY21 28:16 | Girard 243:5 | 174:10,11 | 14:21 16:14 |
| form 133:6 | four-story | 275:5 | 90:7,16 | 31:9,18 | 267:12 | 174:22 | 17:13 18:9 |
| 222:6 | 259:14 | function | 99:15 100:9 | 102:5,15 | give 19:24 | 180:6 | 18:22 23:7 |
| formal | four-year | 58:25 | 141:11,22 |  | 21:17 27:13 | 190:19 | 24:10,18 |
| 183:12 | 31:10 | functions | 142:6,7 | G | 50:2 58:23 | 194:23 | 25:3 27:18 |
| 195:9 219:5 | Francis | 97:3,8 | 159:17,19 | game 6:5 | 70:11 76:22 | 199:16 | 31:14 36:5 |
| 253:13 | 140:17 | fund 3:23 | funds 48:6,7 | 63:23 | 126:4 133:5 | 207:6,16 | 36:25 42:12 |
| former 58:5 | Frankford | 6:13,16,19 | 48:10,12,17 | gap 163:4 | 159:24 | 208:10,17 | 43:11 45:21 |
| formula 78:9 | 264:9 | 7:5 12:3,15 | 49:7,11,13 | gaps 163:3 | 179:21 | 209:5 | 46:9 54:17 |
| 79:18 80:2 | 265:18 | 14:5 42:21 | 49:16,23 | Gas 107:13 | 215:20 | 222:22 | 55:25 57:19 |
| 82:15,19 | Franklin | 42:25 48:8 | 50:3,11 | Gayle 38:3 | 219:2 234:9 | 223:2,15 | 58:15,25 |
| forth $28: 11$ | 165:5 | 65:12 66:21 | 80:6 84:12 | general 13:12 | 242:8 | 237:25 | 59:4 60:3 |
| 73:16 | frankly | 72:7,9,10 | 119:20 | 14:5 15:22 | 243:12 | 243:16,21 | 60:12,18 |
| 148:25 | 162:17 | 72:25 73:7 | 120:5 | 32:25 49:11 | 246:8 248:2 | 246:13 | 61:23 62:19 |
| 229:2 | freight | 73:23 79:17 | 142:19 | 62:2 79:17 | 262:25 | 253:9 | 63:11 64:16 |
| 262:16 | 249:19 | 106:10,12 | 148:6 150:4 | 82:6 106:16 | 263:5 | 262:15 | 65:4 66:5 |
| Forty-five | frequently | 106:16 | 158:12 | 107:13 | 269:11 | 263:2 | 67:3,4 69:2 |
| 73:15 | 226:4 | 109:3 | 176:18 | 133:19 | given 24:13 | 268:14 | 69:14 70:11 |
| forward | Friday 46:11 | 110:24 | 178:21,22 | 135:24 | 72:20 120:7 | 273:10 | 72:3 74:19 |
| 16:14 24:18 | fringe 13:12 | 111:14 | 179:2,5,25 | 145:6 | 148:22 | goal 7:5 | 75:9 79:5 |
| 36:6,25 | 14:14,22 | 126:22,25 | 180:4 | 155:13 | 201:18 | 76:20 98:5 | 82:12 83:5 |
| 39:23 42:7 | 15:13 69:11 | 129:25 | further | 167:20 | gives 257:18 | 98:6 108:7 | 83:23 84:7 |
| 42:18 74:7 | 141:13 | 130:18 | 100:17 | 185:25 | giving 47:16 | 111:22 | 87:23 90:10 |
| 94:14 | 154:18,21 | 133:19 | 139:11 | 215:24 | 58:19 61:19 | 113:8 | 97:16,21,25 |
| 112:18 | 154:25 | 134:5 | future 13:16 | 268:7 | 65:5 88:20 | 144:22 | 99:3 100:8 |
| 126:13,16 | 155:13 | 135:24 | 39:24 132:9 | generally | 88:21 248:3 | 147:23 | 116:11,13 |
| 128:14 | 156:3 | 146:21 | 135:4 | 118:24 | 265:11 | 148:3,12 | 120:18 |
| 148:5 | front 123:13 | 148:20 | 142:11 | generate | glad 147:5 | 163:21 | 124:13 |
| 165:11 | 220:12 | 149:2,6,11 | 213:18 | 77:15 | 155:22 | 166:7,9,13 | 125:12,16 |
| 208:4,24 | 256:12 | 155:13 | 218:18 | generated | 167:7 229:2 | 182:4,16 | 126:16 |
| 211:3 | 259:22 | 156:23 | 219:24 | 223:7 | go 10:3 20:10 | 184:5,14,22 | 135:14 |
| 213:16 | 267:12 | 159:9 | 221:3 | generational | 29:25 31:11 | 186:14 | 137:23 |
| 218:10 | fuel 121:19 | 164:12,14 | 263:22 | 245:22 | 35:15 39:21 | 205:7 255:5 | 138:16,18 |
| 223:15,16 | full 13:14 | 167:5 | 272:22 | generically | 48:17 50:13 | 255:6,6,8 | 139:4,10 |
| 229:16 | 21:15 24:20 | 169:16 | FY 56:14 | 160:15 | 54:2 56:3 | 258:13 | 147:16,19 |
| 252:11 | 28:7 82:6 | 170:12 | 109:6 | Germantown | 77:19,24 | goals 90:9 | 148:5 |
| 257:12 | 93:19 167:6 | 176:19 | 111:10 | 265:18 | 78:10 79:12 | 108:8 128:6 | 149:12,14 |
| 266:4 | 185:21 | 177:14,15 | 112:6 | getting 9:18 | 79:13 80:16 | 163:14,15 | 150:19 |
| forward-loo... | 193:18 | 185:25 | FY14 143:2 | 9:18 45:8 | 81:12 82:2 | God 20:7 | 152:6 |
| 3:18 | 222:17,21 | fund's 142:9 | FY16 89:20 | 64:11 75:18 | 83:21,23 | goes 17:18 | 154:17 |
| found 10:23 | 249:18 | 142:12,16 | 143:3 144:3 | 83:2,4 | 84:8 87:4 | 70:16 78:12 | 155:4 |
| 167:8 | 255:4,13 | 143:9,16,22 | FY17 31:8 | 85:20 88:25 | 91:18 93:24 | 80:23 81:13 | 159:18 |
| 236:20 | 257:22,24 | 144:3 | 107:5 125:4 | 139:2 | 94:13 | 127:13 | 160:6 161:3 |
| 250:15 | full-time 33:9 | fundament... | 141:8 | 151:21 | 103:13 | 134:9 | 161:4 162:5 |
| founding | 34:9 35:17 | 250:16 | 147:12 | 158:24 | 112:19 | 157:16 | 162:9 |
| 40:6 | 145:15 | funded 73:12 | FY18 4:24 | 163:24 | 131:9,10 | 176:9 | 165:11 |
| four 37:10,18 | 153:16 | 73:17 86:9 | 50:18 107:6 | 200:11 | 132:25 | 203:16 | 181:7 |
| 51:17 73:21 | 175:12,18 | 86:9 | 107:11 | 201:8 227:3 | 134:20 | 222:21 | 190:14,24 |
| 93:23 94:8 | fullest 31:11 | funding | 109:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 228: 15,19 \\ & 248: 24 \end{aligned}$ | 135:2 | 224:10 | 191:13,15 |
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| 191:19,21 | 266:4,22,24 | 221:11,11 | 168:16 | grows 81:8 | 269:12 | 219:21 | 128:3,8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 191:22,23 | 266:25 | 221:13 | 248:17 | growth 63:9 | halfway | harp 70:4 | 176:21 |
| 192:3,5 | 267:10,14 | 224:25 | 257:3 | guarantee | 195:9 | Harrisburg | 179:8 |
| 195:22 | 269:16,22 | 232:19 | great-gran... | 257:25 | Hall 1:6 | 22:19 24:21 | 246:15 |
| 196:5 | 271:2,23 | 239:6 | 245:24 | guard 97:15 | 64:17 | Harvard | 255:19 |
| 202:15,16 | 273:5,9,10 | 240:24 | greater 25:17 | guess 7:18 | 144:16 | 177:20 | 260:24 |
| 202:17,22 | 273:12 | 245:12 | 143:21 | 10:10 23:10 | hamper | hate 52:16 | 261:20 |
| 204:16 | good 2:2 4:8 | 254:21 | 146:23 | 28:15 39:19 | 33:15 | head 45:13 | helped |
| 205:2 208:3 | 4:10,11 | 266:5 | 159:5 178:6 | 45:6 68:12 | hand 88:6 | 87:2 197:17 | 193:12 |
| 208:13,23 | 5:17 7:22 | goofy 148:16 | 252:20 | 75:17 88:13 | 97:7 120:8 | heads 5:18 | helpful 36:3 |
| 208:25 | 13:3,4 | gotten 100:11 | Green 1:11 | 93:3,23 | 120:10 | 60:8 | 46:23 86:25 |
| 211:3 | 18:20 19:8 | 120:20 | 22:7,8 23:3 | 99:24 | 197:6 265:8 | health 5:4 | 87:17 |
| 213:16 | 26:25 27:2 | 197:12 | 23:17,25 | 129:19 | 265:12 | 15:21 | 125:21 |
| 214:17 | 27:7 31:22 | governing | 24:7,25 | 131:5,7 | handle 117:2 | hear 3:21 | 128:13 |
| 217:9 | 32:21,22 | 152:8 | 25:21 26:7 | 156:6 215:5 | 117:9 | 52:11,21 | 139:3 |
| 218:13 | 38:20,23 | government | 26:17 84:20 | 241:24 | 169:22 | 53:10 | 159:24 |
| 220:8,13,14 | 44:11,12 | 9:20 33:17 | 84:21 86:7 | 245:21 | 237:13 | 121:16 | 178:14 |
| 220:17 | 49:5 52:11 | 36:11 37:23 | 86:13 123:4 | 251:21 | handled | 155:23 | 205:18 |
| 222:5 | 53:2,3,4 | 38:8 87:25 | 123:5 | 258:17 | 97:12 | 213:9 | 208:3,23 |
| 226:19 | 71:14 72:19 | 96:20 | 124:22 | 259:19,21 | handles | heard 78:25 | 253:18 |
| 227:9 | 72:25 98:9 | 129:10 | 125:20 | guidance | 115:11 | 84:24 167:3 | helping |
| 228:16,24 | 103:18,20 | 151:25 | 126:18 | 237:12 | 171:10 | 227:14,15 | 231:21 |
| 228:25 | 105:21 | 153:12 | Greenlee 1:12 | guilty 38:8 | handling | 247:19 | 245:17 |
| 229:10 | 106:3,4 | 168:9 | 202:2,6 | gun 40:15 | 51:15 104:4 | hearing 2:3 | helps 47:25 |
| 230:11,11 | 115:21 | grade 17:25 | 209:16 | guy 173:14 | 171:9 | 3:14 8:4 | 95:9 |
| 230:13 | 116:7 | gradually | 217:11 | 174:11 | happen 16:20 | 11:13 43:14 | hemisphere |
| 231:6,16,25 | 121:22 | 148:4,14 | 221:6 222:9 | guys 8:17 | 17:15 30:21 | 95:6 213:2 | 241:10 |
| 232:6,14,16 | 123:7 126:3 | graduate | 232:11,15 | 120:15 | 62:2 105:9 | 220:7 223:5 | Henon 1:13 |
| 234:16,19 | 128:17 | 173:14 | 240:2,23 | 129:14 | 105:11,12 | 244:4,16 | 44:8,9,13 |
| 235:18,22 | 129:4,5 | graduated | 247:12 | 162:5 | 201:22 | hearings | 44:19,22 |
| 237:13,14 | 136:24 | 173:7 | Greg 104:14 | 208:11 | 219:17 | 13:17 181:3 | 45:2,25 |
| 238:7,9,23 | 140:10,12 | grandfathe... | 104:23 | 223:16 | 236:4 256:8 | 183:17 | 46:7,25 |
| 238:24 | 140:15 | 246:8 | grocery 183:3 | 257:8 | 256:9 273:5 | 197:19 | 47:5 48:2,4 |
| 239:3,5,6 | 148:23 | grandma's | ground | Gym 1:12 | happened | 209:23 | 49:3,24 |
| 239:10 | 150:25 | 246:15 | 213:21 | 26:22,23 | 112:11 | heart 51:19 | 50:12,17,21 |
| 241:21 | 154:6,7 | grandson | 272:23 | 27:3 29:5 | 227:25 | heavily 48:10 | 51:2,6 |
| 242:7 243:2 | 155:19,23 | 246:4 | group 166:25 | 29:14,18 | 249:5 | heck 75:10 | 52:10 85:20 |
| 243:10,16 | 156:19 | grant 99:6,9 | 173:20 | 30:3,13,18 | happening | hedge 142:19 | 89:8,9,13 |
| 244:6,8,21 | 157:13 | 99:16 100:6 | 214:8 266:2 | 31:7,24 | 74:14,15 | 158:12 | 89:19 90:2 |
| 245:14,20 | 161:17,18 | 100:13,14 | groups | 32:8,11,14 | 148:22 | hefty 235:13 | 90:6,24 |
| 247:8,17 | 167:19 | 104:5 | 219:25 | 77:8,9 79:7 | 241:17 | HELEN 1:12 | 91:24 92:16 |
| 252:11,18 | 172:13 | granted | 220:14,15 | 79:22 80:9 | 254:8 | Heller 104:15 | 92:25 93:21 |
| 253:9,15,17 | 173:3,24 | 193:5 | 220:15 | 80:12,18 | happens | 104:23 | 94:3,15,21 |
| 254:9,17 | 174:7,16 | grants 66:21 | 247:6 | 81:4,7,14 | 197:7 227:6 | Hello 169:20 | 95:3,12,17 |
| 255:12,18 | 181:12,13 | 66:22 | 262:24 | 82:3,24 | 227:20 | help 4:19 | 95:23 98:18 |
| 256:6,8 | 187:6 | 100:10 | grow 27:9 | 84:4,13,16 | happy 5:9 | 11:17 58:5 | 98:19 99:2 |
| 257:14,25 | 194:15 | Gray 170:25 | 42:21 43:3 | 101:18,19 | 111:15 | 68:19 71:2 | 99:10,18 |
| 258:4,8,9 | 197:7 | great 27:10 | 168:8 174:5 | 102:7,11,18 | 166:8 | 71:7,14 | 100:8,16 |
| 258:23 | 199:13,14 | 40:7 51:2 | 174:20 |  | 186:21 | 76:16 80:4 | 209:18,19 |
| 259:6,7,25 | 199:17 | 68:20 71:21 | growing 5:25 | H | Harbor 165:4 | 86:21 97:16 | 211:17 |
| 260:3 | 202:7 | 75:19 95:25 | 42:25 43:6 | half 73:11 | hard 47:17 | 97:21 | 212:2 213:6 |
| 262:14 | 211:14 | 120:2 | 81:11 | 78:2 79:5 | 188:7 264:7 | 100:14 | 213:11,17 |
| 265:20 | 220:21,25 | 130:13 | grown 81:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 158: 19 \\ & 222: 2 \end{aligned}$ | harming | 112:18 | 214:5,16,24 |


| 215:14 | 206:12 | 224:21 | identified | 195:16,19 | include 16:5 | 202:18,25 | 23:7 155:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 216:9,16,22 | 207:16 | 261:5 | 125:10,23 | 195:20 | 16:14 52:2 | 203:7 | 234:25 |
| 217:4,7,13 | hired 19:4 | hopes 115:13 | 212:5 | 198:2 240:4 | 63:22 107:6 | 207:11 | indicative |
| 218:9 | 71:13 99:21 | 185:11 | identify | 248:25 | 107:12 | 216:24 | 224:15 |
| 219:23 | 173:22 | hoping 26:13 | 222:10 | impressed | 176:8 | 259:4 | indicator |
| 220:6,23 | hires 36:23 | 46:12 | 238:3 | 136:20 | 184:11 | increased | 27:7 |
| 221:5 | 173:19 | hospitals | ignored | improve | included | 30:25 49:4 | individual |
| hey 207:16 | hiring 51:16 | 185:6 | 227:10 | 27:23 91:10 | 41:22 52:14 | 85:6 211:20 | 138:8 |
| 243:11 | 51:17 69:20 | 251:11 | illiquid | 93:17,18 | 56:18 | 219:16 | 150:16 |
| hi $44: 14$ | 70:20 100:3 | hotels 182:23 | 142:19 | 130:23 | 127:12 | 228:10 | 152:21 |
| 53:22 90:25 | 100:4 207:2 | 202:20 | imagine 45:8 | 182:5 | 135:4 | 270:2 | 217:20 |
| 202:8 | 207:9 | hour 47:20 | 47:3 | improved | includes | 273:13 | 218:6 223:7 |
| 222:11 | Hispanic | hours 69:25 | immediate | 108:10 | 14:12 34:14 | increases 5:3 | individually |
| 241:12 | 141:19 | 185:15 | 184:14 | 113:13 | 52:5 143:24 | 77:18 79:11 | 217:24 |
| high 6:13 | historical | house 234:13 | immediately | 210:2 | 154:25 | 134:21 | individuals |
| 18:4 65:23 | 264:2 | 243:13 | 268:16 | improvement | including | 154:16 | 9:23 |
| 112:21,22 | historically | 245:13,24 | impact 8:22 | 142:9 | 25:18 35:22 | 183:8,10 | industrial |
| 142:21 | 113:23 | 249:12,13 | 9:9,9 10:10 | 183:25 | 145:15 | 190:9 | 182:15 |
| 144:4 173:8 | 116:16 | 259:9 | 16:10 23:20 | 210:15 | 147:12 | 268:16 | 184:13 |
| 182:22 | 192:20 | 260:16,21 | 24:21 | 212:19 | 158:23 | increasing | 186:9 |
| 183:11 | history 5:13 | houses | 114:14 | 215:24 | 182:23 | 49:4 73:7 | 199:24 |
| 188:11 | 65:23 67:7 | 235:12,14 | 152:16 | 216:3,4 | inclusive 2:12 | 82:17,20 | 211:2 |
| 200:4 | 162:4 | 239:4,7 | 160:3,6 | 250:15 | 109:14 | 85:25 | industry |
| 210:19 | hit 139:16 | 250:16 | 264:18 | improveme... | 134:24 | 108:17 | 167:20 |
| 216:11 | hitting 31:8 | 258:19 | impacted | 53:11 | 145:2 | 144:23 | 186:16 |
| 236:24 | holding 42:8 | housing 9:19 | 232:23 | 257:17 | income | 184:23 | inefficient |
| 269:25 | holds 110:14 | 42:7,10 | 233:2 234:3 | improves | 145:25 | 188:24 | 52:16 |
| high-end | holistically | 107:15 | impacting | 94:13 | 190:11 | 271:13 | inequities |
| 231:16 | 138:9 | 188:20,25 | 237:2 265:3 | improving | 201:3 | incumbent | 182:19 |
| higher 17:21 | home 259:15 | 189:3 | impacts | 74:15 | inconseque... | 145:12 | inflate 249:4 |
| 31:3 57:5 | homeless 10:4 | 248:11,15 | 249:15 | 142:10 | 258:11 | incurring | 256:5 |
| 136:2 141:8 | homelessness | 250:3 | impeding | in-depth | incorporate | 25:12 | inflated |
| 179:3 196:8 | 6:25 9:4,6 | Howard | 57:15 | 110:18 | 93:24 | 138:18,24 | 249:14 |
| 216:7 | 9:16 | 234:10 | implement | in-house | incorporati... | index 48:5,7 | inflation |
| 231:10,19 | homes 239:9 | HR 62:19, 20 | 28:3 91:18 | 121:7 | 2:24 | 48:10,12,17 | 80:24 82:18 |
| highlights | 258:20,22 | 63:7 | 94:11 108:5 | 146:12 | incorrectly | 50:3 142:15 | inform 108:7 |
| 63:21 | 259:14,16 | huge 74:22 | 252:7 | 222:20 | 237:7 | indexes 49:21 | information |
| 147:11 | 259:18,21 | 76:14 163:4 | implementa... | inability | increase 4:25 | 50:6 | 13:16 22:21 |
| highly 83:11 | homestead | 235:24 | 92:3 107:25 | 36:15 59:16 | 5:3 7:5 14:8 | indexing 49:2 | 22:22 25:2 |
| 110:9 | 244:23 | human 54:5 | 110:5 | inaccurate | 14:13,14,20 | 49:15 143:7 | 34:2 36:12 |
| highs 147:3 | honest 173:2 | 55:22 97:4 | 185:12 | 84:2 210:5 | 23:8 67:5 | indicate | 45:9 47:9 |
| hike 235:24 | 173:3 256:2 | 171:18 | 255:20 | incarcerated | 77:14 78:6 | 227:12 | 47:14 91:11 |
| hinders | 256:11,14 | hurting | implemented | 9:23 | 79:21,24 | 238:19 | 92:12 93:20 |
| 205:14 | honestly | 263:12 | 21:14 28:6 | incentives 8:5 | 85:3,7 | indicated | 118:19 |
| hire 15:24 | 168:23 |  | 30:5 77:25 | 264:17 | 106:17,19 | 270:25 | 124:24 |
| 16:3 19:17 | 201:7 | I | 225:9,15 | incentivize | 108:15 | indicates | 125:3,7,8 |
| 20:15 36:22 | honored | i.e 151:25 | implementi... | 265:2 | 111:8 | 189:11 | 125:18,22 |
| 69:15 71:7 | 144:15 | idea 22:4 | 92:10,15 | incentivizing | 113:17 | 219:15 | 126:14 |
| 71:10,10 | hope 5:17 | 87:14 | importance | 62:14 | 134:10 | 233:14 | 139:8 |
| 99:20 100:5 | 15:3 261:9 | 156:14 | 115:4 | inception | 135:15 | 236:7 | 160:22 |
| 163:5 | hopeful 61:6 | 244:22 | important | 157:16 | 186:2,5 | 271:22 | 178:14 |
| 174:20 | hopefully | 268:25 | 27:6 59:18 | 158:21 | 190:13 | 273:3,4 | 180:7 |
| 176:10 | 122:20 | $\begin{gathered} \text { ideas } 141: 5 \\ 179: 14 \end{gathered}$ | 139:9 145:4 | incline 244:2 | 194:16 | indication | 190:22 |


| 201:4 | integration | 121:10,10 | 260:20 | 54:2,9 | 133:25 | July 141:24 | 52:4 54:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 202:11 | 185:16 | 149:11 | involve | Jim 171:23 | 134:4,11,22 | jump 135:8 | 57:6 58:3 |
| 208:11,16 | intent 226:11 | investing | 185:15 | jive 165:22 | 135:16 | jumps 242:5 | 59:6 65:20 |
| 223:22 | 254:16 | 151:16,18 | 196:5 | job 10:2 | 136:5 | June 177:11 | 67:2,11 |
| 234:23 | interest 17:25 | 153:4 | involved | 18:20 62:6 | 137:10,13 | 178:3 | 73:5 76:22 |
| 238:16 | 108:12 | investment | 28:21 57:6 | 85:13 | 138:3,20 | justified | 82:18 83:15 |
| 239:21 | 111:2 118:4 | 7:20 8:2 | 150:2,8 | 172:13 | 139:4,18,21 | 235:10 | 87:14 94:22 |
| 248:6,23 | 119:6 | 10:13 18:18 | 151:21 | 204:19 | 140:5 239:2 |  | 97:23 100:5 |
| 253:20,24 | 121:12 | 19:9 21:12 | 153:13 | 230:4,6,19 | 249:9 | K | 118:13 |
| informed | 131:7,22 | 48:7 50:23 | 182:20 | 248:18 | join 137:2 | K 1:12 | 124:24 |
| 38:25 | 132:5,14,19 | 52:12 74:14 | 252:23 | 257:9 | Joining 106:7 | Kasanis | 126:21 |
| infrastruct... | 132:22 | 110:14 | involvement | 263:23 | 140:19 | 171:20 | 127:12 |
| 17:20 25:11 | 133:13 | 123:19 | 28:19 29:3 | jobs 16:11 | 181:16 | Keene 240:17 | 130:3 |
| 107:16 | 168:6 | 126:2 | involves 54:3 | 58:20,24 | joking 45:4 | keep 11:11,22 | 132:19 |
| 266:10 | interesting | 140:22 | IRS 108:3 | 85:3,8,25 | Jones 1:14 | 27:7 100:13 | 148:16 |
| initial 31:4 | 87:9,16 | 142:12,23 | issue 7:15 | 97:22 | 100:21,22 | 147:25 | 161:23 |
| 185:12 | 248:4 | 143:3,12,15 | 59:7 69:23 | Joe's 173:14 | 101:5,12 | 152:5 158:4 | 173:25 |
| 194:4 | interfacing | 143:23 | 87:24 107:4 | Johnson 1:13 | 116:20,21 | 163:2 | 177:16 |
| 230:10 | 56:25 | 144:13,18 | 114:15 | 38:16,17,22 | 117:4,14,18 | 166:13 | 209:3 |
| initially 150:5 | Intergover... | 145:21 | 119:25 | 39:18 41:8 | 117:21 | 197:6 | 213:20 |
| 190:16 | 3:3,5 | 148:24 | 128:14 | 41:13,24 | 118:6,10,24 | 199:20 | 233:6 |
| initiative | interim 66:6 | 149:22,25 | 137:5 161:6 | 42:4 43:16 | 119:12 | 262:8 | 234:23 |
| 123:25 | interior | 151:2,20 | 212:10 | 43:19,25 | 120:6,12 | keeping | 235:4,12 |
| initiatives | 260:16 | 152:20 | 214:19 | 47:8,12,13 | 121:14 | 200:6 | 242:24 |
| 85:14 108:9 | internal | 153:21 | 217:25 | 72:4 85:19 | 122:12 | 235:25 | 244:15,24 |
| 128:4 | 118:16,17 | 164:21,25 | 218:11 | 103:20 | 192:3,4,12 | 242:17 | 254:17 |
| 144:25 | 239:8 | 165:4,8,9 | 227:7 | 104:6,13,18 | 192:15 | keeps 81:10 | kinds 119:8 |
| Innovation | internally | 165:15 | 246:23 | 104:21 | 193:17,22 | 147:15 | King 38:4 |
| 110:3 | 51:13 67:13 | 170:11,15 | 247:3 | 105:6,10,18 | 193:25 | 173:2,2 | knew 24:9 |
| input 141:5 | 121:2 125:6 | 172:5,10,15 | issued 107:23 | 105:24 | 194:10,20 | KENYATTA | 96:7 212:9 |
| inside 208:12 | 238:4 | 172:16 | issues 15:8 | 106:4,6 | 195:6,15,18 | 1:13 | 232:15,17 |
| 260:21 | interviewed | 173:16 | 22:16 24:17 | 112:5,22 | 196:3,11,22 | kept 211:7 | know 6:22 |
| inspection | 150:15,21 | 179:23 | 60:12 | 113:2,9,19 | 197:4,14,20 | 258:12 | 7:12,17 |
| 238:14 | introduce | investments | 123:12 | 114:4,7,16 | 197:25 | Kevin 240:16 | 11:7,8,8 |
| instance | 169:11 | 6:17 7:3,15 | 124:8 130:7 | 115:12,17 | 198:5,12,16 | key 74:25,25 | 12:4 15:14 |
| 188:13 | 170:22 | 7:16,17 8:9 | 130:20,21 | 115:23 | 198:20,25 | 110:10 | 18:9 19:12 |
| 205:12 | introduced | 17:20 25:12 | 145:2,4 | 116:5,9,13 | 199:3,6,11 | 230:15 | 20:3 22:14 |
| 210:16 | 115:14 | 42:23,25 | 147:20 | 117:3,8,16 | 199:25 | keys 176:20 | 23:15 24:12 |
| 224:8 | introduces | 48:21 50:3 | 185:16 | 117:20 | 200:13,18 | kick 222:17 | 25:24 30:14 |
| 260:15 | 46:22 | 94:23 117:2 | 237:9 | 118:5,8,12 | 201:6,17,24 | kick-off 28:4 | 35:11 40:10 |
| instances | introduction | 142:22 | issuing 25:4,6 | 120:22 | 240:25 | kids 174:4 | 45:18 46:25 |
| 212:21 | 109:10 | 143:6 149:6 | item 72:15 | 122:4 123:7 | 241:2,12 | killed 266:15 | 48:23 55:12 |
| 253:14,19 | inventory | 149:19 | 85:22 | 124:19 | 245:8 | killing 265:14 | 59:24 60:11 |
| instill 182:7 | 211:2 | 150:6 151:3 |  | 125:19 | 246:11,20 | kind 6:3,15 | 61:23 63:25 |
| institution | invest 6:23 | 151:6 | J | 126:17 | 247:9,21 | 6:187:4 | 64:20,23,25 |
| 115:10 | 8:15 9:8 | 152:25 | jail 10:3 | 127:17 | 248:19 | 21:18,19 | 66:18 71:8 |
| institutional | 121:5 | 153:6,14 | James 171:20 | 128:19 | 250:9,13 | 22:24 25:15 | 73:16 76:4 |
| 182:15 | 148:20 | 266:11 | 171:21 | 129:5,22 | 251:3 | 26:13 27:15 | 76:13 |
| 185:4 | 151:6,9,15 | investor | 181:17 | 130:8 | Jones' 202:10 | 28:22 29:12 | 103:22 |
| institutiona... | 152:4,10 | 108:6,7,14 | Jane 254:24 | 131:13,17 | Jordan | 31:10 43:9 | 104:4 |
| 186:9 | 262:17 | investors | Janney | 131:25 | 172:24 | 45:6,17 | 112:25 |
| institutions | invested | 108:15 | 173:13 | 132:7,17 | Jr 1:14 | 48:20 50:5 | 115:5 |
| 116:7 126:3 | 119:21 | invited | JANNIE 1:10 January 3:8 | 133:7,15,21 | 181:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 2451: 16 \\ & 51: 19,20 \end{aligned}$ | 119:21 |
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| 121:12,20 | 260:19 | late 157:17 | 153:13 | 149:15 | loaded | 85:8 86:5 | 179:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 122:8 | 262:2,21 | launching | legs 73:21 | 214:6 265:3 | 155:25 | 87:20 98:3 | 199:23 |
| 123:24 | 271:12 | 92:4 | lend 250:11 | lines 220:13 | loan 104:8,23 | 120:15 | 210:17,19 |
| 124:11 | 273:9,10 | law 19:17 | length 7:13 | lineup 143:23 | 104:24 | 126:13,15 | 210:20,25 |
| 125:5,6,7 | knowing | 70:20 71:7 | Let's 261:9 | link 55:17 | 132:15 | 128:14 | 214:11 |
| 125:24 | 139:15 | 81:16,17 | letting 242:15 | links 55:21 | 133:14 | 132:10 | 215:5,9 |
| 126:10 | 226:19 | 82:16 153:3 | level 14:25 | liquidated | local 124:3 | 135:12 | 227:4 251:9 |
| 129:14 | 227:25 | 153:8 | 28:19 37:7 | 121:13 | 144:5 153:7 | 136:11 | 258:4 |
| 130:19 | 228:23 | 171:22 | 43:11 45:5 | liquidity | 173:13 | 138:5 148:7 | looking 21:19 |
| 132:13 | 229:9 230:8 | 190:10 | 57:5 60:22 | 119:24 | 238:18 | 151:4 | 21:25 25:2 |
| 136:2,10 | 231:15 | 219:7 | 85:7 141:12 | list 147:11 | 272:25 | 153:18 | 31:9 61:20 |
| 139:11 | knowledge | lawyer 71:11 | 168:9 | 165:18 | location | 158:20 | 65:20,22 |
| 148:18 | 208:8 209:2 | 153:16 | 169:25 | listed 5:23 | 145:16 | 163:5 | 79:23,23 |
| 160:11,17 | 209:7,8,12 | 171:21 | 190:11 | 51:3 124:15 | 260:11 | 168:25 | 84:25 85:16 |
| 160:22,23 | knowledgea... | lawyers 20:14 | 233:4 | 234:13 | locations | 169:2 | 88:13 91:20 |
| 161:2,24 | 87:13 | lay 105:2 | levels 5:24 | listen 236:10 | 210:10 | 177:18 | 93:16 |
| 162:5 164:7 | known 143:7 | 139:5 191:7 | 90:16 | Listening | long 6:18 | 178:4 189:5 | 113:10,20 |
| 166:22 | 160:15 | 207:20 | 106:18,22 | 267:23 | 9:15 10:7 | 190:3,25 | 117:23 |
| 168:17,20 | Kristin | layer 207:12 | 141:9 186:4 | lists 223:15 | 18:22 45:7 | 196:10 | 119:2 |
| 169:8 | 172:10,10 | layered 135:6 | 186:7 | litigation | 76:9 89:14 | 200:25 | 124:10 |
| 176:23 | kudos 27:4 | 138:13 | leveraged | 107:18 | 120:16 | 201:2,5,21 | 126:13 |
| 177:19 |  | layers 138:16 | 58:17 | little 13:18 | 170:2 | 209:24 | 134:17,18 |
| 187:24 | L | lead-up | Liberties | 15:19 28:9 | 205:13 | 210:7 | 136:8 138:4 |
| 188:18 | L 1:10, 10 | 241:24 | 214:25 | 33:24 46:13 | 230:16 | 212:20 | 155:8 159:4 |
| 191:14,18 | 275:14 | Leader 48:3 | 233:24 | 46:20 47:17 | 266:13 | 215:12,15 | 165:23 |
| 191:19,22 | L\&I 15:15 | leadership | 235:22 | 49:12,23 | long-awaited | 215:17 | 179:24 |
| 192:5 198:3 | LA 167:16 | 39:11 175:4 | 236:11 | 50:15 53:6 | 185:13 | 223:17 | 189:25 |
| 201:20 | labor-inten... | leading | 240:8 | 53:9 54:8 | long-term | 225:5 226:2 | 191:17 |
| 205:23 | 97:24 | 218:20 | 264:10 | 76:4 78:16 | 10:9 135:23 | 226:13 | 192:9 |
| 211:20 | lack 87:3 | learn 124:7 | 267:13 | 79:3 104:17 | 241:21 | 230:5 | 193:23 |
| 214:4 220:4 | 142:7 | learned 27:15 | LIDAR 238:8 | 138:6 139:6 | 246:16 | 233:20 | 197:13 |
| 221:23 | lady 169:13 | lease 111:4 | 238:15 | 162:11 | 250:11 | 234:5,24 | 199:13 |
| 224:18 | land 41:18,22 | 135:2 | lie $227: 16$ | 170:16 | 266:18 | 238:14,15 | 200:12,15 |
| 226:11,16 | 42:12,15,18 | leases 134:15 | lies 35:20 | 171:25 | 267:6 | 238:19 | 201:9 204:5 |
| 227:19 | 43:17 183:6 | leave 115:7 | 51:7 | 172:12 | longer 7:4 | 239:19 | 205:10 |
| 228:7,8 | 210:21,21 | 191:24 | life 9:18 | 173:18 | 43:2 54:8 | 240:13,18 | 210:3,4,12 |
| 230:21 | 211:19 | 200:4 | light $82: 8$ | 174:9 189:9 | 56:17 59:3 | 241:18 | 211:4 |
| 231:3 | 212:10,16 | 217:14 | 89:2 131:2 | 193:12 | 59:9 63:2 | 242:8 243:7 | 213:24 |
| 235:13,15 | 212:21 | leaving | 166:5 | 210:18 | 205:3 | 243:17,18 | 217:19 |
| 235:17 | 214:14 | 114:11 | 176:23 | 212:11,25 | longtime | 255:12 | 220:2,3 |
| 237:17 | 215:5,11,15 | leeway 219:3 | 261:23 | 216:6 | 238:25 | 258:6,9 | 231:5 233:7 |
| 240:6 | 216:5,5,12 | left 78:12 | likelihood | 217:10 | 267:2 | 260:7,9,21 | 236:20,23 |
| 242:16,23 | 220:9 | 105:16 | 72:21 | 219:3 220:2 | look 6:9 7:21 | 263:17,25 | 247:22 |
| 243:15,21 | 249:17 | legacy 93:13 | 142:10 | 220:3 | 8:14,18,19 | 264:5 | 249:8 |
| 244:15,18 | 257:16 | 93:24 | 269:6 | 221:22 | 8:20,23 | 267:10 | 251:15 |
| 246:19,23 | 261:25 | legislation | limit 149:17 | 259:20 | 18:13 19:22 | 269:4,5 | 259:3 260:5 |
| 246:25 | large 130:4 | 72:17 74:16 | limited | 260:8 | 21:15 28:24 | 271:20 | 260:10 |
| 247:23 | 158:12 | legislator | 266:15 | live 54:2 | 36:9 37:2 | 273:10 | 263:18,20 |
| 251:22 | 179:19 | 152:16 | limiting 73:7 | 193:2,8 | 43:5 48:15 | looked 31:2 | 265:10 |
| 252:14 | 185:4,7 | legislature | limits 73:4 | 222:22,25 | 49:15 50:4 | 40:3 75:5 | looks 33:16 |
| 257:7 | largely 169:3 | 152:22,23 | line 8:3 72:15 | 223:2 | 60:20 62:7 | 96:21,22 | 33:17 60:13 |
| 258:24 | larger 23:21 | 152:24 | 85:21 | 264:13 | 75:11,16 | 137:24 | 60:13 65:13 |
| 260:2,17,17 | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 4 \text { 41:12 } \\ & \text { lastly } 36: 9 \end{aligned}$ | legislature's | 138:17 | Lloyd 174:10 | 76:17 83:7 | 177:9 | 80:3 96:24 |
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| 138:8 159:3 | 149:19 | 102:23 | 169:21 | 107:21 | 227:18 | 145:17 | million 5:2,7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 168:10 | 189:22,23 | 139:8 | 179:13 | math 78:5,15 | 235:14 | 146:11,15 | 10:25 14:13 |
| 221:19 | 189:24 | 170:13 | 230:19 | 176:3 | 238:20 | 146:22 | 17:25 18:12 |
| LOOP | 190:5,7 | 177:14 | mandated | Matt 130:13 | 255:22 | 152:21 | 18:16,25 |
| 241:25 | low-income | 242:5 253:4 | 219:6 | 176:23 | 258:7 | 168:7 | 19:6,6,12 |
| lose 19:19,20 | 188:24 | male 34:10 | manner | matter 7:10 | 266:15 | 169:10 | 19:14,16,20 |
| losing 19:14 | 189:10 | malls 183:2 | 243:10 | 83:6 193:14 | 268:12 | 170:22 | 20:18 22:14 |
| 268:20 | lower 17:17 | man 173:3 | manual 31:25 | 195:14 | 270:24 | 179:21 | 25:23 65:15 |
| loss 12:10 | 108:12,16 | manage | 110:9 | 275:7 | meaning | 180:17 | 65:23 70:18 |
| 231:9,13 | 141:9 | 164:11 | 118:22 | Matthew | 193:9 | 181:14 | 71:18,18 |
| losses 231:3 | 145:12 | managed | map 236:3 | 106:9 | means 16:24 | 188:19 | 78:2,5,18 |
| lost 49:10 | 147:24 | 142:21 | 242:18 | maturity | 17:3,18 | membership | 79:5,12,14 |
| 65:6 117:5 | 162:21 | 143:6 | March 49:17 | 132:20 | 59:15 63:3 | 146:21 | 79:15,16,24 |
| 122:19 | 163:14 | management | 142:14 | maximize | 92:11 102:4 | memorialize | 81:6,7,10 |
| lot 13:5 19:23 | 215:23 | 31:13 56:12 | 254:23 | 106:24 | 155:24 | 266:8 | 83:3,5,6,10 |
| 26:6 28:22 | 216:12 | 60:6 69:23 | Maria 1:15 | 118:3 119:2 | 205:4 | mention | 96:14 99:5 |
| 45:8 46:14 | Luke 123:16 | 82:7 106:23 | 161:20 | 122:21 | 275:22 | 117:19 | 106:16 |
| 47:2,4 57:4 |  | 110:5,8 | 262:21 | 269:24 | meant 257:7 | 168:19 | 111:8,9 |
| 60:7 61:16 | M | 143:19 | MARK 1:16 | maximizing | measure | 176:18 | 114:22,25 |
| 63:9 71:14 | M/W/D | 218:16 | market 42:8 | 119:7 | 200:19 | mentioned | 120:11 |
| 81:24 96:22 | 163:10 | manager | 48:22 | maximum | 224:25 | 6:8 46:3 | 122:16 |
| 112:9 117:6 | M/W/DBE | 28:21 48:18 | 125:12,16 | 135:21 | 258:25 | 117:25 | 132:12 |
| 117:12 | 111:21 | 51:25 52:19 | 147:15,20 | Mayor 3:2,8 | measureme... | 129:23 | 133:2,10,11 |
| 118:22 | ma'am 4:10 | 54:12 | 148:23 | 46:21,22 | 8:20 | 168:18 | 134:8,9,20 |
| 130:4 161:3 | 105:23 | 143:12 | 158:18 | 60:16 61:15 | measures | 198:6 231:4 | 134:21 |
| 178:19 | Madam | 149:25 | 182:18 | 85:24 | 3:17 50:6 | 255:9 | 142:25 |
| 188:9 | 116:23 | 150:2 | 183:16 | Mayor's 52:7 | 210:18 | 260:18 | 143:2,18 |
| 193:13 | 127:14 | 167:12 | 184:16,21 | 85:11 | measuring | merging 92:4 | 147:2 |
| 196:8 205:3 | 161:14 | manager's | 189:7,11 | 254:24 | 200:21 | message | 164:15 |
| 205:4 209:8 | 180:13 | 127:22 | 199:20 | MBE 113:7 | meds 75:18 | 71:19 | 187:3 194:3 |
| 211:15 | magic 103:15 | managers | 200:9 201:4 | MBE/WBE | 76:18 | 244:25 | 194:4,5,6 |
| 212:22 | mail 245:10 | 48:25 | 201:19 | 33:3 113:23 | meet 16:25 | met 55:4 | 196:15,17 |
| 213:3 219:6 | 245:15 | 116:25 | 208:8 | MDO 52:8 | 17:7 63:11 | 141:4 | 198:9,13 |
| 224:10,18 | mailing | 117:9 | 209:11 | mean 7:22 | 162:8 | meter 77:18 | 202:17,21 |
| 228:15 | 251:21 | 143:15,23 | 210:21 | 9:12 12:2 | meeting | 83:21 | 202:22 |
| 229:10 | 252:4 | 143:24 | 211:7 | 23:6,6 24:2 | 124:23 | meters 78:6 | 207:13,16 |
| 237:8 | main 130:7 | 144:6,18 | 212:14,22 | 28:8 31:7 | 130:11 | method | 223:11,13 |
| 245:19 | mainstream | 151:9,21 | 214:15 | 34:20 37:12 | meetings | 189:10 | 248:8 252:3 |
| 255:12 | 179:4 | 163:18 | 215:19 | 40:23 57:11 | 51:25 | methodolog... | 252:21,24 |
| 257:10 | maintain | 164:16,22 | 216:13,21 | 57:14 61:14 | 126:12 | 186:16 | mind 67:22 |
| 258:10 | 141:11 | 165:4,8,9 | 216:23 | 66:12 76:21 | meets 143:16 | Michael | 67:24 |
| 265:19,25 | 207:5 | 165:14,15 | 227:13 | 82:25 86:8 | member | 181:15 | 122:19 |
| 268:12 | major 51:15 | 165:16 | 236:7 | 88:16 101:2 | 127:9 | MICHELE | 163:6 |
| lots 51:12 | 108:20 | 166:15,24 | 240:20 | 102:12 | 144:19 | 275:14 | mine 192:5 |
| 224:9 225:3 | 124:12 | 167:19 | 252:20 | 115:21 | members | Mid 144:9 | minimum |
| 259:13 | 230:10 | 170:15 | 258:13 | 116:2 | 4:12 22:17 | middle | 40:25 253:8 |
| love 46:17 | majority 48:3 | manages | 263:17 | 118:10 | 24:14 36:14 | 237:15 | minority 34:8 |
| 75:20 89:13 | 173:12 | 108:19 | 266:24,25 | 196:2 | 40:7 47:15 | midst 178:18 | 143:22 |
| 121:16 | 222:23 | managing | markets 50:7 | 199:15 | 106:6 | 178:24 | 163:3,9 |
| 132:16 | makeup | 18:14 57:6 | Marquette | 204:21 | 123:11 | Mike 32:5 | 164:6 |
| low 5:24 | 52:14 | 60:14,17 | 145:6 | 210:9 214:2 | 137:2 | 71:13 | 165:16 |
| 76:12 109:3 | making 6:17 | 119:22 | mass 185:13 | 223:8 | 140:17,23 | military | minority-0... |
| 129:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 2 \text { 15:23 } \\ & 39: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 120:21 | material | 226:25 | 144:8 | 174:15 | 123:18 |
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| minus 39:12 | 116:25 | moved 5:21 | necessarily | 6:11 39:10 | 70:6 93:9 | norm 168:5 | 175:11,17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| minute | 117:6,8 | 48:10,25 | 8:21 188:11 | 39:16,22 | 93:10,14,14 | Normally | 196:7,7,18 |
| 132:25 | 118:25 | 49:14 243:4 | 212:8,15 | 108:22,24 | 93:25 99:6 | 258:18 | 198:2 204:7 |
| mirroring | 119:3,5 | movement | 213:4 | 129:19 | 99:24 | Norris 233:24 | 205:20,21 |
| 50:2 | 120:3 | 42:13 | 223:24 | 178:7,9 | 106:25 | 236:2 | 206:7 |
| misleading | 124:21 | movie 183:4 | 263:22 | negotiable | 107:8,13,25 | north 240:9 | 225:24 |
| 210:11 | 131:20 | moving 27:20 | 272:21 | 83:12 | 109:10 | Northeast | 231:4,5 |
| missed 53:16 | 162:2 | 33:15 42:18 | necessary | negotiate | 124:20 | 213:5 | 242:18 |
| 57:9 235:3 | 164:11 | 48:6 53:8 | 121:7 | 30:2 86:24 | 131:24 | 214:12 | numbers 11:7 |
| 235:8 | 165:14 | 57:12 74:7 | 184:19 | 87:6 | 134:23 | 215:3,21 | 11:9 15:19 |
| 236:16 | 187:6 | 74:18 89:22 | necessity | negotiated | 146:19 | Northern | 23:15 24:23 |
| missing 273:7 | 194:12 | 105:5 | 52:15 | 110:23 | 150:4,5 | 214:25 | 62:10 63:12 |
| mission 4:22 | 204:17 | 128:13 | need 6:23 | negotiation | 166:25 | 233:23 | 79:3 112:4 |
| 227:21 | 268:21 | 218:10 | 16:11 17:19 | 86:24 87:15 | 167:14 | 235:21 | 113:16 |
| misunderst... | money's | 229:16 | 19:9 20:10 | negotiations | 178:21 | 236:11 | 114:12 |
| 271:15 | 208:25 | 257:12 | 25:12 28:23 | 29:12 222:8 | 192:9 | 240:8 | 118:9,11 |
| mixed-use | monies | multi-family | 28:25 29:3 | 256:12 | 205:15 | 264:10 | 128:10 |
| 265:21 | 122:11 | 189:3 | 35:11 37:3 | negotiator | 207:2 215:6 | 267:12 | 156:18,25 |
| Mm-hmm | monitored | multi-year | 42:23 43:5 | 87:3 | 215:7 | notch 17:24 | 158:3,7 |
| 118:5 | 110:17 | 43:9 | 55:3 59:4 | neighbor | 223:11 | 114:19,21 | 162:7 163:9 |
| MMO 73:22 | monitoring | multiple | 61:20 62:6 | 234:12 | 233:2 | note 107:19 | 163:10 |
| 74:13 | 61:21 107:3 | 183:7 | 63:7 71:6 | neighborho... | 234:11 | notes 249:7 | 164:6 |
| model 210:2 | 113:12 | municipal | 76:22 91:14 | 159:20 | 242:4 255:2 | 275:6 | 165:22 |
| 210:4 | Montgomery | 97:8 107:10 | 112:25 | 238:23 | 255:10 | notice 254:15 | 187:21,23 |
| modeling | 173:13 | municipality | 118:11 | 273:4 | 258:20 | noticed 10:25 | 195:11 |
| 183:20 | month 121:20 | 151:25 | 188:14,15 | neighborho... | 259:12,23 | 85:21 187:3 | 203:20 |
| 240:16 | 122:11 | MURPHY | 195:21,23 | 210:17 | 268:19 | 187:20 | 211:13 |
| models | 165:19 | 275:14 | 196:12,12 | 211:6,9 | newer 212:23 | notices | 231:7 |
| 209:10 | 171:25 | Museum | 198:3 | 235:19 | 215:10 | 187:17 | Nutter 39:11 |
| modification | monthly | 40:23 | 203:23 | 242:20 | 216:2,4 | 206:9 |  |
| 185:19 | 120:24 |  | 204:3 205:5 | 245:20 | 259:21 | 228:20 | 0 |
| moment | months 29:7 | N | 207:16,19 | 249:16 | newly 10:23 | 251:22 | o'clock 181:4 |
| 191:24 | 29:11 46:23 | nail 226:22 | 209:3,4 | 250:7 | news 27:4 | notwithstan... | objections |
| Monday | 68:13 172:7 | name 4:13 | 210:13,14 | net 48:19 | 39:6 197:16 | 249:22 | 275:4 |
| 85:18 | 173:9,10 | 76:5 119:13 | 217:21 | 78:13 | 245:12,13 | number 8:24 | obligation |
| 120:18 | 177:5 | 150:19 | 218:7 | 142:14 | NFL 64:11,17 | 9:25 11:5 | 14:15 |
| money 10:23 | 187:17 | 156:21 | 219:16 | 147:21 | 65:10 | 12:8 22:15 | 106:18 |
| 11:11 17:4 | morning 2:3 | narrow | 236:16,18 | 169:7 | nice 52:21 | 23:12 24:17 | 107:13 |
| 18:22 19:21 | 4:9,10,11 | 218:18 | 237:12 | 216:18 | nicely 217:12 | 25:25 54:3 | 111:4 133:4 |
| 19:23 26:5 | 13:3,4 | NASP 144:16 | 240:18 | network | nightmare | 71:20,21 | 141:9 186:4 |
| 26:15 30:21 | 26:25 27:2 | national | 242:22 | 167:18 | 122:18 | 79:11 82:17 | obligations |
| 30:22 41:6 | 32:21,22 | 124:2,4 | 245:6 253:3 | never 8:11,12 | nine 142:5 | 97:22 | 17:2,8 |
| 49:10 56:13 | 38:4 44:11 | 144:10,20 | 253:24 | 29:10 39:15 | non-compli... | 108:15 | 107:23 |
| 61:17 66:15 | 44:12 53:3 | 166:24 | 264:22 | 61:9 101:6 | 237:9 | 109:8 | 111:10 |
| 66:18,23 | 53:3,4 | nationally | 267:10 | 101:7 | non-profit | 112:19 | 121:9 135:3 |
| 70:25 71:4 | 123:7 | 38:7 | needed 25:15 | 245:25 | 144:12 | 113:11,13 | 135:23 |
| 77:15 78:10 | 221:11 | Nations 76:2 | 55:17,19 | Nevertheless | 185:7 | 135:8,13 | 139:12 |
| 81:11 94:23 | move 31:25 | Nationwide | 199:19 | 189:19 | non-profits | 146:22 | observations |
| 102:21 | 39:23 42:6 | 145:9,13 | 210:22 | new 29:9, 21 | 75:16,19 | 148:5 | 180:17 |
| 103:24 | 57:15 66:23 | naturally | 212:6,20 | 29:25 36:21 | non-represe... | 160:23 | obvious 235:4 |
| 107:8,13 | 112:18 | 27:10 | needs 55:5 | 36:23 54:18 | 109:16 | 162:18,19 | 259:15 |
| 115:19,22 | 193:10 | near 222:16 | 83:17 246:4 | 57:12,16,17 | non-tax | 162:23 | obviously |
| 115:24 | 243:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nearby } \\ & 264: 13 \end{aligned}$ | negative 5:21 | 69:15,20 | 251:10 | 172:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 841: 2 \\ & 42: 554: 2 \end{aligned}$ |
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| 55:18 82:5 | 170:12 | 154:14 | 213:4,7,7 | 102:3 | 40:7 144:22 | 117:24 | 107:14,16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 255:11 | 171:17,24 | 160:4,8 | 215:8,11,21 | operations | organizations | 122:22 | 122:8 133:2 |
| occasion | 172:5,11,16 | 161:12 | 216:7,20 | 152:9,17 | 144:12 | overseeing | 142:24 |
| 122:15 | 172:21 | 165:12 | 243:18 | 169:22 | original 30:6 | 57:7 | panel 127:2 |
| occur 121:21 | 181:16,18 | 169:18 | 258:19 | 251:10,13 | 70:22 | oversees | paper 10:22 |
| occurred | officers | 170:7 179:9 | ongoing 93:6 | 251:14 | 106:21 | 110:25 | 47:2 109:20 |
| 160:13 | 129:11 | 180:8 | 127:24,25 | opinion | 271:25 | oversight | 128:10 |
| October | 172:17 | 181:12 | 128:8 130:3 | 137:20 | originally | 27:21 | 223:23 |
| 130:12 | offices 168:15 | 188:18 | 182:4 184:8 | 248:3 | 30:4,11 | 170:13 | papers |
| 222:17,23 | 265:22 | 191:5,25 | 205:9 | opioid 6:24 | ourself | overtime 60:6 | 224:19 |
| 223:2 | officials 124:3 | 193:25 | ooh 201:20 | opportunities | 200:19 | 60:12 62:5 | paradise |
| OEO 114:3 | 124:6 | 202:2 | OPA 3:24 | 37:6 53:16 | outline | 62:8,10,15 | 241:19 |
| 163:17 | 152:13 | 206:25 | 20:16 21:22 | 57:9 63:10 | 239:10 | 63:4 69:4,6 | parameters |
| off-the-shelf | offset 211:22 | 209:13 | 28:12 30:10 | 107:4 119:8 | outlook 5:21 | 69:7,11,18 | 149:5,23 |
| 185:22 | oftentimes | 219:7 | 32:5 181:8 | 262:25 | 6:11 39:17 | 70:4 | parcels |
| offered 33:2 | 60:23 | 232:11 | 182:12 | opportunity | 108:22 | owe 131:20 | 182:23 |
| offerings 25:9 | oh 1:14 17:16 | 237:19 | 183:13,23 | 8:13 111:11 | outlooks | 133:3,9,11 | 183:9 |
| 125:13 | 29:18 34:5 | 239:24 | 184:4,25 | 122:21 | 108:24 | owned 186:9 | 186:10 |
| office 4:18,23 | 44:21 88:16 | 240:23 | 185:11 | 169:7 | outlying | 217:24 | park 97:9 |
| 47:21 51:10 | 176:13 | 248:21 | 217:17 | 174:20 | 93:17 | owner 51:22 | 156:16 |
| 52:7 53:12 | 200:22 | 249:13 | 229:11 | 186:19 | outpacing | owners | 158:25 |
| 53:13 89:11 | 217:11 | 250:19 | 252:14 | 266:16 | 144:2 | 183:12 | 178:25 |
| 89:15 90:20 | OIT 27:15,16 | 251:17 | 255:3 | 269:24 | outreach | 184:25 | Parker's |
| 91:2 92:11 | 27:19 28:18 | 254:22 | 267:10 | opposed | 108:6,14 | 185:5 | 247:2 |
| 92:11 93:19 | 31:12 59:23 | 256:16 | OPA's 181:18 | 44:24 45:2 | 246:24 | 186:15 | parking |
| 95:4 104:12 | 164:23 | 270:21 | 182:4 | 55:22 82:18 | outside 19:3 | 187:15 | 77:12,14 |
| 106:12 | okay 12:22 | 273:14,17 | 183:19 | 155:14 | 20:10,15 | 190:10 | 78:6,8,23 |
| 110:3 | 16:22 22:6 | 274:2 | OPD 222:6 | opted 149:2 | 28:2 70:20 | 217:21 | 79:9,24 |
| 111:14 | 24:25 26:17 | old 57:18,22 | open 114:11 | optics 60:13 | 70:21 71:7 | 218:6 219:9 | 81:19 83:19 |
| 112:8 114:6 | 29:19 32:14 | 245:19 | 266:16 | optimal | 104:22 | 219:19 | 239:15 |
| 120:23 | 34:16 35:13 | 271:9 | opened 37:6 | 141:12 | 112:8 | 228:10 | 251:9,13 |
| 121:18 | 36:4 37:19 | older 214:20 | 247:20 | 162:20,22 | 183:22 | 244:12 | part 16:17 |
| 123:10,23 | 37:22 42:20 | 215:13,21 | openings | optimistic | 193:8 207:9 | 262:12 | 21:10,11 |
| 126:11 | 43:25 60:2 | 216:8 | 36:25 | 39:19 62:24 | 207:17,22 | 266:18 | 27:20 36:18 |
| 173:6 | 63:5 64:25 | 258:21 | operate 95:8 | 256:6 | 208:3,7,10 | ownership | 54:24,25 |
| 181:21,23 | 66:5 68:6 | 259:18 | operating | option 179:22 | 208:14,20 | 143:22 | 55:8,23 |
| 182:11,23 | 86:7,13 | on-boarding | 2:16 3:16 | options | 209:11 |  | 62:22 74:17 |
| 186:10 | 87:19 92:25 | 146:18 | 5:25 42:15 | 145:23 | 230:18 | P | 89:24 95:10 |
| 192:22 | 98:12 99:18 | once 56:16 | 45:15,16,20 | 242:6,16 | 231:21 | p.m 274:15 | 96:25 104:8 |
| 206:17,20 | 100:16 | 59:22 | 46:17 53:17 | 245:15 | 263:2 | page 33:6,21 | 179:19 |
| 220:21 | 102:11 | 143:13 | 106:13 | order 30:21 | outstanding | 34:3,4,5,7 | 184:22 |
| 222:12 | 104:20 | 161:3 174:3 | 119:20 | 91:15 | 111:5 132:2 | 35:14,15 | 188:15 |
| 228:12 | 105:14 | 225:7 255:2 | 120:4,11,21 | 149:25 | 133:4,12 | 36:14 63:20 | 192:23 |
| 236:6 | 114:9 116:3 | 261:6 | 127:23 | 184:20 | over-housed | 65:13,16 | 194:14 |
| 238:17 | 116:18 | 264:11,13 | 146:13 | ordinance | 235:12 | 75:6 111:20 | 206:22 |
| 246:25 | 126:17 | one-year | 155:15 | 2:10,13,15 | overall 34:22 | 131:3 | 224:25 |
| 247:3 | 133:15,25 | 156:24 | 181:22 | 3:7 66:23 | 143:4 | 133:18,21 | 227:21 |
| 254:24 | 136:14 | 157:2 | operation | 115:14 | 184:22 | 133:23 | 229:23 |
| 257:3,4 | 140:15 | ones 35:8 | 102:8 | 269:17 | 212:17 | 147:10 | 230:3,6 |
| officer 52:6 | 148:16 | 91:20 | operational | 272:5 | overhead | 161:8 164:4 | 231:25 |
| 97:22 | 150:20 | 164:19 | 58:17 | ordinances | 15:14,23 | 164:18,19 | 232:6 247:7 |
| 140:22 | 151:24 | 187:18 | operational... | 61:21 268:2 | 156:2 176:8 | pages 13:20 | 262:23 |
| 153:16,17 | 153:10,25 | 206:25 | 101:23 | organization | overnight | $\begin{gathered} 46: 2,4,15 \\ \text { paid } 75: 17,22 \end{gathered}$ | 263:8,23 |


| 268:23 | 245:14 | 140:19,24 | 193:14 | 142:16,25 | 159:6 | 179:15 | 200:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| participate | 270:8 | 141:6 146:3 | 194:5,11,21 | 143:3,4,8 | 177:19 | 182:2,7 | 201:9,23 |
| 144:9 146:6 | paying 14:21 | 146:21,25 | 196:15,19 | 143:10,20 | 273:13 | 184:8 | 202:8,19,23 |
| participates | 32:24 37:24 | 147:12 | 204:6,7,9 | 143:20,21 | periodically | 185:20 | 203:2,14 |
| 146:17 | 121:19 | 148:6,8,20 | 205:5,15 | 143:24 | 245:9,16 | 198:8,21 | 204:2,18 |
| participating | 131:22 | 149:2,6 | 206:16,19 | 144:3,21 | permanent | 215:3 248:8 | 205:7,25 |
| 146:4,14 | 132:12 | 156:14,23 | 207:3,19 | 146:5 | 9:19 | 248:16 | 206:6,13,18 |
| participation | 133:10 | 160:12,19 | 227:24 | 147:14 | permitted | Philadelphi... | 207:25 |
| 33:3 111:22 | 196:25 | 161:5 | 228:9 | 148:10 | 189:13 | 182:11,22 | 208:19 |
| 111:23 | 227:24 | 164:12,14 | 231:17 | 154:12,16 | person 3:25 | Philadelphi... | 209:21 |
| 112:9,16 | 249:17,18 | 167:5 | 234:18,24 | 154:17 | 9:17,25 | 250:8 | 210:6 |
| 113:6 | 251:10 | 169:16 | 238:5 | 156:7,8 | 10:2 29:2 | Philly 51:3,20 | 211:25 |
| 144:23 | payment | 170:17 | 242:16 | 157:3,11,15 | 69:21 87:2 | 53:20 55:8 | 212:8 213:9 |
| 145:23 | 131:14,16 | 178:5,21 | 243:21 | 157:17,22 | 87:6,12,17 | 55:23 56:5 | 213:16,19 |
| 163:9 164:6 | payments | 179:4,13,25 | 245:6,17 | 158:22 | 147:18 | 56:16 58:23 | 214:9,22 |
| 165:6 | 107:2 | 180:4 | 246:8 250:3 | 159:16,17 | 174:8 224:3 | 59:12 171:3 | 215:9,17 |
| particular | 109:25 | Pension's | 250:25 | 159:18,19 | 249:11,17 | 179:20 | 216:15,20 |
| 7:25 21:21 | 121:8,23 | 173:24 | 259:7 | 160:12 | 260:4 | phone 228:20 | 217:2,6,18 |
| 32:24 40:2 | 122:9 | pensions | 266:15 | 163:11,13 | personal | physical | 218:24 |
| 63:8 152:14 | 131:11,12 | 51:17 54:4 | 267:16 | 163:14,19 | 232:16 | 210:9 | 220:5,19 |
| 152:17 | 139:13 | 59:17 72:7 | 268:13 | 163:19,22 | personally | 261:24 | 221:4,12,13 |
| 153:15 | 146:25 | 73:10 81:23 | 270:6 | 163:24 | 149:10 | pick 197:20 | 221:19 |
| 241:14 | 147:2 | 130:19 | percent 6:20 | 164:8,10,13 | personnel | 197:21 | 222:5 |
| particularly | 169:23 | 140:7 | 12:9 19:13 | 164:16 | 146:17 | 243:6 260:3 | 223:21 |
| 6:14 199:23 | 171:13 | 153:18 | 32:9 43:3,4 | 166:6,10,13 | 241:8 | Pictometry | 224:6,24 |
| 200:3 | payroll 51:18 | 159:9 171:2 | 48:12,14 | 177:13 | perspective | 238:14 | 225:13,21 |
| 219:11 | 54:5 59:15 | 171:4,6,14 | 49:18 50:14 | 178:20 | 7:20,24 | picture 138:6 | 226:24 |
| 240:14 | 109:7,9,10 | 171:17 | 50:16 73:16 | 202:25 | 9:21 24:14 | PIDC 104:5 | 227:17 |
| 245:20 | 109:18,22 | 172:18 | 73:17 74:11 | 203:18,19 | 27:22 40:12 | pie 75:6 | 228:4,19 |
| parts 104:3 | 115:11 | 173:22 | 74:20,21,22 | 212:18 | 123:17 | piece 16:12 | 229:7,13,18 |
| 209:24 | 116:11 | 174:6 | 77:19 78:19 | 231:9,11,19 | 125:2 126:5 | 18:23 19:11 | 230:14 |
| 210:2,8,9 | payrolls | 176:19 | 80:6,25 | 248:6,9,9 | 179:18,23 | 272:23 | 233:5 |
| 210:12,14 | 121:4 | 177:7 | 81:5 82:11 | 248:10,15 | PFM 123:15 | pieces 73:24 | 234:21 |
| Passively | pays 164:14 | people 10:22 | 82:21 83:20 | 248:16 | 123:20 | 201:4 | 236:5,13 |
| 143:6 | 224:3 | 26:14 40:8 | 83:22 88:8 | 249:24 | ph 171:20 | pin 226:22 | 237:4,19 |
| Paster 4:15 | PBT 107:17 | 40:14,20 | 88:12,17,19 | percentage | PHA 250:4 | Piper 32:6 | 238:11 |
| 53:22,23 | peaks 121:20 | 57:5 59:23 | 90:11 111:9 | 32:2 72:16 | phenomenal | 181:13,15 | 239:18 |
| 54:13,20 | 121:24 | 62:14 65:10 | 111:22,24 | 135:23 | 157:9 | 187:11 | 240:12 |
| 56:4 59:10 | peer 85:5 | 67:12 69:24 | 111:25 | 141:22 | Philadelphia | 188:4,7,21 | 244:3 |
| 103:6 | pencils 200:6 | 71:13 149:9 | 112:5 | 233:15 | 1:2,6 2:20 | 189:2,19 | 246:10,19 |
| path 61:18 | Pennsylvania | 149:13 | 113:11 | percentage-... | 2:22 20:2 | 190:20 | 246:22 |
| pattern 234:5 | 1:6 3:3 | 152:11 | 134:10,21 | 88:4,15 | 33:17,18 | 191:9,25 | 251:15 |
| pay 5:18 17:8 | 149:16 | 153:5 | 135:15,21 | perfectly | 39:6,7 | 192:13,19 | 252:5,25 |
| 33:4 38:5 | pension 3:24 | 160:18,24 | 135:25 | 257:22 | 40:15 77:12 | 193:20 | 253:11 |
| 65:11 69:5 | 5:3 6:14 | 161:10 | 137:23 | performance | 78:11 83:2 | 194:13 | 254:5,9 |
| 69:6,8 | 14:15 15:20 | 164:11 | 138:10,16 | 8:20,23 9:2 | 83:4 95:13 | 195:3,8,17 | 255:8,22 |
| 75:20 | 16:25 17:7 | 167:7,10 | 138:17,18 | 82:7 | 107:7,10 | 195:25 | 257:2,6 |
| 114:24 | 48:8 49:7 | 168:20 | 138:19 | performanc... | 130:4 | 196:4,19 | 258:5,25 |
| 120:19 | 49:11 50:2 | 173:20 | 141:14,17 | 45:10 61:14 | 137:22 | 197:3,5,16 | 260:7 261:9 |
| 121:7 137:5 | 74:25 81:23 | 174:2,2,4,5 | 141:17,18 | performanc... | 168:10 | 197:24 | 263:10,15 |
| 145:3 162:2 | 117:17 | 175:12 | 141:19,20 | 49:7 | 172:20 | 198:4,9 | 265:6,15 |
| 187:7 | 129:24 | 187:7 | 141:20,24 | period 12:3 | 173:7 177:4 | 199:17 | 267:17 |
| 244:13 | 136:19 | 192:16,25 | 142:3,4,14 | 158:11 | 177:23,24 | 200:12,15 | 268:5,22 |


| 269:19 | 170:13 | 228:2 | positions | 46:16 | 101:20 | 270:15,23 | principle 28:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 270:11,20 | 225:14 | 235:24 | 34:23 35:7 | prepared | 103:2,8,11 | 271:5,8,17 | 29:9,24 |
| 271:4,7,14 | 230:24 | 248:23 | 37:20 61:2 | 47:19 | 103:18,21 | 271:24 | printing |
| 271:19 | 236:19 | 249:5 | 62:23,25 | preparing | 104:7,16,19 | 272:3,7,10 | 251:21 |
| 272:2,6,9 | plan's 141:22 | 258:12 | 97:12 | 47:16 186:7 | 105:4,8,13 | 272:14,17 | prior 25:23 |
| 272:12,16 | planned | 260:15,24 | positive 31:23 | PRESENT | 105:20 | 273:8,15,20 | 70:16 75:12 |
| 272:20 | 128:15 | pointed | 159:22 | 1:9 | 106:2,5 | 273:24 | 107:23 |
| 273:14,17 | 132:9 | 155:12 | possibilities | presentation | 111:18 | 274:3,7,8 | 158:10 |
| 273:22 | 225:11 | 189:8 | 24:20 25:8 | 85:11 | 112:20,24 | President's | 174:14 |
| 274:2,6 | planner | pointing | possible | 129:12 | 113:4,14 | 18:11 21:11 | 177:15 |
| place 30:12 | 145:16 | 264:20 | 13:21,24 | 130:14 | 114:2,5,8 | pressure | 225:14 |
| 31:11 74:3 | Planning | points 136:2 | 16:13 24:17 | presented | 115:3,15,20 | 162:9 | 268:11 |
| 118:14 | 43:22,24 | 240:20 | 40:18 | 153:22 | 115:25 | pretty 10:22 | priorities |
| 128:4 | 263:4 | police 97:22 | 153:21 | preservation | 116:6,10,17 | 19:8 38:23 | 212:6 |
| 203:23 | plans 107:4 | 146:15 | 237:17 | 103:25 | 116:22 | 42:11 57:10 | prioritize |
| 222:15 | 107:23 | 172:20 | 239:17 | 235:13 | 122:24,25 | 102:22 | 253:2 |
| 224:17 | 108:5 148:8 | policies | possibly | preserve | 123:6 | 155:25 | priority |
| 225:8 255:3 | 148:10 | 107:25 | 239:11 | 117:11 | 126:19 | 162:3 | 40:21 55:18 |
| 266:5 | 161:11 | policy 42:10 | post 112:11 | President | 127:6 | 169:21 | 58:7 |
| placement | 178:5,6 | 49:20 50:5 | posted 254:16 | 1:10 2:2 | 128:21,22 | 211:14 | prison 97:15 |
| 152:8 | platform | 73:2 135:20 | potential | 3:11 4:4,8 | 129:3 | 247:5 252:9 | Prisons 97:6 |
| places 41:6 | 241:12 | 136:8,11 | 23:20 70:18 | 4:12 5:11 | 130:10 | preventive | private 14:23 |
| 48:24 | play 169:12 | 142:15 | 77:14 | 5:16 7:7 | 136:16,17 | 237:17 | 145:7 151:7 |
| 131:20 | please 2:7 | 149:22 | 151:24 | 8:25 9:11 | 137:14,19 | previous | 151:7,8 |
| 234:3 | 34:11 | political | 185:21 | 10:14,18 | 139:23,24 | 177:16 | 171:23 |
| 242:12 | 105:22 | 153:6,7 | potentially | 11:19,25 | 140:6,10,13 | previously | 266:23,24 |
| plan 2:21 | 163:2 170:9 | 241:9 | 72:21 | 12:11,13,21 | 140:16 | 126:11 | privilege |
| 3:19 6:5 | 221:8 | politician | 114:14 | 13:2 20:21 | 147:7,17 | 156:12 | 217:10 |
| 11:2,9 | 273:23 | 7:16 | 152:4 249:3 | 20:22 21:3 | 148:15 | 172:19 | 232:17 |
| 12:17,18,19 | pleased 53:7 | pony 42:16 | poverty 250:2 | 21:7 22:5,9 | 150:12,18 | 173:4 | privileges |
| 15:20 22:16 | 106:10 | pool 195:24 | powerful | 22:12 26:18 | 151:12,23 | price 107:9 | 232:14 |
| 23:5,5,22 | 181:20 | 196:17 | 208:17 | 26:19,24 | 153:9,24 | 116:8,12,14 | proactive |
| 23:24 24:4 | plug 267:9 | poor 249:16 | PPA 80:13 | 32:16 38:12 | 154:5 169:9 | 224:11 | 237:11 |
| 24:5 39:20 | plus 69:19 | 250:7 | PRA 42:14 | 38:13,18 | 181:6,11,14 | priced 107:8 | 239:17 |
| 41:23 43:5 | 135:22 | population | practice | 44:5,10 | 186:23 | 112:14 | 247:5 |
| 43:12 45:15 | 159:20 | 96:13,15 | 171:23 | 47:10,11 | 187:25 | pricing 87:7 | proactively |
| 45:20 46:21 | 178:20 | portals | practices | 52:22 63:16 | 188:6,17,22 | 105:25 | 237:25 |
| 73:17 74:10 | pockets | 118:18,20 | 179:12 | 63:17 64:5 | 189:17 | 110:21 | probably |
| 75:7 89:17 | 241:17 | portfolio | 180:7 | 64:14,19,24 | 190:4 191:4 | 115:18 | 7:13 10:3 |
| 99:13,15,17 | point 10:10 | 119:24 | pre-tax | 65:3,17,25 | 191:11 | primarily | 12:19 18:9 |
| 107:9 112:2 | 15:22 17:11 | 142:16 | 145:20 | 66:4,8,17 | 192:2 | 78:8 186:5 | 20:4 21:10 |
| 113:17 | 17:24 18:3 | 158:10 | predatory | 66:25 67:10 | 233:21 | 210:25 | 21:24,25 |
| 127:22 | 24:24 42:16 | 164:5 | 243:10 | 67:19 68:2 | 246:25 | primary 5:22 | 28:4,8 |
| 128:11 | 47:9,14 | portion 74:9 | predict | 68:5,10 | 247:10 | 182:4 | 29:16 30:12 |
| 131:4 | 50:24 55:15 | 81:11 | 263:22,23 | 72:4 77:4,5 | 250:18,24 | 237:16 | 31:2 37:18 |
| 133:17 | 59:15 98:8 | 104:24 | 272:21 | 77:10 84:17 | 251:5 | prime 14:18 | 41:16 43:14 |
| 141:6 | 98:9 121:16 | 145:19 | prep 44:16,19 | 84:22 86:14 | 256:18,20 | principal | 43:21 48:13 |
| 144:10 | 138:12 | 206:24 | 44:25 | 86:19 89:3 | 261:11 | 111:2 | 49:12 50:9 |
| 145:11,17 | 164:15 | portrayed | 173:15 | 89:4,10 | 262:3 | 117:11 | 54:8 62:4 |
| 145:18,24 | 167:3 205:2 | 78:22 | 174:10 | 96:3,6 | 264:12 | 131:7,21 | 62:11 70:13 |
| 146:4,7 | 207:23 | position | preparation | 98:14,15,20 | 267:20,21 | 132:5,13,18 | 75:9 76:21 |
| 159:8,22,25 | 212:25 | 75:23 84:14 | 44:20 46:8 | 100:18,23 | 268:8 | 133:13 | 81:9 87:11 |
| 160:15,19 | 219:14 | 126:8 170:6 | prepare | 101:8,14,15 | 269:10,20 | 139:12,16 | 94:8 162:19 |
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| 162:22 | produced | 142:7 | 188:9,11,12 | 223:10 | 123:10,23 | 118:14 | 100:24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 173:9 179:3 | 19:5,6 | prohibit | 189:5,10,12 | 224:8,9 | 125:2 | 124:5 132:8 | 103:23 |
| 187:16 | producing | 151:19 | 189:16 | 228:9 | 127:11 | 139:10 | 104:2 |
| 196:6 211:8 | 183:20 | 153:4 | 190:2 | 233:18 | 183:22 | 161:4 194:2 | 105:15 |
| 215:12 | product | prohibition | 195:23 | 240:10 | provider | 194:6 197:8 | 113:15 |
| 228:6 | 183:24 | 151:20 | 196:7,9 | 241:20 | 164:24 | 206:10 | 115:9 |
| 242:25 | products | project 28:23 | 199:24 | 242:5 244:6 | provides | 207:3 | 124:11 |
| 246:24 | 143:21 | 30:10,16 | 201:2 | 244:12,13 | 85:15 | 212:24 | 133:17 |
| 252:10 | professional | 31:13 51:23 | 205:21 | 245:23 | 251:19 | 229:11 | 135:19 |
| 257:18 | 165:13 | 51:25 52:3 | 206:5 | 246:15 | providing | 237:20 | 137:20 |
| 258:9 | professiona | 52:19 53:14 | 209:12 | 258:2,17 | 2:19 40:13 | 249:6 | 148:16 |
| problem | 182:10 | 53:20 54:3 | 211:5,12 | 259:22 | 48:18 | puts 75:23 | 149:3 158:8 |
| 74:25 76:14 | professionals | 54:7,12 | 214:10,13 | 268:3,10,17 | 183:14 | 84:13 115:4 | 160:10 |
| 87:11 89:23 | 124:5 126:2 | 79:10 90:14 | 223:9 | 270:17 | proving | putting 67:17 | 162:11 |
| 90:3 160:12 | 144:11,14 | 150:22 | 225:20 | 273:18 | 18:19 | 71:18 72:16 | 179:11 |
| 176:5 | profile 142:10 | 171:4 | 226:5 233:9 | property-sp... | proxy 144:25 | 125:15 | 190:15 |
| 187:21 | profits 78:14 | 179:20 | 233:11 | 183:15 | prudent | 128:4 | 191:14,17 |
| 192:16,20 | program 2:10 | 184:10 | 234:11 | proponents | 158:4 | 194:11 | 194:14 |
| 193:12 | 3:18 7:22 | 196:5 | 235:5,21 | 144:13 | public 2:3 | 209:9 | 196:14 |
| 220:19 | 18:14 21:15 | 222:17,20 | 236:25 | proposal | 3:13 78:3,7 |  | 197:6 |
| 225:2 227:5 | 25:3,14,19 | 222:21 | 241:23 | 11:24 70:23 | 95:21 | Q | 198:18 |
| problems | 26:3 28:21 | 229:23 | 243:16 | 77:13 | 126:13 | qualifications | 200:7 |
| 187:24 | 40:5 51:4 | 233:8,10 | 248:7 | proposed | 148:6,8 | 168:12 | 202:10,13 |
| 193:16 | 51:20 56:13 | project-bas... | 249:21 | 2:24 3:16 | 178:5 179:4 | qualified | 203:22 |
| procedures | 56:14,18 | 27:21 | 252:15,17 | 14:5 106:15 | 179:24 | 192:21,25 | 205:6 218:3 |
| 108:2 | 90:21 | projected | 252:19,24 | 107:7,12 | 180:3 | quality 91:10 | 226:2 233:7 |
| proceed | 100:15 | 113:8 | 258:10 | 111:13 | 266:10 | 116:15 | 241:25 |
| 105:22 | 103:25 | 132:23 | 259:24 | 125:4,13,24 | 275:15 | 144:5 | 242:14 |
| 140:14 | 104:5,8,23 | 228:6 | 265:21,21 | 155:9 183:9 | publicly | 184:23 | 251:18 |
| proceedings | 107:15,17 | projecting | 266:3 | 183:16,21 | 60:13 116:4 | quandary | 253:2 |
| 275:4 | 108:6,14 | 79:4 | 268:13 | 185:24 | 123:9 | 265:8 | 267:24 |
| process 28:11 | 109:11,13 | projectio | 272:4 | protect | pull 267:9,9 | quarter 17:24 | 271:16,25 |
| 28:19 29:25 | 109:13,19 | 66:2 | 273:11 | 117:11 | purchase | 18:3 49:25 | questioning |
| 44:16,20 | 109:22,23 | projections | property 20:2 | protests 61:8 | 174:14,14 | quarterly | 133:3 |
| 45:7 47:25 | 145:21 | 79:14 122:3 | 20:4 27:8 | prove 201:19 | pursuant 3:5 | 127:21 | questions |
| 55:11,16 | program-b... | projects 26:5 | 89:11,16 | proven 9:6 | pursue 184:5 | quarters | 4:19 5:10 |
| 56:15 60:9 | 16:18,20 | 27:18 59:25 | 91:2 95:4 | provide 8:6 | pursued | 226:19,21 | 5:20 13:6 |
| 110:9 | 21:13 53:8 | 94:5 125:17 | 181:21,23 | 33:7,9 42:9 | 252:3 | 227:8 | 22:11,15 |
| 125:25 | 54:18 55:7 | prominent | 181:25 | 94:16 95:24 | push 261:23 | quest 264:16 | 24:8 38:24 |
| 185:19 | 55:20 56:3 | 123:20 | 182:6,9 | 106:11 | pushed | question 7:18 | 44:16 69:2 |
| 206:22 | 56:7 58:14 | promote 64:2 | 183:12 | 110:6,18 | 112:12 | 13:12 16:23 | 77:16 84:24 |
| 209:22 | 61:15 | promoting | 184:7,23,25 | 111:12 | pushing | 17:7 21:12 | 100:17 |
| 218:23 | programs | 145:2 | 185:5 | 116:14 | 242:3,15 | 23:4,10 | 102:23 |
| 219:5,6,22 | 17:5 18:12 | prongs | 186:11,15 | 123:17 | 244:22 | 27:11 33:12 | 111:16,20 |
| 229:12,16 | 18:16,18 | 115:18 | 187:15 | 125:8,18,22 | put $25: 14$ | 33:20 34:7 | 115:5 |
| processes | 21:21 40:2 | proper 229:3 | 190:10 | 146:9 | 26:15 43:12 | 36:17 39:4 | 126:23,24 |
| 28:24 51:21 | 40:19 52:18 | properties | 196:23 | 149:23 | 45:14 65:8 | 39:20 45:19 | 127:2,11 |
| 204:11 | 93:24 94:24 | 32:3,9 | 211:16,23 | 165:19,21 | 67:23 68:3 | 54:21 55:9 | 129:7,18 |
| processing | 109:18 | 182:15,20 | 214:2 | 166:2 180:7 | 70:24 73:16 | 57:4 68:25 | 140:2 147:6 |
| 169:23 | 242:15 | 182:25 | 216:11,25 | 181:20 | 74:3,13 | 69:3 70:17 | 147:10 |
| 171:12 | 244:23 | 183:6,11 | 219:9,19 | 242:19 | 88:23 94:3 | 73:10 75:3 | 154:10 |
| procurement | 246:24 | 185:9 | 220:8 | provided | 94:17 96:11 | 75:24 86:12 | 180:16 |
| 110:4 | progress | 187:13,14 | 222:12 | 110:20 | 115:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 86: 22 ~ 87: 23 \\ & 96: 16 ~ 99: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 186:22 |


| 187:2 | rapid 244:2 | reaching | 31:22 35:23 | reassessment | 38:15 44:7 | recruit 193:7 | 100:7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 191:18,20 | rare 219:17 | 146:11 | 36:19 42:23 | 102:4,6,14 | 47:12 52:24 | recruits | reflects |
| 191:23 | rarely 156:4 | 186:6 | 51:22 52:3 | 182:13 | 68:7 77:7 | 99:24 | 174:18 |
| 192:7 214:6 | 219:17 | react 242:20 | 56:6 59:24 | 184:10,18 | 84:19 86:16 | redefine | 237:21 |
| 217:8 | Rasheia | reactionary | 60:7 62:22 | 188:3 | 89:7 96:4 | 240:21 | refunding |
| 232:10 | 106:6 | 220:24 | 63:10 71:14 | 201:14 | 98:17 | redefined | 107:3,11 |
| 247:17 | rate 12:5 42:9 | read 2:7 3:15 | 71:14 75:11 | 211:13 | 100:20 | 240:19 | 124:21 |
| 251:8 | 49:8,9 | 13:19 141:2 | 87:10,16 | 213:14 | 101:17 | redemption | regard 124:9 |
| 257:10 | 89:20 | 192:8 | 95:5 97:16 | 215:4 | 116:19 | 142:20 | 124:18 |
| 258:16 | 111:23 | reading 41:16 | 97:21,23 | 229:23 | 123:3 127:3 | redevelopm... | regarding 2:4 |
| 261:6 | 119:9 132:5 | 175:9 | 102:5,16 | 240:15 | 128:24 | 263:14 | 22:13,16,21 |
| queue 218:22 | 132:14,19 | ready $272: 19$ | 138:21 | 255:4 | 136:21 | reduce 9:6 | 85:2 111:12 |
| quick 10:20 | 132:20,21 | real 7:22 | 158:13,16 | reassessme... | 137:16 | 67:3 109:8 | 124:8 125:3 |
| 27:11 63:19 | 133:13 | 46:10 60:3 | 163:7 | 27:5 28:7 | 154:2 | 142:2 148:4 | 125:8 |
| 71:17 | 142:2,8 | 63:19 65:24 | 176:11 | 187:10 | 256:22 | 148:14 | 126:12 |
| 101:21 | 146:24 | 75:12,14 | 207:17 | 216:19 | 261:13 | 161:25 | 182:8 |
| 103:22 | 147:22,24 | 97:10 | 213:22 | Rebuild | recommend | reduced 67:9 | regards |
| 251:8 | 148:4,10 | 103:21 | 218:18 | 107:16 | 19:22 | 67:21,22 | 107:22 |
| quicker 13:25 | 158:4,25 | 148:20,22 | 223:6 | 134:14 | recommend... | reducing | 118:23 |
| 205:4 | 159:3,10,15 | 149:12,13 | 226:14 | recall 69:12 | 95:21 | 67:14 | region 124:7 |
| quickly 13:24 | 161:25 | 150:3 168:6 | 227:2,24 | 73:18 99:7 | 183:23 | 106:25 | regional |
| 60:3 61:2 | rated 109:4 | 181:25 | 228:15 | 130:9,16 | 208:2 | 131:23 | 238:18 |
| 100:23 | rates 77:19 | 184:13 | 233:16 | 213:15 | recommend... | 147:22 | 273:2 |
| 120:13 | 83:21 | 188:15 | 238:25 | recapture | 90:11,15 | 182:19 | regular |
| 232:21 | rating 6:9 | 191:7 198:7 | 257:11 | 190:12 | 91:4,9,13 | reduction | 107:24 |
| 239:11 | 17:3,17,18 | 198:11 | 261:22 | receive 22:20 | 91:17,19 | 65:14,24 | 184:8 205:9 |
| Quinones-S... | 39:9,22 | 199:12,19 | 264:6 | 88:11 | 92:2,23 | 129:19 | 230:17 |
| 1:15 52:25 | 72:5 74:23 | 201:14 | 267:10 | 119:17 | 93:2,3,6,8 | 142:4,23 | regulations |
| 161:20 | 108:23,25 | 224:12,13 | reap 121:11 | received 40:4 | 93:16 | 143:4 | 108:4 |
| 261:14 | 127:13 | 224:16 | reason 5:2 | 46:11 67:18 | 170:14 | 211:24 | reimbursed |
| quite 27:16 | 128:2 | 225:5 | 11:3 129:21 | 85:17 | recommend... | redundancies | 63:25 64:12 |
| 78:17 | 129:19 | 232:21 | 156:7 | 106:24 | 186:6 | 52:17 | reimburse... |
| 162:16 | 130:24 | 235:25,25 | 163:21 | 108:22 | reconfigura... | redundant | 64:6 |
| 168:22,23 | 176:20,22 | 237:18 | 234:8 | 122:15 | 222:20 | 185:18 | reimburse... |
| 168:24 | ratings 6:10 | 238:24 | 266:12 | 196:15 | reconvene | refer 195:4 | 64:10 |
| 223:5 | 115:7 | 251:13,24 | reasoning | receiving | 181:7 | reference | reimburses |
| 253:12 | 130:14 | 267:11,13 | 40:11,21 | 40:25 | 274:12 | 22:16 23:4 | 119:4 |
| quoting | 176:25 | realistic | reasons 23:14 | 116:16 | record 5:12 | 25:5 85:13 | reiterate |
| 156:25 | ratio 20:12 | 62:11 256:7 | 26:3 27:6 | recess 181:4,5 | 9:7 38:3 | 86:2 198:10 | 85:18 |
|  | 80:19 136:3 | reality 9:12 | 58:22 | 274:10 | 39:4 47:24 | referred | 124:25 |
| R | 142:6,25 | 227:20 | 150:25 | recessed | 53:7 90:9 | 151:11 | 241:4 |
| raise 141:14 | 143:3 | realize 27:16 | 264:24 | 274:15 | 124:25 | referring | relate 185:10 |
| raised 22:13 | re-budgeting | 129:10 | reassess | recession | 126:21 | 150:10 | related 55:14 |
| 22:18 23:4 | 45:5 | realizes | 225:19 | 72:22 85:7 | 136:25 | 177:22 | 164:25 |
| 104:10 | re-RFP | 185:21 | 226:20 | recipients | 143:17 | 265:17 | relates 6:5 |
| 190:17 | 113:22 | reallocation | 249:2 | 146:23 | 150:7 | reflect 142:7 | 7:19 166:4 |
| 241:13 | reach 113:16 | 49:14 | reassessed | recognize | 156:21 | 168:16 | relationship |
| raises 106:19 | 159:17 | really 7:21 | 32:12 | 137:7 269:3 | 191:6 | 182:17 | 31:16,21 |
| ramping | reached | 8:3 9:10 | 211:19 | recognized | 203:21 | 211:10 | 184:20 |
| 53:11 | 29:10,20,23 | 10:15 11:10 | 212:7 214:7 | 218:17 | 222:10 | 269:2 | 220:25 |
| range 26:8 | 147:3 | 16:9 18:6 | 214:10,17 | recognizes | 225:24 | reflected | relationships |
| 178:22 | reaches | 22:23 25:20 | 268:19 | 12:23 22:6 | recreational | 14:16 33:11 | 108:11,20 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 231:12 } \\ \text { ranks } 37: 14 \end{gathered}$ | 186:13 | 27:11 31:3 | 270:2 | 26:21 32:18 | 149:15 | 36:14 99:12 | relative 49:20 |


| relatively | 225:4 | 11:12,22 | 42:17 54:5 | resulting | 11:2 80:21 | 113:15 | 274:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 109:2 | reporter | 176:18 | 55:22 57:12 | 142:22 | 81:20 82:11 | 114:20 | right-size |
| 141:23 | 275:24 | reserves | 59:21 | results 79:25 | 83:7 88:2 | 115:16,21 | 96:20 |
| reliance | reporting | 19:16 72:19 | 171:18 | 143:19 | 122:5 | 115:22 | rising 152:15 |
| 158:12 | 163:12 | reserving | 183:22 | retail 182:25 | reverend | 116:18 | risk 19:14 |
| remain | reports 5:23 | 24:15 | 203:24 | retired | 172:25 | 118:19 | 71:18 142:9 |
| 189:24 | 183:15 | residency | 208:2,3,8 | 161:11 | review 32:25 | 119:9 | 149:19 |
| 190:5,7 | represent | 193:6 | 231:2 | 172:20 | 107:24 | 122:23 | 219:10,13 |
| remained | 19:18 | resident | 239:20 | 174:3 | 110:19 | 124:22 | 219:20 |
| 163:10 | 183:25 | 258:3 | respect 2:25 | 193:15 | 126:14 | 131:25 | Ritz 150:17 |
| remains | 217:19 | residential | 126:24 | retirement | 184:11 | 138:24 | Rizzo 250:25 |
| 141:9,23 | 262:3 | 19:10 20:16 | 159:22 | 3:24 145:25 | 218:25 | 140:20,21 | RMXs |
| 227:17 | representat... | 20:19 | 187:4 | 146:10 | 234:25 | 148:21 | 239:14 |
| remap 239:11 | 71:22 | 184:12 | 188:19 | return 7:19 | Revised 2:21 | 150:19 | road 72:22 |
| remapped | representat... | 200:4 | 209:6 | 18:17 19:8 | revisions | 153:25 | Rob 4:3,4,13 |
| 236:22 | 52:7 | 202:14 | 267:25 | 21:12 49:8 | 183:16 | 155:17 | 19:13 38:19 |
| remapping | representat... | 206:23 | respectfully | 49:10 73:23 | 196:6 | 156:11 | 41:14 44:3 |
| 236:24 | 4:17 190:23 | 207:7,10,17 | 147:4 | 119:10 | 227:12 | 159:21 | 44:14,14 |
| remember | 230:3 | 214:13 | respects | 142:2,8,12 | Reynolds | 160:14,16 | 68:18 75:25 |
| 25:22 39:10 | represented | 224:8 | 107:21 | 147:21,22 | 1:15 32:19 | 165:7 | 77:11 98:24 |
| 75:25 | 141:15 | 231:15,20 | respond | 147:24 | 136:22 | 167:10 | 99:3 127:19 |
| 122:14 | 218:15 | 234:7,17,20 | 229:24 | 148:5 | rezoned | 169:14 | 129:9 |
| 130:11 | representing | 236:18 | response | 156:14,16 | 269:17 | 172:3 173:2 | 140:24 |
| removed | 146:5 | 238:8 | 20:23 168:4 | 156:24 | 271:10 | 175:10,25 | 160:11 |
| 158:15 | 233:20 | 240:14 | 180:19 | 157:3,5,11 | RFP 29:25 | 191:5,12 | 230:25 |
| rent 189:15 | represents | 249:3 | responsibili... | 157:15,16 | 115:13 | 192:14 | 254:10 |
| 190:11,13 | 142:9 | 257:13 | 52:13 | 157:19 | 206:11 | 197:3 | Robby 99:3 |
| 262:19,22 | reproduction | 260:8,10 | responsible | 158:7,22,25 | Rick 52:2 | 198:17 | role 91:8 |
| rents 190:6 | 275:21 | 262:16 | 169:21 | 159:3,5 | right 7:8,17 | 200:23,24 | 92:13,14 |
| repayment | request 4:24 | 263:3 | 170:12 | 162:2 | 10:6,15,20 | 201:24 | 94:9 169:12 |
| 110:25 | 13:21 47:6 | 265:23 | 181:24 | returns 49:18 | 11:6 12:22 | 203:2 | 171:18,19 |
| Repeat 35:4 | 141:7 147:4 | residentially | 187:22 | 74:14 | 14:3 18:9 | 208:21 | 176:21 |
| replace 59:4 | 154:12 | 244:20 | rest 62:8 | 119:25 | 23:25 29:21 | 210:7 | rolls 138:11 |
| 76:15 204:6 | 219:24 | 245:5 | 75:15 123:8 | 158:9,14,16 | 34:6 35:21 | 213:19 | 184:3 |
| replaced 59:8 | requested 5:5 | residents | 197:23 | 177:6,18 | 37:23 41:3 | 216:15 | roof 269:22 |
| replacement | 141:10 | 190:18 | restaurants | 178:8,9,11 | 42:11 44:2 | 228:4 | room 1:6 |
| 56:9 | 194:15 | 238:25 | 183:4 | 178:23 | 45:25 51:5 | 234:12 | 167:6 |
| replacing | requesting | 241:22 | restoration | Rev 172:24 | 51:9 53:25 | 240:24 | 168:25 |
| 93:12 | 186:11 | 242:6 | 106:20 | revealed | 57:24 59:11 | 241:22 | 252:11 |
| report 39:7 | requests | 246:16 | restrictions | 144:2 | 64:15,25 | 243:12 | 274:12 |
| 85:2 91:12 | 25:17 | 250:11 | 189:15,15 | revenue 15:7 | 65:11 66:16 | 247:22 | Rose 38:3 |
| 92:20 | require 93:14 | resolution | 189:22 | 21:16 28:12 | 68:14,17 | 251:16 | rotational |
| 127:22 | required | 1:18 2:6,8 | 190:17 | 43:4 72:18 | 69:9,16 | 252:8 | 125:25 |
| 160:21 | 253:15 | 2:18,19 | restructured | 77:23 81:25 | 72:13 73:9 | 256:10 | rough 114:20 |
| 161:8 | requirements | 117:23 | 142:17 | 107:14,19 | 73:11 74:8 | 262:4,7,24 | roughly |
| 177:11 | 33:15 | resolved | result 10:23 | 118:25 | 76:24 79:4 | 263:9,14 | 72:11 |
| 197:9 | requiring | 107:18 | 77:25 78:6 | 122:10 | 82:3 92:9 | 264:23 | 154:13 |
| 247:25 | 72:17 | resonating | 108:12 | 190:17 | 93:25 94:2 | 265:6 267:8 | 202:18 |
| 249:23 | research | 38:6 | 128:6 | 198:19 | 94:9 95:19 | 268:9 | 207:11 |
| reported | 183:18 | resource 57:4 | 144:17 | 203:16 | 100:17 | 269:22 | round 75:3 |
| 78:25 | 205:19 | 238:11 | 197:8 | 205:14 | 101:12 | 271:4 | 96:2 120:6 |
| 224:11,15 | 214:4 | 239:20,22 | 219:13 | 230:23 | 102:12 | 272:18,22 | 160:10 |
| 224:19 | reserve 5:24 | resources | 252:6 | revenues 6:20 | 105:14,21 | 273:9 274:4 | routinely |


| 110:17 | 162:24 | 234:2 235:2 | schools 40:8 | 191:2 | sending 67:12 | sessions | 111:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| row 170:23 | 163:23 | 236:23 | 77:15 78:3 | 195:20 | 187:18 | 146:10 | 131:23 |
| RPR-Notary | 164:2,17 | 239:16 | 78:7,19 | 196:6 | 206:9 | set $72: 18$ | 132:21 |
| 275:15 | 165:2,12,20 | 247:24 | 79:25 | 209:10 | sends 67:2 | 149:5 | 155:14,16 |
| rule 251:2 | 166:3,11,22 | saying 11:21 | Scott 173:13 | 210:10,22 | senior 172:5 | 195:24 | 165:11 |
| 253:17 | 167:14,23 | 15:12 19:7 | seat 105:19 | 211:6,8,14 | 172:15 | 196:17 | 236:6 |
| rules 153:3 | 168:18 | 20:6,17 | SEC 108:3 | 214:3,12 | 220:15 | 231:2,6 | showed 47:21 |
| 153:12 | 174:18 | 39:7 61:6 | second 6:11 | 215:23 | seniors | setting 162:6 | 215:19 |
| run 6:18 10:8 | 232:13,18 | 61:22 84:10 | 17:16 18:23 | 216:21,22 | 243:11 | 200:13 | showing |
| 18:22 29:2 | 232:19 | 101:24 | 73:10 104:8 | 223:8,23 | sense 21:18 | seven 36:23 | 131:19 |
| 177:15 | 233:19 | 102:16 | 130:16 | 224:23 | 23:18 24:9 | 57:24 83:6 | 144:3 |
| 241:10 | 234:22 | 161:24 | 168:8 | 233:8,13 | 44:2 48:17 | 107:5 | 159:25 |
| running | 235:9 236:9 | 179:8 | 177:22 | 236:16 | 122:14 | severe 130:21 | 160:2 |
| 51:23 | 236:17 | 204:15,18 | 194:2 | 237:20 | 207:2,5 | severely | 176:24 |
| 221:17 | 237:6,23 | 210:11 | 243:18 | 239:6 | sensitive | 234:4 | shown 17:23 |
| 241:11 | 238:20 | 215:7 | 262:10,17 | 240:18 | 246:7 | sewer 251:25 | 99:17 |
| 255:23 | 239:24 | 216:14 | 262:20 | 242:4,25 | separate 42:8 | Shahied | shows 33:23 |
| 256:4 261:7 | 241:15 | 227:23 | 266:12 | 243:5,9 | 117:15,16 | 174:9,12,15 | 33:24 80:16 |
| runs 52:3 | 244:5 | 228:18 | section 63:20 | 244:7,7 | 217:21 | Shamika | 86:8 89:17 |
|  | 245:22 | 236:8 | 65:13 227:4 | 245:10 | separately | 140:20 | 111:24 |
| S | 248:22 | 243:11 | 236:2 | 253:3 | 138:5 | 169:17 | 131:5,6 |
| S 1:11 | 250:12,22 | 244:16 | sector 14:23 | 258:10,10 | September | 171:5 | 138:6 177:3 |
| safe 117:4 | 260:18 | 257:2 | sectors | 258:18 | 129:20 | 173:20,23 | side 231:17 |
| SAFER 99:9 | 261:15 | 263:20 | 232:22 | 259:4 | 130:12 | 174:6 | 234:17,20 |
| 99:15 | 263:11 | 265:5 | secure 110:12 | 260:21 | 176:24 | Shamika's | 241:9 |
| Saint 173:14 | 264:3 265:7 | 269:11 | secured 99:6 | 263:21 | series 91:13 | 140:21 | 253:22 |
| salaries | 266:7 | 271:9 | Securities | 271:4 273:3 | serious 71:20 | Shank 123:16 | 256:13,14 |
| 168:22 | 267:18 | says 82:4 | 124:5 | 273:12 | 102:23 | share 11:21 | 264:24 |
| 169:2 | Sanchez's | 83:20 | 144:11 | seek 144:4 | 246:22 | 95:20 | Siebert |
| salary 16:7,9 | 69:3 | 101:22 | see 4:21 | 185:7 | serve 145:9 | 233:22 | 123:15,16 |
| 34:8 35:15 | Saskia 90:18 | 131:10 | 16:15 18:19 | seeking 30:20 | service 9:20 | shared 36:12 | sign 64:17,17 |
| 35:16 163:3 | 90:25 222:6 | 155:8 | 21:15,16,23 | seeks 185:2 | 33:13,14,24 | 190:23 | signal 67:2,11 |
| sale 224:11 | 222:12 | 175:12,17 | 35:24 36:9 | seen 67:8 | 34:15 35:22 | sharing 42:14 | signed 87:5 |
| 224:16,17 | sat 122:16 | 197:9 | 41:2 43:3 | 88:6,7 | 107:2 111:3 | sharp 200:6 | 222:16 |
| sales 15:6 | satisfy $24: 19$ | 199:18 | 48:16,20 | 166:16 | 111:7 | shed $82: 8$ | 254:3,5,20 |
| 74:5,12 | save 18:22 | 200:22 | 53:14 70:11 | 231:10,11 | 114:23 | sheet 53:18 | 255:18 |
| 182:18 | 19:21 64:16 | 249:10 | 88:8,22 | 235:4 | 131:14 | shift 31:12 | significant |
| 184:17 | 204:16 | scale 61:16 | 101:6 | selecting | 134:3,7 | 97:10 | 15:23 25:4 |
| 200:23,25 | saved 21:5 | scenario 8:15 | 103:25 | 145:5 | 135:3,20,22 | shock 234:19 | 82:10 113:5 |
| 223:19,22 | saving 61:17 | 266:18 | 124:14 | self-manage | 137:23 | 237:15 | 124:17 |
| 238:17 | 115:19,22 | schedule | 129:9 | 145:21 | 169:24 | shopping | significantly |
| 244:7 | 115:23 | 139:3,5 | 132:16 | self-serve | 175:13 | 182:25 | 31:15 |
| Sanchez 53:2 | savings | scheduled | 133:12 | 179:22 | 181:19 | short 73:12 | 145:11 |
| 53:5,21 | 107:11 | 141:13 | 135:12 | sell 227:21,22 | 193:4 | 119:24 | signs 65:9 |
| 54:11,14 | 252:3,11 | school 11:20 | 136:19 | 234:13 | 207:22 | 181:5 | silos 95:8 |
| 55:24 56:8 | saw 10:21 | 40:16 77:20 | 137:3 150:7 | 269:13 | services 17:5 | 193:21 | 185:18 |
| 56:19,23 | 64:22 | 77:24 79:6 | 152:11 | seminar | 74:24 76:19 | short-term | similar 9:22 |
| 57:8,20 | 103:12 | 80:20 81:13 | 158:14 | 146:18 | 95:15 97:4 | 117:13 | 45:6 150:4 |
| 58:6,9,13 | 129:15 | 83:8,15 | 160:7 167:8 | seminars | 110:21 | 118:4 | 177:3,4,17 |
| 60:2 61:5 | 187:23 | 84:8 173:8 | 173:18 | 146:14 | 165:14 | 122:22 | 213:14 |
| 61:11 62:13 | 196:19 | 203:18 | 179:14 | send 71:19 | 174:13 | show 12:3,14 | 234:8 235:6 |
| 62:18 63:5 | 212:9 | schooled 72:6 | 180:25 | 88:18 | servicing | 12:20 35:25 | similarly 8:8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63:14 } \\ & 161: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 214:13 | 86:23 | 187:16 | 187:23 | 220:12 | 43:23 81:21 | 35:14 |


| simpler 260:8 | 264:7,18 | sounds 19:13 | 173:12 | 62:14 123:8 | 177:14 | steps 254:18 | 193:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| simply 33:8 | smaller 34:19 | 35:23 72:13 | 265:19,24 | 140:23 | starting | steroids | study 91:5,21 |
| 136:24 | 35:9,10 | 82:22 | spinoff 7:24 | 141:15,16 | 82:16 150:6 | 53:18 | 92:17 95:21 |
| single 217:17 | 48:20 | 255:17 | 8:16 | 141:20 | 169:13 | stick 162:6 | 143:14 |
| Sinking 3:23 | 187:12 | South 20:2 | split 62:7 | 144:8 | 178:24 | 200:22 | 144:2 |
| 106:10,12 | smart 174:11 | speak 221:22 | spoke 126:10 | 153:17 | 213:20 | 214:18 | 163:18 |
| 110:24 | 174:16 | 222:6 230:2 | 226:16 | 168:23 | 225:16,19 | sticker | stuff 5:17 |
| 111:14 | Smith 75:25 | 254:10 | spoken | 170:17 | 243:5,9 | 234:19 | 25:14 58:18 |
| 126:22,25 | 76:16 | 270:11,16 | 123:25 | 173:25 | starts 248:15 | 237:15 | 63:8 167:7 |
| 134:5 | smoking | 270:20 | sponsors | 175:12,18 | state 11:14 | sticking | 191:5 237:7 |
| sir 4:9 77:6 | 149:14 | speaking | 144:10 | 183:19 | 45:5 47:23 | 167:2 239:4 | 264:23 |
| 147:8 170:9 | smoothly | 213:8 | 167:15 | 186:20 | 72:10 78:10 | stimulate | 265:11 |
| sit 254:4 | 222:22 | speaks 225:2 | spot 76:24 | 188:19 | 79:18 80:3 | 242:11 | Stukes-Bay... |
| 268:17 | social 9:21 | spearheading | 94:18 | 190:25 | 81:16,17 | Stitt 2:7 3:12 | 144:15 |
| 272:24 | 97:20 145:4 | 171:3 222:7 | spreadsheet | 192:9 | 82:15 87:24 | 130:13 | sub 238:5 |
| sitting 269:23 | sold 223:9,10 | special | 110:10 | 193:18 | 88:3,11 | 176:23 | sub-univers... |
| situation | 234:12 | 217:10 | square | 221:16 | 119:4 | stock 147:20 | 187:12 |
| 27:23 150:9 | solely 48:8,9 | specialized | 233:25 | 257:9,11 | 149:16 | 152:14 | subgroup |
| 153:19 | solicit 153:5 | 192:24 | 236:2 | staffer 34:9 | 152:23 | 158:17 | 212:6 |
| 220:24 | solve 193:12 | specific 23:12 | 269:13 | 35:17 | 153:3,8 | stoked 45:11 | subjective |
| 235:11 | somebody | 129:21 | Squilla 1:16 | staffing | 156:21 | stool 73:21 | 83:12 |
| 261:25 | 16:3 19:4 | 130:2 153:2 | 221:8,9,14 | 141:12 | state's 88:12 | stop 28:6 | submit |
| six 2:11 36:23 | 19:25 | 209:12 | 221:15 | 186:7 | 88:15,19 | 177:21 | 217:16 |
| 89:18,19 | 176:11 | 210:17 | 223:4 224:2 | stages 185:12 | state-of-the... | stops 262:4 | 219:20 |
| 107:5 131:5 | 231:4 | 213:25 | 224:21 | stand 74:7 | 185:22 | stores 183:3,4 | 253:16 |
| 131:19 | somewhat | 226:23 | 225:7,18 | 181:3 253:7 | stated 14:4 | 203:3 | submitted 3:2 |
| 135:15 | 197:11 | 233:18 | 226:8 | standard | 148:3,12 | 265:22 | 141:3 |
| 137:24 | son 246:3 | 266:10 | 227:14,18 | 120:14 | statement | stories 262:10 | 175:21 |
| 141:10 | soon 149:13 | 273:18 | 228:5,23 | standardized | 4:22 21:2 | 262:18 | subsequent |
| 233:11 | sooner 59:19 | specifically | 229:8,14 | 110:12 | 46:10 | story 38:5 | 115:5 |
| 239:6 | 255:20,23 | 62:5 122:6 | 230:7,21 | standards | 149:22 | 223:25 | 199:22 |
| size 260:13 | sorry 44:17 | 158:8 165:9 | 231:14,23 | 93:9,15 | statistical | 225:4 | 211:15 |
| skew 33:11 | 100:3 | 210:20 | 232:5,9 | 94:13 | 183:19 | straight 97:8 | subsequently |
| 168:22 | 104:18 | specifics | 233:21 | 186:17 | 245:11 | strain 161:5 | 150:15 |
| skipped | 105:14,22 | 178:8 | 241:14 | standpoint | 248:6 | strategies | subset 219:25 |
| 157:21 | 105:24 | speculate | 256:23,24 | 70:3 87:8 | statistically | 170:15 | subsidies |
| skyrocketing | 133:23 | 17:13 | 257:8 | stands 274:10 | 242:21,25 | street 259:8 | 250:4 |
| 235:20 | 134:16 | speculating | 258:14 | start 30:6 | statistics 88:2 | 265:19 | substantial |
| slashed 40:3 | 152:4 | 67:4 271:3 | 259:5 261:4 | 56:16,22 | 197:7 248:3 | Streets 97:9 | 26:2 183:25 |
| slightly 78:24 | 157:20 | spend 7:11 | 261:10 | 109:13 | 248:4 | strengtheni... | subtracted |
| 129:18 | 175:15 | 26:14 66:13 | stability | 135:6 | status 27:13 | 141:6 | 81:20 |
| 141:8 | 199:16 | 94:23 | 37:14 | 136:10 | 162:12 | stressed | success 20:12 |
| slip 39:23 | 223:2 232:3 | 183:13 | stabilized | 138:22 | 185:10 | 108:25 | 21:23 207:7 |
| slow 112:3 | 251:6 | 196:13 | 211:10 | 149:14 | statutorily | stretch 169:6 | successful |
| 229:15 | 256:24 | spending | stable 5:21 | 225:19 | 185:9 | strictly 225:5 | 12:5 194:22 |
| slows 230:4,6 | 271:15 | 3:17 9:15 | 39:10 | 226:10 | stay 102:20 | strong 229:5 | 194:25 |
| Slusser | 272:18 | 9:24 21:20 | Stacey 171:7 | 238:2 242:3 | 163:11 | strongly | 195:13 |
| 254:24 | sort 54:21 | 63:21 | 171:8,13 | 253:4 257:2 | staying 60:24 | 19:22 | successfully |
| small 38:24 | 55:9 119:18 | spends 39:7 | 174:6 | started 81:2 | stays 119:9 | structural | 109:17 |
| 48:21 85:15 | 201:11 | spent 11:20 | staff 33:23 | 82:25 83:9 | steering 52:5 | 52:13 | succession |
| 151:18 | 205:23 | 18:15,21 | 36:14,24 | 93:3 98:23 | 52:18 | structure | 271:10 |
| 232:24 | 259:20 | 22:25 30:22 | 40:7 42:14 | 158:16 | stenographic | 70:6 261:24 | suggestion |
| 239:14 | sound 102:15 | 94:25 | 47:15,17 | 173:21 | 275:6 | struggle | 19:15 |


| suggestions | 136:9,12 | 205:16 | 272:4 273:5 | 272:24 | 125:15,23 | 174:6 | 274:5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 149:10 | 147:19 | 221:17 | taken 190:15 | $\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a x }} 8: 515: 6$ | 125:24 | term 7:5 9:15 | thank 3:12 |
| summarized | 154:11 | 222:24 | 190:20 | 44:25 45:3 | tech 188:19 | 43:2 56:17 | 5:12 12:25 |
| 4:22 | 165:23 | 223:6 252:8 | 245:3 270:5 | 74:5,13 | technical | 59:3 87:4,7 | 20:20 22:8 |
| summary | 170:24 | 255:3,10,13 | 275:6 | 75:21,22 | 185:16 | 132:6,14 | 26:18,20,23 |
| 133:18,19 | 197:24 | 255:19,23 | takes 63:2 | 76:11,13,16 | 245:18 | 133:14 | 32:14,17,20 |
| 141:2 | 199:25 | 257:20 | 152:2 | 79:9 88:2 | 246:17 | 222:16 | 38:10,12,14 |
| 175:10 | 201:23 | 260:3,24 | 205:13 | 104:14,22 | technically | terminated | 38:17 41:13 |
| summer | 202:12 | 261:7 | 228:6 | 104:22 | 53:17 | 165:10 | 44:3,6,9 |
| 206:11 | 205:25 | systems 54:4 | Taliaferro | 107:19 | technology | terms 7:11 | 48:2 52:23 |
| supervises | 207:4 | 55:23 56:2 | 140:20 | 182:9,12 | 53:12 57:22 | 8:2 10:19 | 63:14,16,18 |
| 171:9 | 220:19 | 59:14 92:8 | 169:17,20 | 184:19,23 | 92:12 93:20 | 21:22 30:2 | 68:6,9,18 |
| supervision | 221:4 | 93:11,14,18 | 170:4 | 188:20 | 93:25 96:18 | 31:15 57:11 | 68:22,24 |
| 275:23 | 222:21 | 118:11,13 | talk 6:3 8:5,8 | 194:18 | 97:13,15,24 | 113:6 120:4 | 77:3,3,9 |
| supervisor | 235:22 | 118:15,16 | 22:3 53:6 | 195:4 196:2 | 98:6 110:4 | 120:10 | 84:16,18,21 |
| 174:12 | 236:4 |  | 63:7 90:20 | 196:4,25 | 164:24 | 188:2,4 | 86:15,18 |
| support | 239:18 | T | 98:10 116:2 | 205:15 | 204:16 | 190:8,8 | 89:2,3,5,9 |
| 20:16,18 | 245:6 | table 4:7 | 127:14 | 210:24 | tell 67:20 | 191:13 | 95:16,19 |
| 40:5,13,19 | 267:17 | 90:23 | 163:8 | 211:3,23 | 104:13 | 194:16 | 96:2,5 |
| 40:19 41:2 | 272:12 | 103:17 | 236:19 | 213:22,23 | 114:13 | 195:11 | 98:13,14,16 |
| 58:3,5 59:9 | 273:16 | 140:9 | 259:22 | 251:24 | 161:3 | 208:21 | 98:19 |
| 68:19 70:16 | surface 38:7 | 181:10 | talked 15:6 | 266:14 | 167:10 | 219:3 | 100:19,23 |
| 70:17 73:21 | surpassed | 198:15 | 19:24 25:7 | tax-abated | 169:19 | 221:21,23 | 101:13,19 |
| 124:9 | 146:22 | 208:20 | 60:7 61:16 | 234:11 | 175:10 | 229:19 | 103:3,5,7 |
| 144:25 | surpassing | 222:4 | 72:4 78:23 | tax-paying | 176:4 | 238:17 | 111:19 |
| 206:23 | 143:25 | 254:14 | 114:10 | 72:8 75:4 | 205:19 | 244:17 | 116:21 |
| 207:10 | 163:20 | tables 133:19 | 148:18 | tax-support... | 238:22 | 253:24 | 119:14 |
| supporter | surrounding | take 5:10 | 231:8 | 135:22 | 239:7 | territory | 122:13,24 |
| 100:25 | 248:14 | 6:21 28:5 | 251:23 | taxable | 259:15 | 83:12 | 123:2,5,6,9 |
| supportive | sustain 100:9 | 43:6 50:2 | talking 11:18 | 185:10 | 262:20 | testify 3:25 | 123:22 |
| 41:4 | 100:14 | 55:13 | 12:8 18:25 | 198:7,23 | 265:15 | 186:19 | 124:8 |
| Suppose | swath 226:4 | 118:19 | 31:13 38:5 | 199:2,5 | telling 152:6 | testimony | 126:18,20 |
| 66:18 | swayed | 121:2,23 | 45:12 53:19 | taxes 23:9 | 223:24 | 3:21 4:21 | 127:5,7,10 |
| supposed | 259:20 | 147:19 | 56:20 77:18 | 75:12,14,17 | 225:4 269:6 | 5:9,13 14:4 | 128:17,18 |
| 30:4,11 | sweeps | 148:7 150:3 | 85:25 122:6 | 75:22 79:24 | ten 6:12 | 22:14 32:25 | 128:19,20 |
| 242:10,12 | 117:24 | 189:14 | 188:8,18 | 187:8 | 138:11 | 77:21 83:19 | 128:23 |
| sure 13:6,25 | 122:22 | 190:25 | 218:25 | 188:24 | 156:15 | 84:2 85:9 | 129:2 |
| 16:11 26:11 | switch 254:2 | 192:22 | 230:22 | 220:8 | 157:24 | 103:4 | 136:14,15 |
| 39:21 41:15 | system 33:5 | 205:2 | 255:21 | 241:13 | 159:4 177:6 | 105:23 | 136:16,18 |
| 42:5,17 | 33:16 40:16 | 212:20 | 273:11 | 244:13 | 193:8,9 | 106:11 | 136:23 |
| 44:4 54:16 | 54:17 55:6 | 215:15 | talks 133:18 | 245:14 | 262:4 | 111:12,19 | 137:10,11 |
| 59:6,8 | 55:10,21 | 218:13 | tangled | 251:14 | ten-year | 111:21 | 137:13,15 |
| 60:21 69:4 | 56:12,24 | 223:17 | 245:19 | 252:22 | 157:19 | 124:11,15 | 137:18 |
| 69:17 75:4 | 57:11,13,13 | 224:5 | 246:14 | 270:8 | 159:6 193:6 | 126:23 | 139:19,20 |
| 86:5 88:8 | 57:16 59:2 | 226:18 | 247:3 | taxpayer | tend 168:22 | 140:4,14 | 139:20,21 |
| 92:21 96:18 | 93:13 110:6 | 229:18 | target 27:8 | 197:11 | 174:5 196:8 | 141:3 | 139:22,25 |
| 102:20,23 | 110:12 | 232:14 | 102:20,24 | 229:25 | 212:12 | 147:10,13 | 140:3,5 |
| 104:11 | 118:17,20 | 237:4 242:8 | 135:21 | taxpayers | 215:23 | 175:17 | 141:3 147:6 |
| 105:16 | 146:10 | 260:20 | 136:4 | 16:24 182:8 | 216:2,6 | 180:10 | 147:8 |
| 113:12 | 182:9 | 261:2 | task 226:15 | 251:22 | tends 226:24 | 181:20 | 153:25 |
| 120:15 | 185:14,23 | 263:16 | tasked | team 125:11 | Teresa | 186:25 | 154:4 |
| 121:6 131:3 | 204:4,12,15 | 266:19 | 229:20 | 174:18,21 | 170:25 | 251:19 | 161:12,14 |
| 131:8 133:7 | 204:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 268: 9 \\ & 271: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 244:10 | teams 125:10 | 171:5,7 | 254:25 | 161:21 |


| 167:24,25 | 211:11 | 57:17,18 | 203:19 | 182:21 | 49:22 50:25 | titles 2:8 | track 143:17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 168:3 170:8 | 236:5 | 59:5,10,11 | 205:18 | thought 13:9 | 54:5 57:11 | 246:12 | 150:7 |
| 170:10 | 263:25 | 60:7 61:25 | 206:7 | 20:25 25:13 | 58:2 59:13 | TMS 110:6 | trade-off 6:16 |
| 174:23,24 | things 6:8,22 | 62:4,9,16 | 207:14,25 | 54:8 63:3 | 67:8 69:8 | 110:11 | 7:4 25:11 |
| 175:5,8 | 7:2 8:19,21 | 62:17,21 | 208:4,13,24 | 65:22 87:10 | 76:4 77:20 | 118:16 | 42:24 73:2 |
| 180:8,9,12 | 8:24 10:11 | 63:8 64:8 | 212:18,19 | 206:22 | 77:22 78:4 | today 3:13,21 | 73:3,6 |
| 180:20,22 | 15:3 25:20 | 65:19,21 | 214:11 | 207:18,23 | 91:16 96:22 | 4:15 10:22 | tradition |
| 181:7 | 39:2 48:20 | 67:6,8,16 | 219:2 | 240:7 | 110:25 | 32:6 96:24 | 200:8 |
| 186:18,24 | 51:16,18 | 68:13 69:13 | 220:20 | thoughtful | 111:17 | 106:7 107:8 | 201:12 |
| 186:24 | 59:17 62:2 | 70:21 71:12 | 221:24 | 76:23 | 117:22 | 112:14 | traditional |
| 191:12 | 62:5 91:14 | 71:15,25 | 224:24 | thousand | 121:21 | 114:10 | 61:18 |
| 202:3,5 | 116:24 | 72:17,24 | 228:2,3 | 188:9 | 127:20 | 121:17 | traditionally |
| 209:13,15 | 118:13,23 | 75:13 76:22 | 230:18 | 195:22 | 174:14,15 | 140:19 | 268:2 |
| 209:16,19 | 121:4 122:7 | 77:21 78:20 | 231:24 | 212:18 | 174:15 | 181:16 | trained 86:23 |
| 217:13 | 127:15 | 78:21 79:14 | 239:22 | thousands | 177:19 | 190:24 | training |
| 221:5,6,9 | 128:6,13 | 81:9 82:8 | 240:4,11 | 46:4,14 | 180:5,5,24 | 203:23,25 | 87:15 |
| 232:12,12 | 135:8 | 82:22 84:2 | 241:5,6,8 | 146:11 | 193:6 | 254:4 274:5 | 146:12 |
| 239:25 | 151:16 | 84:6,10 | 244:3,24 | threats 11:12 | 207:18 | today's 98:6 | 167:6 |
| 240:2,24 | 180:2 235:5 | 87:15 88:5 | 245:3,4 | 11:14,15 | 218:4,13 | told 160:11 | trajectory |
| 241:2 | 236:20,22 | 88:7,9,24 | 248:4,11,24 | three 37:18 | 219:3,10 | 160:11 | 31:10 |
| 246:20 | 240:15 | 91:14,24 | 249:21 | 40:2 48:13 | 220:16,21 | 165:13 | 114:11 |
| 247:9,13,15 | 246:6 | 92:21 95:4 | 252:2,8 | 51:15 72:5 | 223:5 | 243:14 | transaction |
| 248:21 | 259:13 | 95:9 96:9 | 253:7 | 90:7,17 | 229:10 | 250:25 | 113:6 |
| 256:16,18 | 260:4 262:5 | 96:19 97:6 | 254:16,23 | 93:22 94:19 | 234:2 | tongue 169:9 | 124:17,20 |
| 256:19,21 | 263:7,16 | 99:14 100:2 | 255:25 | 94:22 | 238:12 | tool 58:19 | 125:11 |
| 261:10,12 | 266:21 | 100:3,4,12 | 256:10,11 | 108:20,23 | 241:5 246:9 | tools 58:23 | transactions |
| 261:15 | think 6:18 | 101:3 | 256:13 | 109:4,5 | 250:23 | top 6:12 | 107:5,6,12 |
| 267:18,20 | 7:3 8:4 9:5 | 103:12 | 259:25 | 143:10 | 257:5 | 131:10 | 112:17 |
| 267:22 | 9:12,14 | 123:16 | 261:19,19 | 167:11 | 259:10 | 175:13 | 117:7 |
| 274:4,4,6 | 10:5 13:18 | 125:21 | 264:22 | 170:6 177:5 | 262:8 265:4 | 197:17 | 124:14 |
| 274:13 | 14:4 18:5 | 126:5 | 266:5 | 226:17 | 265:19,25 | TorreyCove | 125:4,14 |
| thanks 20:21 | 18:13,16 | 128:12 | 268:23 | 234:10 | 266:13 | 145:7 | 127:25 |
| 52:21 77:4 | 21:13,17,22 | 130:20 | 270:4 | 268:18 | 273:13 | total 16:16 | 223:10 |
| 183:21 | 21:24 24:8 | 132:15 | thinks 71:13 | three-fourths | 274:11 | 94:5 111:6 | transcript |
| 257:6 | 26:12 27:5 | 148:2,23 | third 90:12 | 200:9 201:7 | time-trended | 133:3,4 | 275:8,21 |
| theatres | 27:7,23 | 156:12 | 130:16 | 201:11 | 184:17 | 142:3 146:8 | transfer |
| 183:5 | 30:11,24 | 158:3,20,23 | 262:10,18 | three-quart... | timeframe | 164:18 | 61:21 66:23 |
| theory 92:6 | 31:5,20,22 | 159:8,12,13 | 262:20 | 227:9 | 143:5 | 197:15 | 91:11 119:3 |
| thing 10:4 | 36:22 37:11 | 160:5,11,13 | third-party | three-year | timeline | 203:10 | 246:4 |
| 17:16 19:9 | 37:12,13 | 162:16,17 | 145:9 | 143:17 | 53:15,24 | 210:21 | transferred |
| 102:17 | 40:4,17 | 162:18,21 | 218:15 | 157:10 | 92:3 218:21 | 212:22 | 246:2 |
| 113:10 | 41:3,16 | 163:20 | third-story | 158:11 | 221:25 | totaled 203:9 | transferring |
| 115:21 | 42:13 43:22 | 166:14 | 266:12 | throw 169:2 | 222:2 | totally 195:13 | 246:3 |
| 117:10 | 45:12 46:2 | 175:19 | Thirty 144:20 | 239:5 | timely 110:22 | 236:22 | transit-orie... |
| 121:22 | 47:16 48:12 | 176:24 | Thirty-one | thrown 187:4 | times 57:23 | 264:11,14 | 262:6 |
| 122:19 | 49:5,12,21 | 179:2 | 178:7 | tight 120:19 | 100:12 | totals 14:5 | transition |
| 130:2 136:7 | 50:9 51:7,9 | 189:24 | Thompson | tightly 52:4 | 122:10 | 106:16 | 145:13 |
| 152:6 | 51:14,22 | 190:18 | 90:19,25 | time 13:18 | 224:9 225:3 | 185:25 | transpire |
| 168:19 | 52:14,20 | 193:13 | 91:2 92:9 | 15:24 17:9 | 233:22 | touch 7:14 | 22:18 |
| 176:17 | 53:15,24 | 194:8 | 92:19 93:4 | 17:19 26:14 | timing 59:7 | tourism 64:2 | traumatic |
| 187:6 189:3 | 54:20 55:15 | 198:10,23 | 94:2,7 | 37:18 42:16 | title 245:19 | towers 188:13 | 226:5 |
| 194:2 | 55:19 56:13 | 199:7 200:8 | 222:6,11,12 | 42:22 43:7 | 246:14,18 | townhouses | Treasurer |
| 199:14,17 | 56:21,22 | 202:12 | thorough | 47:17,20 | 247:3 | 269:18 | 3:23 103:9 |


| 106:7,8 | 150:6 175:2 | twofold | 134:13 | 215:13 | 76:18 93:13 | 239:23 | 91:8 121:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 111:14 | 223:15 | 242:14 | 147:14 | 217:23,23 | 125:24 | 240:10 | 122:11 |
| 116:23 | 244:9 | tying 184:15 | 149:18 | 243:20 | 205:20 | 249:4,14,22 | 128:14 |
| 119:15 | 245:16 | type 40:4 | 198:4 204:4 | 269:18 | users 110:16 | 252:20 | 146:13 |
| 123:21 | 263:23 | 52:11 64:13 | 223:13,14 | universe | uses 183:7 | 253:25 | 177:8 |
| 126:8,23 | trying 10:10 | 69:25 76:16 | 227:22 | 143:15,25 | usually 48:19 | 263:9 268:3 | vary 15:19 |
| 127:7,14 | 42:6,9 | 149:5 151:6 | 230:8 239:2 | 163:18 | 156:5 | 268:16 | vast 120:2 |
| 137:21 | 83:13 91:18 | 152:9 | 241:16 | 166:15,17 | 248:25 | 269:9,21,25 | vastly $235: 7$ |
| Treasurer's | 100:13 | 211:16 | 244:14 | 184:12 | 257:2 | 270:2,9,17 | vehicles |
| 106:12 | 105:9 | 214:2 | 245:7 249:2 | universities | utilization | 270:21,24 | 142:20 |
| 173:5 | 148:19 | 220:24 | 260:9 | 185:6 | 143:14 | 271:13,20 | vendor 28:3 |
| treasury | 166:20 | 233:18 | 263:19 | 251:12 | 144:2 | 272:11 | 29:6,9,11 |
| 110:5 | 192:20 | 241:7 253:3 | understand... | unknown | 163:17 | 273:6 | 29:21 30:20 |
| tremendous | 236:21 | 258:17 | 182:3 | 72:22 | 261:22 | valued 148:8 | 254:6 256:2 |
| 220:7 | 237:16 | 266:2 | understand... | unnoticed | utilize 179:15 | 182:23 | vendor's |
| 248:13 | 239:11,15 | types 211:5 | 226:12 | 246:13 | utilized | 183:11 | 256:14 |
| 257:9 | 242:10 | 211:11 | understand... | unofficial | 207:21 | 188:11 | venture 151:5 |
| tremendously | 247:5 | 233:9 | 43:8 82:21 | 245:23 |  | 196:8 | verify 209:4 |
| 248:12 | 257:19 | typically 69:7 | 108:11 | unpopular | V | values 182:6 | versions |
| trend 5:24 | 262:5 | 119:11,16 | 124:16 | 75:9 | vacancies | 182:17 | 78:25 |
| 112:2 130:3 | 263:18 | 260:17,19 | understood | unrealistic | 89:25 90:5 | 184:15,21 | versus 69:20 |
| 273:2 | 267:4 | Tyrone | 36:7 63:13 | 236:12 | 163:6 | 189:6 | 110:23 |
| trending | Tuesday | 172:23 | 102:25 | unrecognized | vacant 183:6 | 202:14 | 138:8 |
| 242:21 | 120:19 |  | 154:11 | 137:9 | valleys | 203:8 | 142:15 |
| trends 238:18 | turn 245:25 | U | underutilized | 174:22 | 121:20,24 | 206:24 | 204:23 |
| 263:24 | two 6:4 13:15 | U.S 130:5 | 264:24 | untangle | valuable | 208:22 | 252:24 |
| 269:5 273:2 | 15:5 23:14 | ultimately | underway | 246:12 | 199:13 | 211:10 | 261:24 |
| tried 55:5 | 23:16 31:16 | 8:6 9:17 | 145:13 | up-and-co... | valuations | 212:23 | vet 153:20,20 |
| 137:7 256:9 | 32:24 41:5 | 10:6 148:25 | unfair 238:25 | 151:9 | 257:23 | 214:15 | 153:21 |
| trouble 227:3 | 47:21 51:18 | unanticipat... | 250:16 | upcoming | value 23:9 | 215:5,23 | vetting 23:2 |
| true 95:8 | 55:25 71:21 | 66:22 | unfortunat... | 185:2 | 75:14 | 217:24 | viewed 215:6 |
| 155:20 | 73:22,24,25 | uncertainties | 66:9 217:22 | update 27:13 | 106:24 | 218:2 235:7 | violence |
| 167:22,22 | 74:2 90:10 | 72:23 | 218:6 | 107:24 | 181:25 | 236:7 241:6 | 40:16 |
| 176:16 | 93:22 | uncertainty | 252:10 | 178:17 | 182:19 | 241:20 | virtually |
| 223:18,21 | 102:15 | 11:5 | unfunded | updated | 183:16 | 242:5 244:6 | 77:22 |
| 223:25 | 104:3 | underfundi... | 129:24 | 110:17 | 185:10,21 | 257:17 | visit 174:4 |
| 227:17 | 108:23 | 60:11 | uniformity | 234:2 | 199:18 | 258:17 | visitors 64:2 |
| 229:13 | 130:7 172:7 | underneath | 182:6 184:2 | updating | 200:9,10,11 | 263:24 | visits 146:13 |
| 230:14 | 172:12 | 233:17 | 184:6 | 136:11 | 200:17 | valuing | visual 238:13 |
| 275:7 | 176:19 | understand | 210:18 | upgrade | 201:10 | 189:10,12 | vital 95:5 |
| Trustee | 196:7 222:2 | 7:8 12:2 | 259:2,2,6 | 268:3,15 | 202:18 | 201:2 | volume 205:5 |
| 144:14 | 224:17 | 16:11 24:7 | 259:10,19 | 269:19 | 203:7 | Vanguard | 205:8 |
| trustees | 235:5 240:9 | 33:14 37:25 | 261:21 | upgraded | 210:22 | 172:6,19 | vote 152:25 |
| 170:14 | 242:18 | 46:24 67:11 | Unions | 257:14 | 211:20 | variance | voted 66:13 |
| 180:5 | 264:14 | 69:5 70:2 | 146:16 | 272:11 | 212:3,22 | 268:6 | 141:25 |
| truthfully | two-158:11 | 75:5 76:17 | unique | upgrades | 215:15 | 270:12 | votes 152:13 |
| 201:13 | two-day | 78:17,18 | 123:17 | 58:2 | 216:2,5,11 | 272:8 |  |
| try 5:15 6:19 | 146:18 | 80:4 83:13 | unit 173:16 | upper 37:14 | 216:12,18 | variances | W |
| 117:10 | two-part | 83:14,24 | 174:13,13 | 265:24 | 216:21,23 | 268:2 | wage 14:23 |
| 121:5 | 54:21 | 86:11 98:8 | 218:7 | upward | 216:25,25 | varies 16:6 | 15:12 75:22 |
| 122:20 | two-story | 102:19 | units 4:23 | 242:21 | 219:13 | 69:9 | 154:15 |
| 127:15 | 258:20,22 | 104:9 128:3 | 211:18 | urgent 25:15 | 220:9 | various 4:16 | 156:7,9 |
| 148:13 | 259:15,16 | $\begin{aligned} & 128: 9 \text { 131:3 } \\ & 131: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 212:23 | use 62:15 | $\begin{aligned} & 223: 18,19 \\ & 237: 3,20 \end{aligned}$ | 4:23 52:9 | wages $154: 19$ <br> wait 237:24 |


| 253:3 | 237:11,24 | 134:25 | 9:23 11:22 | 201:9,15 | 156:8,12 | went 19:3 | 144:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| waiting 82:5 | 237:24 | 251:25 | 12:17 14:21 | 204:5,9,16 | 162:17 | 20:5 50:13 | wondered |
| 250:3 263:4 | 238:22 | way 7:22 | 16:18 18:21 | 205:8,9 | 166:18,20 | 59:20 | 267:24 |
| waiver 193:6 | 239:16 | 11:15 13:15 | 19:13 25:3 | 206:8 | 167:3 | 150:22,23 | wondering |
| walk 29:15 | 241:15 | 13:17 14:24 | 25:22,25 | 208:25 | 187:14 | 167:11,12 | 65:9 66:5 |
| 204:22 | 249:6 256:4 | 16:13 18:21 | 26:13 27:20 | 210:11 | 190:20 | 167:17,18 | word 95:7 |
| 205:2 | 256:5,25 | 19:21 20:13 | 31:8,9 | 211:4 | 192:19 | 203:4,5 | work 26:13 |
| 264:12,13 | 262:8 | 33:25 45:11 | 39:15 40:12 | 213:20,21 | 194:15 | 229:2 | 28:24 35:12 |
| walked 29:13 | 264:17 | 60:20 64:9 | 40:18 42:6 | 213:22,24 | 211:20 | 232:21 | 47:15 51:21 |
| 103:12 | 266:17 | 73:4 76:19 | 45:9 48:11 | 219:2 | 218:10 | 234:11 | 55:3 68:20 |
| 238:7 251:3 | wanted 18:10 | 78:21 79:17 | 49:3 50:7,9 | 220:15,17 | 223:4 | 270:9 | 91:6,25 |
| want 11:11 | 22:10 68:18 | 94:12 100:4 | 53:7,7,10 | 228:2 | 225:21 | weren't 24:22 | 107:13 |
| 16:2 18:24 | 84:23 | 104:25,25 | 53:17 54:16 | 229:20 | 228:19 | 167:4 | 116:15 |
| 20:23 35:23 | 105:14 | 105:11 | 55:25 57:12 | 230:17 | 231:10,11 | 212:25 | 118:17 |
| 40:20 42:21 | 122:13 | 117:6 | 58:22 60:14 | 231:18 | 236:14,16 | 226:12 | 120:23,25 |
| 45:18 47:23 | 123:8 | 121:17 | 61:18 62:19 | 235:18 | 237:20 | 230:9 | 121:17 |
| 48:24 51:22 | 124:25 | 132:4 137:8 | 63:11 66:19 | 237:13 | 244:24 | 266:19 | 124:2 127:8 |
| 53:5 55:12 | 125:5,7 | 145:24 | 67:2,16 | 239:10 | 246:23 | West 173:7 | 137:4 |
| 56:2,15 | 136:25 | 155:23 | 73:11,12 | 242:7,10 | 247:7 | 241:19 | 168:13 |
| 59:6,7 | 154:10 | 157:9 182:4 | 81:9 82:5 | 243:23 | 251:22 | 243:8 | 171:10 |
| 62:22 68:11 | 163:8 164:7 | 185:8 | 87:23 90:9 | 244:10,19 | 255:14 | wherewithal | 193:11 |
| 68:21 69:4 | 176:17 | 190:14 | 90:18 91:21 | 244:19,21 | 266:14,15 | 228:8 | 195:7 204:9 |
| 69:17,24 | 191:20 | 203:10 | 91:22 92:10 | 248:24 | 267:15 | whichever | 220:20 |
| 75:4 90:8,8 | 244:14 | 204:6,20 | 93:16 | 249:7 252:8 | 268:23 | 247:10 | 229:22 |
| 94:17 96:11 | 247:18 | 215:10 | 102:24 | 254:16 | weakest 6:12 | white $34: 10$ | 262:24 |
| 105:19 | 256:2 | 245:12 | 111:25 | 255:11,13 | Wealth 76:2 | 35:18 163:3 | worked |
| 122:12 | 265:25 | 248:11 | 113:10 | 255:21 | wear 69:25 | 171:7 | 123:18 |
| 123:22 | wanting | 252:10 | 115:22 | 259:3 | Wednesday | wide 169:7 | 151:17 |
| 124:24 | 102:19 | 255:14 | 116:11,13 | 260:10,20 | 1:7 | wider 226:4 | 172:19 |
| 127:6,10 | wants 218:7 | 267:15 | 119:22 | 261:5 262:5 | weed 149:14 | widespread | 173:5 |
| 128:17 | 260:15 | ways $69: 18$ | 120:15,18 | 262:21 | week 11:7 | 76:12 | worker 97:20 |
| 129:8 131:2 | Ward 241:18 | WBE 113:7 | 121:18 | 263:20 | 12:9 19:25 | Wilds 181:18 | workforce |
| 131:8 | warehouse | we'll 8:19 | 126:21 | 265:9 266:5 | 22:14,23,25 | 192:11 | 96:23 |
| 132:13 | 269:12 | 28:3 31:25 | 128:4 | 266:9 | 22:25 23:13 | 193:24 | 248:10 |
| 137:20 | 271:9 | 43:23 63:6 | 133:10 | 267:14 | 30:9 107:9 | WILLIAM | 249:25 |
| 139:15 | warehouses | 100:13 | 136:7,12 | 268:20 | 112:15 | 1:12 | working |
| 140:3 | 183:5 | 107:9 | 138:18,20 | 273:7 | 197:9,19 | willing 19:14 | 31:21 54:15 |
| 156:20 | warned 114:9 | 133:11 | 138:24 | we've 11:13 | 231:8 | 65:11 | 54:22 59:23 |
| 161:23 | warning 65:5 | 138:7 140:7 | 139:10 | 15:5 37:13 | weekend | Wilmington | 60:8 68:23 |
| 164:2 | wash 265:4 | 165:25 | 148:11 | 39:14 45:11 | 47:23 | 173:5 | 69:24 91:17 |
| 165:23 | Washington | 179:5 | 155:12 | 48:11,25 | weekly 51:24 | wind $64: 11$ | 91:21 92:23 |
| 166:11 | 147:18 | 180:25 | 159:10,18 | 49:4,13,14 | 109:9 121:3 | winds 35:22 | 104:14,21 |
| 169:19 | wasn't 21:8 | 203:12 | 159:21 | 49:19 51:12 | weeks 29:23 | witness 4:6 | 105:6 110:3 |
| 176:9 191:9 | 27:17 65:8 | 204:19 | 162:21 | 67:871:13 | 254:19 | 90:22,22 | 114:3 |
| 192:6 202:9 | 84:8 105:16 | 223:16 | 163:19 | 91:16 92:22 | weigh 10:12 | 103:16,16 | 123:15,19 |
| 202:11 | 150:19,24 | 224:23 | 166:9 | 95:5 96:21 | weight | 140:8 181:9 | 124:2 204:8 |
| 206:23 | 162:19 | 230:19 | 176:14 | 100:11 | 261:24 | 198:14,14 | 220:25 |
| 212:3 219:8 | 201:12 | 238:12,15 | 179:3 181:7 | 104:5 | welcome | 222:3,3 | 249:16 |
| 223:6 226:2 | 207:4 235:2 | 238:19 | 187:8,18 | 114:10 | 63:23 77:6 | 254:13,13 | 250:7 257:3 |
| 227:19 | 248:16 | 254:19 | 188:8 | 116:16 | 101:16 | Witnesses 4:6 | 262:11 |
| 233:16,19 | 256:6 | 258:12 | 189:24 | 118:7,14 | 116:24 | 140:8 181:9 | works 28:22 |
| 234:4 | watch 137:3 | 266:8 | 199:13,18 | 123:24 | 161:16 | women 35:15 | 40:8 51:14 |
| 235:17,24 | water 107:7 | we're 5:9 6:15 | 200:12,15 | 127:17 | 180:11,15 | 143:22 | 58:8,10,12 |



| 90:1 91:1 | 196:1 197:1 | 202:22 | 2016 109:6 | 134:20 | 194:3,4 | 17:1 18:1 | 123:1 124:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 92:1 93:1 | 198:1 199:1 | 19 54:10 | 138:19 | 2023 2:11 | 30,000 10:2 | 19:1 20:1 | 125:1 126:1 |
| 94:1 95:1 | 200:1 201:1 | 90:14 102:3 | 141:24 | 3:20 | $300110: 13$ | 21:1 22:1 | 127:1 128:1 |
| 96:1 97:1 | 202:1 203:1 | 102:14 | 142:18 | 21 28:16 | 117:19,25 | 23:1 $24: 1$ | 129:1 130:1 |
| 98:1 99:1 | 204:1 205:1 | 111:24 | 177:12 | 255:7 | 30th 177:11 | 25:1 26:1 | 131:1 132:1 |
| 100:1 101:1 | 206:1 207:1 | 112:5 211:4 | 178:4,18 | 22 19:14,19 | 178:3 | 27:1 28:1 | 133:1 134:1 |
| 102:1 103:1 | 208:1 209:1 | 255:2,5,9 | 210:16 | 71:17 | 31 14:24 | 29:1 30:1 | 135:1 136:1 |
| 104:1 105:1 | 210:1 211:1 | 257:21 | 2017 1:7 2:25 | 111:24 | 178:9 | 31:1 32:1 | 137:1 138:1 |
| 106:1 107:1 | 212:1 213:1 | 261:5 | 83:22 | 113:17 | 319 234:12 | 33:1 34:1 | 139:1 140:1 |
| 108:1 109:1 | 214:1 215:1 | 19.6 203:6 | 106:18 | 134:8 | 31st 112:7 | 35:1 36:1 | 141:1 142:1 |
| 110:1 111:1 | 216:1 217:1 | 1960 96:13 | 111:6,10 | 135:25 | 32 194:6 | 37:1 38:1 | 143:1 144:1 |
| 112:1113:1 | 218:1 219:1 | 96:23 | 141:25 | 22,000 35:20 | 196:14,17 | 39:1 40:1 | 145:1 146:1 |
| 114:1 115:1 | 220:1 221:1 | 1967 160:13 | 144:14 | 220 134:9,21 | 329 133:24 | 41:1 42:1 | 147:1 148:1 |
| 116:1 117:1 | 222:1 223:1 | 160:15 | 145:14 | 2200 234:10 | 33 74:4 | 43:1 44:1 | 149:1 150:1 |
| 118:1 119:1 | 224:1 225:1 | 1987 160:13 | 146:6 157:2 | 223,000 | 106:19 | 45:1 46:1 | 151:1 152:1 |
| 120:1 121:1 | 226:1 227:1 | 1988 158:21 | 186:3 195:5 | 89:21 | 109:14 | 47:1 48:1 | 153:1 154:1 |
| 122:1 123:1 | 228:1 229:1 | 1992 3:8 | 195:8 | 224,000 16:4 | 141:15 | 49:1 50:1 | 155:1 156:1 |
| 124:1 125:1 | 230:1 231:1 | 1st 141:24 | 202:14 | 23 99:5 | $33.5142: 24$ | 51:1 52:1 | 157:1 158:1 |
| 126:1 127:1 | 232:1 233:1 |  | 203:5,12 | 24,000 34:12 | 35 57:18,22 | 53:1 54:1 | 159:1 160:1 |
| 128:1 129:1 | 234:1 235:1 | 2 | 222:18,23 | $\mathbf{2 5}$ 68:13,16 | 78:19 81:3 | 55:1 56:1 | 161:1 162:1 |
| 130:1 131:1 | 236:1 237:1 | 2 19:16 20:18 | 274:11 | 90:11 | 81:4,4,7 | 57:1 58:1 | 163:1 164:1 |
| 132:1 133:1 | 238:1 239:1 | 43:470:18 | 2018 2:11,14 | 248:10 | 35,000 | 59:1 60:1 | 165:1 166:1 |
| 134:1 135:1 | 240:1 241:1 | 71:18 83:10 | 2:17,23 | 249:24 | 146:24 | 61:1 62:1 | 167:1 168:1 |
| 136:1 137:1 | 242:1 243:1 | 96:14 | 3:17,19 | 28 144:3 | 36 57:18,22 | 63:1 64:1 | 169:1 170:1 |
| 138:1 139:1 | 244:1 245:1 | 141:18 | 106:13,15 | 163:13 | 163:24 | 65:1 66:1 | 171:1 172:1 |
| 140:1 141:1 | 246:1 247:1 | 148:8 181:4 | 111:7,13 | 28,000 96:14 | 166:9 | 67:1 68:1 | 173:1 174:1 |
| 142:1 143:1 | 248:1 249:1 | 235:25 | 131:10 | 96:16 | 36.7 143:24 | 69:1 70:1 | 175:1 176:1 |
| 144:1 145:1 | 250:1 251:1 | 2,478 109:19 | 133:2 | 28.11 164:15 | 166:6 | 71:1 72:1 | 177:1 178:1 |
| 146:1 147:1 | 252:1 253:1 | 2,500 253:9 | 181:22 | 28th 111:6 | 37 15:15 | 73:1 74:1 | 179:1 180:1 |
| 148:1 149:1 | 254:1 255:1 | 2,600 13:19 | 182:12 | 120:10 | 57:23 81:10 | 75:1 76:1 | 181:1 182:1 |
| 150:1 151:1 | 256:1 257:1 | 2.8 248:6,9 | 183:14,21 | $29143: 9$ | 83:5 163:19 | 77:1 78:1 | 183:1 184:1 |
| 152:1 153:1 | 258:1 259:1 | 20 12:9,11 | 184:10 | 29th 254:23 | 164:7,10 | 79:1 80:1 | 185:1 186:1 |
| 154:1 155:1 | 260:1 261:1 | 19:13 56:22 | 185:25 |  | 376 248:16 | 81:1 82:1 | 187:1 188:1 |
| 156:1 157:1 | 262:1 263:1 | 65:23 69:12 | 186:12 | 3 | 38 83:5 | 83:1 84:1 | 189:1 190:1 |
| 158:1 159:1 | 264:1 265:1 | 69:19 83:3 | 194:18 | 3 3:8 20:18 | 38th 241:18 | 85:1 86:1 | 191:1 192:1 |
| 160:1 161:1 | 266:1 267:1 | 83:5 88:20 | 196:2,4 | 33:21 34:4 |  | 87:1 88:1 | 193:1 194:1 |
| 162:1 163:1 | 268:1 269:1 | 194:5 231:9 | 202:16 | 34:6,8 | 4 | 89:1 90:1 | 195:1 196:1 |
| 164:1 165:1 | 270:1 271:1 | 255:6 | 203:12 | 79:16 | $473: 1179: 12$ | 91:1 92:1 | 197:1 198:1 |
| 166:1 167:1 | 272:1 273:1 | 20,329 146:3 | 210:24 | 111:20 | 83:11 | 93:1 94:1 | 199:1 200:1 |
| 168:1 169:1 | 274:1 | 200 20:4,7 | 225:19 | 133:10 | 164:18 | 95:1 96:1 | 201:1 202:1 |
| 170:1 171:1 | 170196 1:18 | 106:21 | 2018's 213:23 | 141:13,18 | 252:2 | 97:1 98:1 | 203:1 204:1 |
| 172:1 173:1 | 2:5,13 | 200:20 | 2019 54:2 | 154:16,17 | 4,000 188:10 | 99:1 100:1 | 205:1 206:1 |
| 174:1 175:1 | 170197 1:18 | 200,000 | 101:24 | 156:7,8 | 253:10 | 101:1 102:1 | 207:1 208:1 |
| 176:1 177:1 | 2:5,15 | 196:23 | 102:9,24 | 203:4 | 4.24 178:23 | 103:1 104:1 | 209:1 210:1 |
| 178:1 179:1 | 170213 1:18 | 200:20 | 184:19 | 3,000 188:10 | 4.6 143:20 | 105:1 106:1 | 211:1 212:1 |
| 180:1 181:1 | 2:6,18 | 2007 82:25 | 213:22 | 253:9 | 157:23 | 107:1 108:1 | 213:1 214:1 |
| 182:1 183:1 | 175,000 | 83:4 | 223:2,3 | 3.2 177:13 | 4.63 157:21 | 109:1 110:1 | 215:1 216:1 |
| 184:1 185:1 | 196:24 | 2014 77:17 | 241:10 | 3.5 203:4 | 4.9 178:20 | 111:1 112:1 | 217:1 218:1 |
| 186:1 187:1 | 18 65:15 | 79:9 83:20 | 244:21 | $3.52157: 11$ | 4/5/17 3:1 4:1 | 113:1 114:1 | 219:1 220:1 |
| 188:1 189:1 | 70:25 89:21 | 83:25 | 255:11 | 3:50 274:15 | 5:16:17:1 | 115:1 116:1 | 221:1 222:1 |
| 190:1 191:1 | 90:13 136:4 | 143:11 | 2020 135:7 | 30 15:16 | 8:1 9:1 10:1 | 117:1118:1 | 223:1 224:1 |
| 192:1 193:1 | 155:9 | 199:21 | 2021 101:25 | 48:14 50:14 | 11:1 12:1 | 119:1 120:1 | 225:1 226:1 |
| 194:1 195:1 | 163:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 2015 \text { 92:20 } \\ & 92: 2296: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 2022 2:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 111: 22 \\ & 113: 8,1 \end{aligned}$ | $13: 1 \quad 14: 1$ $15: 1 \quad 16: 1$ | 121:1 122:1 | 227:1 228:1 |



