AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING

TASK FORCE MEETING

June 7, 2016

Piatt Place

Suite 390

301 Fifth Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15222

Moderator: Helen Gerhardt

Reported by: Sherri Kostante

- - - -

NETWORK DEPOSITION SERVICES
1101 GULF TOWER
707 GRANT STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

- - - -

ORIGINAL

IN ATTENDANCE

Task Force Meeting June 7, 2016

Helen Gerhardt - Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations
Carl Redwood - Hill District Consensus Group
Paul O'Hanlon - Disability Rights Network
Carlos Torres - Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations
David Friedman - Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations Intern
Shaina Madden - URA
Michael Smith - Department of City Planning
Renee Robinson - ACTION-Housing
Nicole Jackson - Housing Authority, City of Pittsburgh
David Weber - Housing Authority, City of Pittsburgh
Michael Jansen - HUD
Jay Dworin - Fair Housing Partnership
Mary Gibson - Allegheny County Human Relations Commission
Bob Damewood - Regional Housing Legal Services
Kevin Quisenberry - Community Justice Project
Peter Harvey - Allegheny County Department of Human Services
Molly Nichols - Pittsburghers for Public Transport
John L. Tague, Jr. - City-County Task Force on Disabilities
David Jones - Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission
Carey Cummings - Allegheny County Human Relations Commission
La'Tasha Mayes - New Voices Pittsburgh
Angela Reynolds - United Way of Southwestern Pennsylvania and PA 2-1-1 Southwest
Chuck Keenan - Allegheny County Department of Human Services
Celeste Scott - Pittsburgh UNITED
Barney Oursler - Pittsburgh UNITED
Gale Schwartz - Housing Alliance of Pennsylvania
Sarah Kinter - Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations
Valerie Roberts - Office of Mayor Peduto

June 7, 2016

3:18 p.m.

- - - -

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I am Helen Gerhardt. I am a commissioner with the Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations and a member of the steering committee.

On the telephone, we have Carl Redwood and Paul O'Hanlon.

This is our new executive director of the Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations, Carlos Torres.

MR. WEBER: Please speak up, it's hard to hear.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Carlos, do you want to speak for yourself?

MR. TORRES: Sure. Carlos Torres, director of the Pittsburgh Commission on Human Relations.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Hi. I'm David Friedman. I'm an intern at the Commission on Human Relations for the summer.

MS. MADDEN: Shaina Madden from the URA, representing our department.

MR. SMITH: Michael Smith with the

department of city planning.

MS. ROBINSON: Renee Robinson, ACTION-Housing.

MS. JACKSON: Nicole Jackson, counsel for the Housing Authority, City of Pittsburgh.

MR. WEBER: David Weber, chief operations officer for the Housing Authority.

MR. JANSEN: Michael Jansen, HUD.

MR. DWORIN: Jay Dworin, Fair Housing Partnership. D-W-O-R-I-N.

MS. GIBSON: Mary Gibson, Allegheny County Human Relations Commission.

MR. DAMEWOOD: Bob Damewood, Regional Housing Legal Services.

MS. MAYES: Hello. This is La'Tasha.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Hello, La'Tasha. Welcome to the call. We are just now doing introductions. As soon as we come to this point of the table, I'll ask you to introduce yourself as well.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Kevin Quisenberry, Community Justice Project.

MR. HARVEY: Peter Harvey with

Allegheny County Department of Human Services.

MS. NICHOLS: I'm Molly Nichols with Pittsburghers for Public Transit.

MR. TAGUE: John Tague, City-County Task Force on Disabilities.

MR. JONES: My name is David Jones. I think for the next several meetings I'll be taking Lyle's place. I'm an investigator with the commission, and I do primarily housing investigations under the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

MS. CUMMINGS: I'm Carey Cummings, appointee to the Allegheny County Human Relations Commission.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Would you like to say anything?

MS. CUMMINGS: I feel like I should just take notes. This is my first meeting on anything, and I so I think that learning is good.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I believe we have three people on the call at this point.

La'Tasha, would you like to introduce yourself.

MS. MAYES: Good afternoon,

everyone. I'm La'Tasha Mayes. I work with (inaudible) --

THE COURT REPORTER: I can't hear her. I'm sorry.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: La'Tasha Mayes is executive director of New Voices Pittsburgh. She's a member of the steering committee of this task force.

Thank you all for coming. We have a pretty stacked plate, so let's just dive right in. The first thing in the order of business is the process guidelines for our joint work on this task force. This was sent out a number of times over the past months. I want to thank the committee that worked on this really hard: Paul O'Hanlon, who is here on the phone; with us is Mary Gibson.

If there are any oversights in this draft -- Mary, is there anything that you saw that needs to change?

MS. GIBSON: I double-checked all my notes, no, I'm good.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Awesome.

Paul O'Hanlon, did you see anything that did not make it into the final draft?

MR. O'HANLON: No, that's fine.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Great.

Would those who have had a chance to read this document, this is a time for really open discussion, things that you think are missing, things that you think should be amended, so I'm going to open the floor for that discussion.

MR. WEBER: This is David Weber. I work for the Housing Authority. I have a couple of concerns. One is that the stated goal involved on the first page talks about help assess -- two things regarding this. It says, assess current impediments to fair housing choice, and I guess both the city and the county already have a requirement to complete an assessment of impediments to fair housing choice, so I'm not sure why this task force would duplicate that work. That's already done -- going to be done. I'm not sure why that would be part of our work.

The second concern that I have is that the impediment -- you know, this cites the 2013 analysis of impediments and references recommendation 7-A. Impediment 7,

which this recommendation was in response to, was specifically about a need for a countywide approach to affirmatively furthering fair housing, and the goal that's stated here does not include that at all.

It seems to me that if the task force is going to accomplish the goal for which we were established, that should be somehow referenced in the objective of the task force.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: In 7-A it does talk about those who should be represented, and that does have both city and county entities. There have been a number of invitations extended to both county entities of McKeesport, the Municipality of McKeesport, and Penn Hills. I have had responses that they are interested, but they were not able to send representatives today.

MR. WEBER: And I understand. But I think that the stated goal of the task force would be to identify policy recommendations for countywide policies to further fair housing.

MS. NICHOLS: But the goal of -- are

you talking about the bolded section that begins: The goal?

MR. WEBER: Yes.

MS. NICHOLS: That doesn't indicate a place, whether it's city or county. You're saying, just name the location that we're --

MR. WEBER: Right. The particular impediment that this task force was set up to address is the lack of countywide strategies, and so our task should be to identify countywide strategies that overlap those jurisdictions.

MR. DWORIN: But it's fair to say also that including "countywide," meaning it may require looking at specific municipalities throughout the county, so I don't know that simply saying "countywide" is somehow making that as a county goal.

I'm comfortable with it not indicating counties, any particular municipality, with the understanding that we have -- you know, our stated purpose is countywide, but I don't want to say something that limits us from looking at a particular municipality as an impediment here or an

impediment there, whether that's, you know, my own, municipality, Churchill, or whether it's the City of Pittsburgh, or whatever it is, so I don't know that it necessarily needs to spell out "countywide" in here.

MR. WEBER: Well, just let me say that I think that we should, because, you know, it was created not to address all of the impediments to fair housing; we're to specifically address this impediment, and so we should be focused on that.

That doesn't mean we should ignore the other things; it overlaps. You know, we're all working on lots of different things to advance fair housing, but I feel the task force needs to be focused in order to be effective.

MS. MAYES: I'm sorry. I cannot hear whoever's speaking. I don't know what kind of service you have there, but I cannot hear a thing. It's breaking up wildly.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Carl and Paul, how about for you? Carl?

MR. REDWOOD: It's very hard to hear.

MR. DWORIN: Should we maybe repeat it, Helen?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yeah.

MR. WEBER: You can paraphrase it, that's fine.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So if I'm understanding you correctly, David, you're concerned that this task force, as it's looking for intergovernmental and interagency cooperation, should not really be doing an assessment of the analysis of impediments to fair housing on the city and county levels; am I understanding you correctly?

Are you saying that we should be focused on the actual act of cooperation to affirmatively further fair housing rather than analyzing the barriers?

MR. WEBER: Well, I guess maybe I'm saying two things. One is that our primary purpose isn't to do the analysis; that's already required for the county and the city to do, so we shouldn't duplicate that work.

My second point is that we need to specifically identify that we're trying to address the need for a countywide approach to

fair housing and that we should be looking for policy recommendations to promote countywide furtherance of fair housing, because that's the impediment that the task force was -- it was created under the recommendation to address that impediment, so our goal should be to address that impediment.

MR. TAGUE: Let me just ask a question. So are you saying then that part of the -- in other words, it's not part of the role of the affirmatively furthering fair housing to do a review and to see whether or not what is required under the impediments is being done, carried out?

That was part of the conversation we had early on, about what is the role of us, and I thought that was part of our role, to make sure the impediments were being addressed.

MR. WEBER: Right. Well, I guess from -- you know, I could certainly see that for many of your organizations, that would be part of what you would see as your role. For the housing authority, you know, we're doing it, so we're not going to assess whether we're

doing what we're supposed to do; we think we're doing what we're supposed to do, so it creates a little bit of a conflict for some of the task force members.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Excuse me. Before we go further, there are two people that entered the room, and if they could state their name and their organization for the court reporter.

MS. REYNOLDS: Angela Reynolds, United Way of Southwestern Pennsylvania and PA 2-1-1 Southwest.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: And she's also a member of the steering committee.

MR. KEENAN: Chuck Keenan. I'm with the Allegheny County Department of Human Services.

MR. DAMEWOOD: Bob Damewood. I think David makes a valid point. I mean, you know, the recommendation for addressing impediment No. 7 is the reason why this task force was created.

On the other hand, I think there are entities here, Allegheny County, for instance, who isn't bound by this task force, right?

So, you know, Allegheny County has no reason at all to look at the impediments identified by the City of Pittsburgh at this point, right?

So I hear what you're saying, our focus should be countywide. It should be regional, you know. It should be beyond just the boundaries of the City of Pittsburgh, I absolutely agree with that. But I don't think that we should constrain our focus to this impediment in particular.

I think we should be looking at all the impediments identified by the city, by the county, and by other entitlement jurisdictions -- you know, if McKeesport sends somebody, you know, let's look at theirs, right -- and address them in concert with them.

MS. NICHOLS: So would the point be to change the bolded goal? Instead of helping to assess, you're saying the assessment's already happening, we're not doing the assessing; we're trying to address? I don't know, that's a big thing to do, but --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I think there

was a special committee of the analysis of impediments. There were some real concerns that the latest versions of the analysis of impediments did not address some of those key impediments and that the ways in which public comment was not incorporated was a real concern.

So there has been a pattern noted by many advocacy organizations and members of communities that are impacted by barriers to fair housing that their -- that the outreach has not been very extensive, and so they feel they, first, are not present to really be able to represent their concerns, and then when those concerns are expressed, those comments are not then reflected in the analysis of impediments.

And in our meetings with the steering committee, there has been a real commitment to trying to make sure that we do extensive outreach to those communities and organizations that represent those who face those barriers and make sure that there's a better representation of their concerns.

This was quite a few steering

committee meetings, really thinking that through, you know, looking at the analysis, analyzing -- doing an analysis of the analysis, and trying to, you know, reflect those gaps that were perceived by a number of organizations.

MR. WEBER: I mean, I don't want to belabor this and take the whole meeting, and I certainly can acknowledge that if there are gaps, if there are issues with the process, that should be included, and it's certainly appropriate for the activists and advocacy organizations to call out the city or whoever's doing those studies.

But I don't think the task force is an activist and advocacy organization. You know, we're trying to develop policies, you know, recommendations of how to actually change so that there is more fair housing, not to call out other people for not doing their job.

That's the role of many of your organizations; I don't see that as being a role of the task force.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Jay?

MR. DWORIN: I mean, just to your point, I don't know if the point of the task force is to essentially call out --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Can you be louder, Jay.

MR. DWORIN: Certainly. I was saying, I don't know if the point is that we call out what's missing. I think the language is really --

MR. REDWOOD: Can you speak up please.

MR. DWORIN: -- in that it says, to help assess. It doesn't say that we'll provide the assessment itself. I recognize that the county -- I can't speak any louder than this.

But I recognize that the county and the city, the impediment communities, you know, have their own assessment that they do, but both -- I think it's beneficial particularly that you have this roomful of people, that they're willing to go through and say, hey, here's a point that you may miss, or as you bring in a consultant to do 2017-2018, that they have access to us as a task force,

that we can help again with that assessment process.

I don't think that what this language states is that we want to do an assessment -- I don't think we want to do the analysis, I should say, rather. I think what this says is, as this analysis is being done, as it is completed, that we can work to help that process go forward and make sure that we don't have to go back and say, hey, you missed something that was glaring, that we can move it forward in a way that allows for each entitlement community in a regional, or at least a semi-regional fashion, to get this information in the early stages.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: David, does that make sense?

MR. WEBER: Yeah. I mean, I understand. I'm going to go on and say that the --

MR. REDWOOD: Carl Redwood.

David, the task force needs to deal all of those, not just 7. The danger with just focusing on 7 is that it could --

MR. WEBER: But that's actually

what --

THE COURT REPORTER: Hold on, hold on. I can't hear the person on the phone. I need him to speak up, and I can't have someone in the room speaking at the same time.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Let's wait until each person finishes speaking before we speak, okay?

Carl, can I paraphrase what you said, and you please correct me if I'm wrong?

MR. REDWOOD: Of course.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So what I understood you to say is that the analysis of impediments actually covers a number of other -- that this task force covers another range of purposes that are laid out in the analysis of impediments, and that in this document there's too much of a focus on just 7, which explicitly talked about our creation and the basic purposes of that.

So Carl, are you saying that we need to incorporate more of the goals laid out in the analysis of impediments in our process guidelines before we vote on this document?

MR. REDWOOD: I'm not saying before

we vote on the document, but I'm saying our purpose has to be to make sure, the best we can, that every single municipality -- that we're affirmatively furthering fair housing everywhere in the county. We have the list, and there's eight impediments, so we have to look at all eight.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So it sounds to me like, in some ways, you and David are in agreement, that there really needs to be a focus on the countywide compliance with affirmatively furthering fair housing, that this indeed needs to be addressed to all municipalities, not just those listed as distressed communities in Sections 7-A through -C; is that correct?

MR. REDWOOD: Yeah, I agree with that. But the bottom line is, we're not doing well on furthering fair housing; we want to fix the problems.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: In terms of our region --

MR. REDWOOD: Our task as a task force is to help everybody do better so that people can live in communities of opportunity.

We need to focus on tearing down all the things that are -- we need to combat all the things that are preventing us from doing well in terms of low income families in particular, but also all the other classes.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Was everybody in the room able to hear Carl?

MR. QUISENBERRY: Could I add something?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Kevin Quisenberry. Just to David's point, I thought Bob made a good point, you know, if you just talk to the Pittsburgh analysis -- well, the other jurisdictions may or may not have reason to subscribe to just impediment 7.

What if you said that the goal is to help inform the assessments of current impediments, and that would apply to the city's assessments, the county's assessments, and it would be clear the task force is not doing the assessment; the jurisdiction does the assessment.

MR. WEBER: Right.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I move to make

that amendment. Do I have a second?

MR. WEBER: I'll second it.

MS. REYNOLDS: Can you repeat it?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Kevin, can you --

MS. MAYES: I'm sorry, could you repeat the amendment? I cannot hear. I'm sorry.

MR. QUISENBERRY: The goal of the AFFH Task Force is to help inform the assessments of current impediments to fair housing, and then leave the rest the way it is.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Were you able to hear that, La'Tasha?

MS. MAYES: No. Whoever's sitting closest to the thing, like, I need you repeat it, because I cannot hear anyone else in the room.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes, I'm afraid I'm going to have to be a translator here today.

MS. MAYES: You really are.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I apologize, everybody. This is going to increase the

length of our meeting, but I don't think there's an option.

So Kevin Quisenberry has suggested making an amendment to the goal of the task force. Instead of, the goal is to help assess current impediments to fair housing choice, he has suggested that we say, help inform the assessments of current impediments to fair housing. And that was acceptable to David Weber, who raised the concern.

Paul and Carl, any thoughts on that change?

MR. REDWOOD: This is Carl. That's fine, that's good.

MS. MAYES: Thank you.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Can we go ahead and vote on making that --

MR. WEBER: Can I have a point of order?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Sure.

MR. WEBER: How many members are there of the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Task Force?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: We do not have an exact count. We will be doing a -- if we

adopt these process guidelines, basically we're going to be doing votes by the majority of those present, so we are going to be listing all those participants.

You know, we've had a number of consistent participants, and we do have a nomination process for members of the task force. At this point, those who -- you know, if you show up, if you participate, that that's the majority that we're going on in terms of votes.

MR. TAGUE: Is that in the guidelines?

MR. WEBER: The guidelines reference a quorum as a simple majority of participating members is a quorum, so in order to have that, you've got to know who your members are.

MR. TAGUE: So could we change that to a quorum of those present?

MR. WEBER: No. I think we should identify -- I mean, maybe not today, but we need to identify who the members are.

MR. TAGUE: But it should be in the guidelines, right, you're clear on the guidelines, what you said about referencing

the voting, the quorum?

MR. WEBER: I'm saying it is in here. You know, sometime between now and the next meeting, we should try to --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: There needs to be an official list of --

MR. KEENAN: Someone needs to know the denominator; we're doing a division problem and don't know what the denominator is.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MS. NICHOLS: Well, it's not just a simple majority of those present. What if only five people are here?

MR. WEBER: Well, what it says in here is you need a simple majority of the participating members to be present to have a quorum, then you have a majority of those present to vote.

MR. DAMEWOOD: I hope we don't have more than twice the number of people here.

MR. TORRES: I have a question.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Before we go any further -- Carlos has a question as well -- if the two people who just came in

could introduce themselves and address yourself to the court reporter.

MS. SCOTT: Celeste Scott, Pittsburgh UNITED.

MR. OURSLER: Barney Oursler, Pittsburgh UNITED.

MR. TORRES: Are all the municipalities in the county on the same cycle to complete the assessment of impediments; yes or no?

MR. WEBER: No.

MR. TORRES: Because we have a timeline right here, right, for the upcoming assessment of fair housing including 2017 and 2018?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Because this came out of a city analysis of impediments, of course that's the cycle that's named. It doesn't preclude us from helping to inform other analyses of impediments on their timelines, but maybe that should be explicitly stated.

MR. TORRES: I think right now you're limiting yourself between 2017 and 2018.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: There are a number of potential amendments on the floor, and I think that David raises an excellent point, that we should -- that this be included in our process guidelines, that an official listing of members needs to be sent out to the full body.

Many of you received invitations, and you had participating bodies that were listed, but that does need to be sent out officially so we know exactly how many of us there are and what a simple majority is. So I move --

MR. WEBER: I mean, I'm not suggesting that that needs to actually be in the guidelines. I think it's an assumption that you know who your members are, and then whoever's facilitating this needs to say, here are the members, here's the --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes. And we have sent that out before. Basically the members were those who participated and were listed as participating.

In the guidelines there's a participation requirement, right, so we're

really asking that people show up, that each organization send a representative to at least three out of the four meetings each year, and that if an organization doesn't participate to that standard, then they would be dropped.

We did send out that full list, but we can certainly send it out again. And there are new members that should be on that list. We do indeed have a simple majority of those that were listed, but I will make sure that that is sent out.

And David, would you like -- do you think it's a good idea to have that be part of our process guidelines?

MR. WEBER: I think it's a procedural item, it's not a policy item; do you know what I mean?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Okay.

Then Carlos Torres suggested that we might look at the dates here as a potential impediment that we might want to remove. Are others -- do I have a motion to do that, or do we need more discussion?

MR. WEBER: Carlos made a motion.

MR. DAMEWOOD: Bob Damewood. Why

are the dates even here? Why do we need the dates?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: This is a revision, and I actually did not notice that that had been added. I think Carlos is right on, I think that we really don't need it in there.

MR. HARVEY: So would we also get rid of, first and upcoming or the time limit in general? I mean, are we tasked with just looking at the next AI?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes, I think that we should -- go ahead.

MR. HARVEY: Do you think the assumption is that everything will be taken care of after the next AI?

MR. DAMEWOOD: This is Bob Damewood. I would just say let's talk about, do we need to strike the whole clause or just say for upcoming assessments of fair housing. I mean, just leave it open.

MR. TORRES: This is Carlos speaking again. One thing to keep in mind is, by definition, the task force has a beginning and an end, so leaving it open, we might have to

think about task force as part of the name of the group, if you will. Just an observation. I'm not disagreeing with you, I'm just saying --

MR. DAMEWOOD: I second what Peter said.

MR. TORRES: Which was what, Peter? I'm sorry.

MR. HARVEY: We'll end when there's no more impediments to fair housing.

MR. TORRES: Some of us may not be around.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: You know, my own feeling is that it is an enormous impediment not to have cooperation of the many organizations and institutions that are responsible or concerned about these issues, that is very -- one of the big concerns in this county has been that we have been operating in silos.

It is, of course, difficult to bring together so many different entities across the county, but I think I've already seen incredibly constructive conversations and cooperation on really critical things. We now

have Port Authority that's involved in this board, and they are now actively working with Isaac, who is also on this board. Neither of them are here today, but we've seen -- all of us, I think, have seen some really great cooperation already happening on the most basic level.

And for us to think how all of our different municipalities are so completely interconnected, we really cannot divide by artificial boundaries as we consider our own policies and we consider trying to put those policies into practice.

There is this basic question of whether we should be a task force in the timeline that we've laid out when it comes to next steps, next year, once we have addressed the first and upcoming assessment of fair housing, I would suggest that that's a good time for us now to plan, to think about whether we would try to become an ongoing commission, what kind of form we could take.

And of course, that's going to take a lot of thought and deliberation with our various elected officials, with the Housing

Authority, with the URA, with the organizations represented here at the table, so can we table that basic question until, on the timeline here, June of 2017?

MR. WEBER: Yes.

MR. TORRES: Perfect.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Great.

So for now, the suggestion -- hello? Do we have a new person?

La'Tasha?

MR. O'HANLON: This is Paul. I had to use a different phone.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Welcome back.

MS. MAYES: I'm still here.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: There was a suggestion to take out the time limits. Was that a formal motion, Carlos?

MR. TORRES: It was just a question. I am not a member of the task force.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Would someone like to make that motion?

MS. REYNOLDS: Are we finished with the first one?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I think we did not, so let's go back to --

MS. REYNOLDS: Because the question came up to as to whether or not we have a quorum.

MR. WEBER: It was moved and seconded.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So we have a vote on the change to the goal being: Help inform the assessments of current impediments to fair housing. All in favor, say aye.

- - - -

(A chorus of ayes.)

- - - -

MR. WEBER: Is there anybody opposed to it?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Is anybody opposed?

Are there any abstentions?

MR. SMITH: (Inaudible) --

MR. WEBER: Yeah, I agree.

THE COURT REPORTER: What was --

MR. WEBER: Well, if you're not a member, I'm --

THE COURT REPORTER: I did not hear what you said.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So you were not

sent to represent the city planning department?

MR. SMITH: I was here, I wanted to be just here for this item that dealt with the task force recommendations.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Okay.

MR. TAGUE: So you don't represent Valerie?

MR. SMITH: No.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I had asked Ray Gastil to send a representative today as a member -- and Valerie McDonald-Roberts said she is going to be here, but I think she's just running a little late.

So I go ahead and move to take out this timing clause, basically to remove in the goal the clause, for the first and upcoming assessment of fair housing in 2017, 2018. All in favor, say aye.

- - - -

(A chorus of ayes.)

- - - -

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Any opposed?

MR. WEBER: Yeah, yeah. I thought we were going to table that question until

June of 2017.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Oh, I think we were going to table the question of whether we would stay a task force, how long we would stay in operation --

MS. NICHOLS: This is just about adding the date?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Right. This basically removes any limitation on our scope or extension of our scope.

MR. WEBER: I would prefer to abstain then.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Thank you.

Were there any other proposed changes? Do the criteria for membership make sense to everybody?

MR. QUISENBERRY: Can I ask a question?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Sure.

MR. QUISENBERRY: This is Kevin Quisenberry. What's the time frame for needing these procedures to be finalized?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: We sure hope to get it done today. We've been working on it for about nine months.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Is it possible to get it done today?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Are there other major suggestions for changes? Because if there are, then we may need to go back to the drawing board, but these were sent out numerous times, and we requested feedback numerous times.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Is there a consensus that there is the ability to do business today?

MS. MAYES: Hello. This is La'Tasha. I don't have a major change, I hope it's a minor change, which is around the length of time nominations that get sent to the steering committee. It says at least eight days before the quarterly meeting -- I'm sorry, I'm on page 3, it's the first bullet that's numbered E, capital E.

I'm recommending a longer period of time for members to make nominations to the steering committee. I would just imagine it would take longer than eight days to manage and process all that. My recommendation is for 30 days, and I want to put that out on the

floor. And that was the only significant change that I -- the only major change I had.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So at this point, as it's envisioned in its current draft, the nominations could be sent in to the steering committee eight days in advance of a quarterly task force meeting. That means that the steering committee would need to send it out seven days before the quarterly task force meeting so that everyone has at least a week to consider that nomination.

La'Tasha, I think you're suggesting that everyone should have a month to consider those nominations?

MS. MAYES: Yes.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I'll express a concern from me. I hope that this can be a very inclusive task force, and so I don't know -- like, what do you all think? Do people need a full 30 days to look at a nomination and consider whether that nomination is appropriate based on our criteria? Do people feel like there should be more time?

MR. WEBER: This is David. I think

that's appropriate, to have more time. I mean, if someone's on vacation, you know, they may not even see it and the meeting goes by, so I think having additional time is reasonable.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: It does sound reasonable, I understand that.

MS. GIBSON: This is Mary Gibson. I think we can make a decision even -- I go abroad and travel, and I still check my e-mails. Unless you're going to Antarctica or something, I think everybody can just check their e-mail or have somebody, you know, be a designated person and make a decision.

I think all of the nominations that we've had so far for this task force have been unanimously accepted, so I would be shocked if there was a problem within seven days. It's just more for speed and easiness than anything else. I mean, 30 days isn't bad, but it just seems like, you know, more of a bureaucracy than needs to be here.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Kevin Quisenberry. Between 8 and 30, how about 10, 12, 15?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: What's 8 plus

30 divided by 2?

MR. TORRES: 16.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: La'Tasha, would 15 days be an acceptable amendment? And what do you all think, is 15 days an acceptable amendment?

THE CROWD: Yes.

MS. MAYES: Yes.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I move to amend to 15 days.

MS. NICHOLS: I second. I'm Molly.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: All in favor?

- - - -

(A chorus of ayes.)

- - - -

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Any opposed? Any abstentions?

For the abstentions, could you quickly state your names.

MS. MADDEN: Shaina Madden, URA.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Thank you.

MR. KEENAN: Can we find out who in the room is actually a member? I don't even know who's a member in the room and who should be voting and who shouldn't be voting. I have

no idea if I'm a member or not.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Oh, you're a member.

Okay. So we sent out that big list of organizations that came to the meetings and have been participating on a regular basis as members. You have been here, I think, at every meeting that I can remember.

MR. KEENAN: Yeah, probably.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: We are going to be sending out that list as a more formal membership based on David's very valid concern about that.

So if you would, raise your hand if you have been participating and you consider yourself a member of this task force. Any of the entities, the City, the City Commission on Human Relations, the City-County Disability Task Force --

MR. KEENAN: So one of the reasons I asked is, I have a boss, and I don't have permission from my boss to do this; I don't know if I should be voting or not. A lot of you guys don't have that concern, but I do, so I think if there's a designated -- somebody

from the county, it should go to somebody high up in the county to appoint somebody rather than me just coming to the meetings. That's not your problem; that's my problem, but --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: It is part of the process guidelines that anyone who is a member should be able to vote on behalf of their organization. What I would ask is that everyone here who wants to participate and be a voting member, please take this back to your higher authority and get that permission.

Please pass on the invitation that it's an ex officio position, so that that entity, that organization, can send anybody to vote at a task force, a full task force meeting, so they should send somebody who can vote. In general, we're going to be trying to send out those things that are deliberated on well in advance so that the organization or entity can have time to develop an official position.

MR. DAMEWOOD: Bob Damewood. I have two comments about the membership, whatever, provision at the top of page 2. The first one, it talks about, you know, category A, ex

officio representation of the city, county, and municipal governmental institutions named in the AI.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Right.

MR. DAMEWOOD: The AI is a large document. I think you mean in impediment 7-A --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes, we do.

MR. DAMEWOOD: -- but what I would recommend is something like, you know, the City of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County -- or all housing authorities and CDBG entitlement jurisdictions within Allegheny County. I would state it categorically, right, like, what are the criteria for membership as opposed to referring to a section of the AI which may change, you know. That's my first suggestion.

My second one is, in category B, it's a descriptive, like, laundry list, but there's -- it should refer at some point to the process for nominating and accepting members. After the laundry list, something like, who have been nominated and accepted as provided herein, or something like that. I

mean, some kind of -- because right now it's just so expansive, right?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: No. 10 talks about the nomination process, A, B, and C, but you think that that clause, it should refer to that?

MR. DAMEWOOD: I mean, right now it just says, membership will include, right?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MR. DAMEWOOD: In category B, you have to have been nominated and approved by the task force.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Bob, would you like to move that that be --

MR. DAMEWOOD: Sure. But Kevin Quisenberry just raised a point of order, or a point of clarification, like, are the commission members and --

MR. QUISENBERRY: Kevin Quisenberry. I'm going to stop talking on process. We don't have time to get through this today, I don't think anyway. I would suggest generally, put this to a red line and try to do it short of next quarterly meeting. I mean, it seems like you need to know who the

members are, you need to know what the quorum is, you need to know all of that stuff before business can be conducted.

But on this point, I think it talks about housing authorities, maybe CDBG entitlement jurisdictions, but those aren't the only members of the committee as the committee began, correct?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: That's correct.

MR. QUISENBERRY: So don't limit it to that. If you were going to list out who the original members of the committee are, you list all of them, so that you know who does the selecting for new members.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: We have been going by that list of participants in the task force as our membership. I'm hesitant to call off all business, I guess my concern is that this has been sent out and there have been many requests for feedback, and I'm hesitant to put it off for another three months.

I think that if we send out membership, you know, the list, as we have quite a few times before, and we have a process by which new organizations can be

nominated or suggest that they themselves be nominated, they can apply for membership, I don't see a reason not to adopt this. Is that -- do others also have the concern that we should not adopt these process guidelines until we further revise? Are there other major problems -- yes, go ahead.

MS. NICHOLS: I'm inclined -- it sounds like the main concern about this clarity of who's a member and who is not and then how do we make a vote legitimate if we're not clear on who the members are; is that right?

MR. QUISENBERRY: Yes.

MS. NICHOLS: I guess, Helen, when you say it's not really clear who a member is or who -- when you sent out those lists of people, aren't those all people that said, yes, I'm willing to participate and be a member of this task force? So don't we know who the members are; do you know what I'm saying?

If we do know that that list of people is who the members are and that we can use that as our basis, then it seems like we

can vote today based on that list of people you sent out multiple times.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MR. TORRES: So for the purpose of -- this is Carlos from the Commission on Human Relations, Pittsburgh. For the purposes of moving the process along, what I suggest is that our commission is going to create a very simple membership application that is going to be sent out for organizations to complete. We're going to give them 30 days to complete it. When the 30 days are over, we're going to have a complete list of people or organizations that have said, we want to be part of this group.

At the end of those 30 days, we'll circulate that, and we'll say, if anyone that you're aware of that should be part of this group is not included, they have an additional two weeks to complete this thing, and then we can close it until the nomination process takes place. Is that fair?

MS. GIBSON: This is Mary Gibson. I thought we already did all those nominations, so I don't want to --

MR. TORRES: But we don't -- I don't know who has a complete list of who the organizations are.

MS. GIBSON: We don't have the minutes for the previous meetings? I mean, people who are here obviously want to be part of the --

MR. TORRES: But there's no official thing.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Well, there is, but it's --

MR. KEENAN: Don't you keep a list that's up on the table?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: That's the steering committee.

I think that this is a good suggestion. I think that we need to do really good outreach to make sure that we reach all those -- like, using the sign-in lists from the past meetings, that we really reach out and make sure that those people know that this is happening.

MR. TORRES: Ask people, if you get it and you want to include yourself or someone else to us, send it to them and ask them to

send it back. It's not limited to just those people. If you know ten groups that need to be part of this group, send it to those ten groups and have them submit their form.

Then we'll have a comprehensive list and we know where it is, we know who's maintaining it, and then there will be no question as to how many people are at the table, we know it should be 30 organizations, we have a quorum, right? Whatever the number is, I'm just throwing 30 out there just for the sake of an example.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Molly, did you have a concern?

MS. NICHOLS: No. I guess I'm just -- I've seen a list of names that says, these are the members of the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Task Force, and it's, like, 35 names, and my understanding is they'd only be on that list if they said, yes, I want to be on that task force as a member and I'll represent my organization.

Is that not -- don't we already have a list?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Those people

that are on that list have been at a meeting and said that they want -- they or their organizations want to be part of the task force for sure.

MS. KINTER: Then that's the list.

MS. NICHOLS: So then we have over half of the people on that list ready to vote today, that's the quorum we would just need to establish, and then we can vote on the process guidelines. These guidelines have been sent out millions of times. I'm more on moving forward than having another meeting where we're talking about this again.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes. So here's my suggestion, that we keep everybody who has indicated that they want to be part of this. I really don't see a -- I have not witnessed a single person or organization here that shouldn't be on it based on our own criteria we've laid out here. We started with that baseline as members. We make sure to reach back out to them and make sure that they actually still want to be part of this task force.

But then, Carlos, the application

form that you're talking about, I think that's a great idea for going forward.

Can we say, we will accept the list of people who have been -- you know, that we have at this point, all the participants up to this point, and that in the future we will use the form that has been suggested by Carlos, giving organizations 30 days upon receipt to send it back. Does that make sense? Maybe that can be part of, like, the self-nomination or application form. I think that's a great amendment.

MS. NICHOLS: Yes.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor, aye.

- - - -

(A chorus of ayes.)

- - - -

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I do think we need to move forward. We will send out this amended document. It can be amended again in the future. If there are concerns that remain standing, I urge you, please do send them to us, and we will bring those amendments to the next meeting for further discussion and

potential change.

MS. NICHOLS: So we're not voting on this until the next --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: We are. I move that we vote on this, to accept this, but it will be open to further amendment as needed. Do I have a second on that?

MS. NICHOLS: Yes, I second it.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: All in favor, aye?

- - - -

(A chorus of ayes.)

- - - -

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Any noes?

Any abstentions?

David Weber is abstaining.

All right. So we have a proposal for fair housing recommendations that is an initial response to the recommendations of the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Task Force. Has everyone has a chance to read this?

This would be -- this is an initial response. We'll be working on far more extensive recommendations to be sent out to

the full task force for further consideration on August the 9th.

At this point, the steering committee has been really thinking about -- we had a small subgroup of people to consider these initial affordable housing recommendations and to create an initial response, and that was Paul O'Hanlon, Bob Damewood, Jay Dworin, Cherylie Fuller, and Sarah Kinter.

Over the next months, we hope to far more fully flesh out these recommendations, as well as creating a sort of ABC's policy document which fully explains many of the terms, the best practices from around the country, policies that have been tried in other places. It will be a real educational document.

One of the things we've noted on the steering committee is that many of us just aren't on the same page in terms of basic terms, basic understandings of the law, understanding how it should apply.

Would anyone from that small subgroup like to address this further?

MR. DAMEWOOD: I would like to say one thing, or ask one thing. The subgroup was -- your invitation went out to the entire task force, right, asking who wanted to participate in helping draft this?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: No. It was discussed within the steering committee, and the steering committee made --

MR. DAMEWOOD: Yes, steering committee, that's what I meant.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: The steering committee, yes.

MR. DAMEWOOD: And so the subgroup wasn't -- you know, those were the ones who raised their hand and said yes.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Right.

MR. DAMEWOOD: I just wanted to point that out.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes, these were volunteers.

MR. WEBER: Volunteers from the steering committee.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

So let's address that document itself. Having looked this over, are there

any concerns that people want to raise, or proposed amendments?

MR. WEBER: I would say that everything after the first paragraph basically is -- you know, it's sort of -- it's activist speak. It's speculative. There's nothing to back it up. They're recommendations that don't reflect actual policy of the organizations.

I think it's completely disrespectful of the hard work that the Affordable Housing Task Force did. You know, maybe it did not focus and put fair housing everywhere up and down in its recommendations, you may have issues with its recommendations, but until we've got something specific to say, look, here's the policy that you should add to your recommendations to further promote fair housing, I think it's completely inappropriate to include all of this stuff.

Other than saying, hey, look, you need to address fair housing, reminder, you need to address fair housing, I think that's fine, but until we've got some real recommendations to make that could actually be

implemented on the ground, I don't think it's at all appropriate.

MR. DWORIN: If I could comment to that. One of the problems, I think, and the reason we end up with a document like this that you're saying is disrespectful --

THE COURT REPORTER: Speak up.

MR. DWORIN: I'm sorry.

I was saying that one of the difficulties -- and I understand what you're saying, that it feels to you as if it would be disrespectful -- is the sort of lack of a fair housing presence on the task force itself. And I asked specifically, so that you know, since you're talking a language of kind of the question of being respectful today, I think we tried to be respectful.

There was a task force meeting here, the Affirmatively Furthering, and we had members of the Affordable Housing Task Force here. I specifically posed the question, who was on that task force who represented a fair housing lens, okay? I was very specific about that, not even affordable housing lens, but a fair housing lens, who was going to ensure

that the AFFH obligation so that every dollar that was spent was spent through a lens that said, will this create less or more segregation, like who was that person?

There was no answer to that. I think it created a situation that we're looking at it through that lens, and because of that, you end up with a situation with recommendations coming from this task force may seem as if we're not taking into consideration or respecting the Affordable Housing Task Force, but I will tell you that the group that worked on this really took that into account.

I personally, all right, as I spoke with them, wanted much more, and probably more -- if you're going to say activist speak, probably much more activist speak, all right?

They said, wait a second, we need to take into account where this task force is coming from, give them a sense of a baseline. So I don't think that the language here is as activist speak as you're stating.

I think what it does do is, it begs the question that was asked meetings ago: Who

on -- there's an obligation by that task force to look at everything as it relates to more or less segregation, and so I would --

MR. WEBER: Actually I would disagree with you about that. The obligation is on the city, when it's establishing policy, be considering that.

MR. DWORIN: Fair enough. Fair enough.

MR. WEBER: Affordable Housing Task Force was tasked simply to look at affordability, and they did that, and many of their recommendations will address fair housing issues. But the --

MR. DWORIN: Fair enough. Fair enough.

THE COURT REPORTER: One at a time.

MR. WEBER: Our task is to address -- this task force's task is to address the fair housing policy issues, so what we should do is, we should figure out policy recommendations to address the fair housing issues, not say, oh, you didn't address the fair housing issues.

MR. DWORIN: But don't you think, in

turn, what we are doing, though, to say, hey, you missed something --

MR. WEBER: But what is it that you missed? We've not gotten the specific details of a policy recommendation --

THE COURT REPORTER: One at a time.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Wait, wait --

MR. WEBER: I'll say one more thing. Before we make recommendations, we should do the work of a year's worth of research and what the recommendations are, because the things that are listed on the back of this sheet are not thought through, they're not realistic, they're asking for actions from people who don't have the authority to take those actions, and that's not -- I don't think that's reasonable.

I'll back off. Certainly I would have hoped that you would have at least acknowledged the actual work and the policy efforts that are under way, and it doesn't do that here. Now I'll stop, and I'm sorry that I got a little worked up.

I should have let Michael go first.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: No, no, it's

important that --

MR. DWORIN: I mean, we all want to work through this together to get some --

MR. DAMEWOOD: I just want to point out, you know, this wasn't intended as a slap in the face or as a criticism of the Affordable Housing Task Force. The intent of this was to say, you know, that's fine, you know, those are the affordable housing recommendations, but just bring to the attention of different city council that there is a whole stack of policy issues that weren't addressed by the Affordable Housing Task Force.

This isn't intended as criticism; it is intended as kind of a placeholder, all right? Letting city council know, you know, when you consider the affordable housing recommendations, that's not -- you know, that there are all these other considerations that you have to consider, that you've got affirmatively furthering fair housing obligations as well.

I agree with you that we shouldn't make recommendations, make specific

recommendations, without, you know, going through a process to arrive at those recommendations.

I think most of what this document does is point out the kinds of things that weren't considered by the Affordable Housing Task Force, the kinds of impediments that are real, that need to be addressed in an AFFH recommendation, that, you know, the Affordable Housing Task Force wasn't even charged with looking at. You know, it's not that you did something wrong. It's that, you know, it's incomplete, and city council needs to know that it's incomplete.

MR. SMITH: Well, I wanted to just back up -- this is Michael Smith from the city planning department -- because it sounds like you jumped to this timeline, you said August 9th, so if I -- I wasn't sure that we were actually on this document yet because you noted that there was going to be a response that would be made by --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: A far more extensive response. Really, these are initial concerns that were raised that were not

addressed and we think that should be addressed by legislators. As they consider the Affordable Housing Task Force recommendations, they also need to be considering these fair housing, that they're not really considered.

MR. SMITH: On the timeline it's just saying August 9th, 2016.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So over the next new months we're going to be working on a far more extensive set of recommendations where we really flesh out what is laid out here in a kind of bare form, really providing the documentation, the knowledge, and expertise which provides the case for these recommendations.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So this is an initial response of people who have been working in this field for a long time. And, you know, Michael, we did raise this concern a number of times, and it was -- I know that you took these concerns to city planning, and they -- so we think at this point, we just want to note these more specific concerns that

were not addressed, and provide that kind of expertise and knowledge and concern for legislators to consider in a far more extensive document. It will be sent out in August for everyone on this task force to see, to respond to, to send possible amendments, additions, omissions, you know --

MR. SMITH: So the team that will be working on that is Ms. Fuller, Paul O'Hanlon, Jay Dworin, or is everyone --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Those are the first volunteers.

MR. SMITH: Oh, okay.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So I've already asked Kevin Quisenberry to please be part of that, if he'd be willing. This is open to others who would like to work on it, for sure.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Well, I mean, I think that's fine. I think, you know, speaking on behalf of Ray, who is one of the co-chairs, and David was also a member of the task force, and many of the people in here have some affiliation with the task force, I think we'd be willing to meet and to actually talk about this.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Great. Wonderful.

MR. SMITH: I mean, I think there's a lot of recommendations that were put through in the report -- for those that have able to read it, I appreciate you actually taking the time to read this -- that do actually get into some fair housing. I mean, that's going to be something that we have to work out and see what that looks like.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MR. SMITH: And I do want to say that we're not going to just say we don't want to work with this response, but to David's point, some of it is going to require some more conversation before this goes --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Absolutely. And I spoke with Ray --

MR. SMITH: We need to actually figure out, what is actually the intent of some of these recommendations, how can we actually realistically address these, and maybe we already are addressing them in ways due to the fact that we have these short-term, mid-term, and long-term recommendations for

each of the specific policies that are outlined.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: We would so welcome you being at the table to help us develop those documents. You know, the thing is, is that this is really crystal clear, though, is that there is -- that there has been massive displacement, and it has mainly affected black Pittsburghers, and so there are enormous concerns.

You know that I've been involved, you know, with really talking to a lot of the people who are being affected by this, and there's a lot of people here who witness that this is happening along racial lines, and so it is critical -- the Affordable Housing Task Force did not address that concern -- both in terms of those who -- you know, there are a number of protected classes that really need to be -- their concerns, their needs, and the barriers and the impacts that they're facing need to be explicitly addressed in our policies, they need to be explicitly addressed in our legislation.

I think the people who are working

on this task force want to provide the expertise and the knowledge and the concern that can help the city to do that.

MR. SMITH: I think a positive next step would be for me to take this back and talk with you, I guess, as the representative of the small group, the small group that will be working on this, talk to some task force members that would be very critical in responding to this in the most appropriate way, including someone like David, who's member of this task force.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Carlos, I see some response.

MR. TORRES: I'm sorry, the answer is no, don't take this back anywhere, because it's a product that still needs work, as was mentioned before. I don't think it's ready for that.

MR. SMITH: Before anything official in August gets submitted.

MR. TORRES: And there will be opportunity for review. In the state that it is right now, I will not recommend it going outside of this body to anyone in an elected

office or an appointed position --

MR. SMITH: Oh, absolutely.

MR. TORRES: -- or anything of that matter, because it is very -- in infancy still, and I think it will do a disservice, because as -- Mike, is it?

MR. SMITH: Dave.

MR. TORRES: The gentleman here, David, mentioned earlier, you know, I think there's some language that we need to work on, and for that matter, I don't think we should take it anywhere just yet.

MR. SMITH: So maybe you'll have to set something up between Ray and yourself. I mean, if you're comfortable with that.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: No, that does not --

MR. TORRES: I'm not a member of the task force. The commission has a stake in this product, and that's why I'm saying no, particularly because the way that this group was set up was under the auspices of the commission initially. The commission was the one that kind of initiated this whole thing, and I do not want the commission's name to go

on something that is not complete just quite yet.

For sure, we can be in contact and we can have dialogue and move it forward, but please do not share this with anyone just yet. I would ask you to give us a little bit of time, particularly because one of the goals was that today we were going to give opportunity for a vote, and that has not happened yet, correct?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: That's correct, yes.

MS. SCHWARTZ: I'm sorry. Helen, this is Gale Schwartz with the Housing Alliance. I'm having a really hard time hearing what people are saying. Can you just, like, give me a summary of what the challenge is?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes. Carlos Torres has raised the concern that this draft is not in a complete enough form to share with other city officials or elected officials. I'm not sure that there's consensus on that point.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Can I make a

statement?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes, please.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Kevin Quisenberry. I fully agree with Carlos. I read this for the first time in preparation for today. I thought it's a generally good thing to convey to the Affordable Housing Task Force and to the city that both of those groups of people should look at the issues they're talking about through a fair housing lens, I think that's fair.

MR. WEBER: I do, too.

MR. QUISENBERRY: And I also think it's fair to try to identify some concrete things where you could look through that lens and identify some recommendations, and that's what I think the positive of this is, but I fully agree, I wouldn't share this with anybody outside of this room, you know, until it's a more effective, practical, useful thing.

MS. GIBSON: This is Mary Gibson. Out of curiosity, for practical purposes, the people who were involved in the Affordable Housing Task Force, obviously our group and

that group have very different things that they're focusing on, and rightly so.

I know that it had come up in a previous meeting with this task force about the delays associated with trying to help people in terms of the affordable housing because -- you know, because it's just a process, there's a task force created, a lot of delays associated with it initially.

That being said, I would hate for our task force, the Fair Housing Task Force, to cause further delay for a group that has been working quite a long time on, you know, the affordable housing, and so with that being said, I hope -- and I don't know, but I hope that you're not waiting for this task force to do any of your important activities.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: No.

MR. SMITH: No.

MS. GIBSON: I would hope not.

I mean, the reason why I say this is because, I agree, you know, I'm not a huge fan of this document as it is right now, and I don't want, you know, our elected officials to say, well, we're not going to do anything with

affordable housing because, look, there's all this fair housing stuff that we need to review, let's put this off for another year in the timeline, and so nothing happens for a year or two, and that's what I want to avoid at least, and I'm sure everybody else does.

I just want to make sure that that's clear, you know, just from a practical purpose, because, you know, I think obviously the two groups, while they have different purposes, there's some overlap also, so I hope that that will kind of help in this situation, because I really don't want this to slow the work of the other task force.

MR. DAMEWOOD: This is Bob. I agree with everything that was just said. I would -- I think we should ask -- as a task force, ask Michael to go back and talk to folks, definitely the co-chairs of the Affordable Housing Task Force, I'm not sure who else --

MR. SMITH: I don't have another task force --

MR. DAMEWOOD: But talk to whoever. You know, look, there are certain

implementation steps that need to take place, right? There are certain subcommittees that are still meeting, they're going to carry the task force recommendations forward, and it seems to me that there's no reason why those subcommittees shouldn't have people from a fair housing perspective helping to shape those recommendations, right, helping to shape the implementation of the affordable housing recommendations.

I would hope that Michael could take that back to, you know, Councilman Lavelle, to Ray Gastil, as, I guess, a concern that's shared by the folks here -- if it is shared by the folks here.

You know, I just wanted to throw that on the table and see, like, what is -- I mean, if Michael isn't going to go back to his boss with this document, what do we want Michael to go back to his boss with?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Well, this document has been sent to his boss. This document went out to a very wide range of the people who are listed as our members and, you know, others who are interested in becoming

members, so it's out there; these concerns are out there.

I would suggest -- I want to listen to Molly first, and then I'll make my suggestion.

MS. NICHOLS: I just want -- I don't know if this is a clarifying question, but if it's the law to affirmatively further fair housing -- is that right; that's the law? So, like, something like this question, has the city addressed persistent patterns of segregation, that's a question the city has to ask itself; is that right?

And then maybe this is a little clarity around the Affordable Housing Task Force made recommendations to the city that the city is now going to take up for legislation, and David, you were saying, if the Affordable Housing Task Force wasn't tasked with fair housing, or fair housing might be a part of it, to me, this just seems like a great opportunity for us to say, let's make sure that whatever legislation happens at the city level, we're following the law, and people in this room are concerned if aspects

of the Affordable Housing Task Force didn't explicitly name the ways that these recommendations are affirmatively furthering.

I'm sure there's plenty of instances where you could name it more precisely, so this is a great opportunity for that to happen and still name some of the limitations. And this might be -- and I understand there's policy, we need to get votes, we need to get this through, but how can we also use it as a opportunity for -- whether it's the Affordable Housing Task Force or this task force to say, here's all the things that it's doing to affirmatively further fair housing -- great. And here are the limitations that either city council needs to recognize or think about how to form their legislation.

But yeah, it does seem really important to not see it as an attack, but an opportunity to do this all better.

MR. DWORIN: Point of clarification. When did this go out widely?

THE COURT REPORTER: I have trouble hearing you all the way over here. Speak louder.

MR. DWORIN: I'm sorry. Every time I do that, I think I'm yelling, so my apologies.

As a point of clarification, when did this go out broadly? Because I was still under the impression that this was in a small group that was being --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: No. Jay, you and I had talked about, we had set a deadline of Friday, that was because we wanted to send it out to the larger group for them to consider.

MS. NICHOLS: Who did it go to?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: To everybody on the -- that has participated in --

MS. NICHOLS: On the Fair Housing Task Force?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MS. NICHOLS: So it's about 35 people.

MS. GIBSON: And I believe that there's overlap on the two task forces.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MR. WEBER: Well, everyone was blind-copied, so there was no way to see who

else received it, and none of the documents were labeled draft. I mean, if it's a draft, it should say it's a draft.

MS. ROBERTS: Good point.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Can I just ask one question -- we're out of time, I know. Do we know the time frame on the next steps between the city's actions on the recommendations of the Affordable Housing Task Force?

MR. SMITH: Well, there's many different steps. If you look at the report, each recommendation has many different sorts of next steps that are associated with --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Speak up, please.

MR. SMITH: I will be as loud as possible. The task force itself is no longer needed as an official task force body; this document represents the culmination of the task. But the schedule, it varies. For instance, the housing trust fund, that is moving forward in a much more faster direction than, let's say, our increased 4 percent LIHTC.

MR. QUISENBERRY: So any recommendations that this group may have on the housing trust fund should come first probably.

MR. SMITH: I mean, you guys --

MR. QUISENBERRY: I mean, location, location, location, is the one thing that, when I read through this, makes sense to me. If you're talking about siting for units that are being funded through the trust fund, or if you're talking about siting for units in the IZ context that are going to be off-site of the development, the location of those units, it's critically important to improve access to opportunities for minorities, people with disabilities. There's a fair housing piece to --

MR. SMITH: And if you take a look actually in the inclusionary housing recommendation, we actually make a reference to that, the importance of actually crafting policy that's --

MR. QUISENBERRY: I saw a few references to this.

MR. SMITH: Yeah.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I'm looking at our -- this is a direct quote from the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Guidebook published in December of 2015. HUD grantees -- those who are receiving CDBG funds are required to affirmatively -- in all their planning activities, their operations, they are required to consider affirmatively furthering fair housing concerns, so this includes overcoming patterns of segregation and the denial of access to opportunity.

I'll be glad to send this part of the law, but this was a real concern, in that this planning activity of the Affordable Housing Task Force, this standard was not met.

MR. SMITH: Say that again, the specific --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Specifically, affirmatively furthering fair housing --

MS. SCHWARTZ: I have a question, Helen. This is Gale from the Housing Alliance.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes?

MS. SCHWARTZ: How do you actually measure whether or not that was met?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: What I'm going to do is, I'm going to send this passage from the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Guidebook, and what I would suggest is that we table this document at this point, and we will move forward with the much larger extensive set of recommendations so that we really can present the grounded research and information that those who are far more expert than I brought to the table.

Does that make sense to those who participated in drafting this initial document?

Is Jay still here?

MS. KINTER: Just for some closure here on the bullet point that --

MR. REDWOOD: Hi. This is Carl.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes?

MR. REDWOOD: In answer to Gale's question, the way that the city thinks they've met their obligation is by setting up this task force that we're on.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Carl, did you say that the way that the city is trying to meet this obligation was by setting up this

task force?

MR. REDWOOD: Yeah. That's why this task force was set up, to help them meet that obligation.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: To address these concerns.

MS. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Carl.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes, Sarah?

MS. KINTER: I guess I would just like to make a motion to table this bullet point response. Let's focus on the real recommendations that we want to make regarding AFFH.

I think, you know, the intent of this was to let the city know that, you know, the Affordable Housing Task Force recommendations didn't have that fair housing element, and obviously we've talked a lot about that, different perspectives, but at the end of the day, we want to come up with some good, solid fair housing recommendations or make policy recommendations from that standpoint, and we should focus all of our attention on that.

MR. DAMEWOOD: I think there's value

in letting city council know if we think something more is needed, if this task force thinks something more is needed. I think there's value in letting the, you know, decision makers know up front, you know, rather than letting them go through their process and then once the process is done, say, you know what, it doesn't do this, this, or this.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I agree.

MR. DAMEWOOD: I think it's better to get the issue in front of them now, this is my personal opinion, and to participate in, you know, implementation measures for the affordable housing recommendations going forward.

I mean, I don't see anything wrong with -- what David said, you know, about the first paragraph. I mean, why not make that statement? Why not say that publicly?

MR. SMITH: Michael Smith, city planning. Just, you know, as a point of clarification from my role in planning, we are going to be going to training, the fair housing training that was part of the -- at

least part of the AI, actually working with the fair housing partnership to get further training on how to better practice fair housing policies.

I mean, it's something our department is going to be working on, and currently we're trying to further refine how these recommendations look. I just wanted to put that out there to just make sure that everyone's aware of it.

MS. NICHOLS: When does the training start?

MR. SMITH: I'm not sure. This is something that I'm working with Mike Petrucci to --

MR. TAGUE: I want to just get clarification. Obviously this would require city council to pass legislation, housing trust fund, right, that would require legislation?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. TAGUE: And is that the first thing that they're going to work on?

MR. SMITH: Right now, that's the most active in terms of the legislative

process.

MR. TAGUE: Well, what I'm trying to determine is whether this group, that that would be what we would want to address first, the trust fund issue and how it plays out with fair housing.

And going back to, I think, Molly's point about trying to address things in a structured manner, not jumping all over the place, so that's why it's good to know what city council is going to do, and then we can write up recommendations that would go with that. Is that a technique we can use?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I don't think we can count -- we can't know what city council is going to address first; we don't have a set time table. I, myself, think it's important to address initial concerns to really help inform council, the people who are going to be making laws and policies, that there are really critical fair housing obligations that have not been addressed yet.

I think that this draft does need further work, but I'm hesitant to wait another two months until August to get any response

out to the lack of a fair housing lens in the Affordable Housing Task Force recommendations. I would suggest that it's valuable to have these concerns out there for city council to really look at as they craft policies, as they craft laws.

My suggestion is that we give it another couple weeks of work and we ask others to participate in that work, who feel like they have expertise, but I'm not -- I would -- I don't just think tabling it completely at this point is the best possibility.

MS. NICHOLS: I would make the motion -- I don't know how people feel about the first paragraph -- and David, the first paragraph, "The joint City-County Task Force" down to "AHTF recommendations" is the one you're talking about?

MR. WEBER: Yes.

MS. NICHOLS: Like, are we in this room prepared to go public with that paragraph so that at least city council is acknowledging this task force naming fair housing as a crucial component when they're considering their legislation, and do that now because

it's June 7th and they're not here in August.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MS. NICHOLS: Like, I don't know if there's going to be a public hearing, Michael, on this. Representative Lavelle said there might be, in the summer.

Anyway, but some occasion for this body, to name this out there now, as we then continue to work on the specific policy that comes, but if people in this room are okay with the first paragraph, I would move to accept it and put it out.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I second that motion.

MR. SMITH: Can I say something to that, though? I do think that in the first paragraph, particularly No. 3, I mean, the placement of affordable housing units to allow for residents to move to areas of opportunity, I mean, that has a huge implication towards our inclusionary housing policy and how that's actually crafted.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: That's right.

MR. SMITH: I do think that the task force did a really aggressive job towards

getting that recommendation to a position where it could address how we move communities that are not currently in neighborhoods of opportunity in positions to obtain housing in areas of opportunity.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Can I please add one thing. To David's point earlier, he was talking about moving -- creating opportunities for people to relocate to areas of opportunity. Isn't that what the fair housing laws really want?

And I just wanted to say, because what you said touched exactly to it, I agree with what David said, but I think it's only half of the equation. I think it's a both/and solution of the Fair Housing Act, not an either/or.

I don't think the purpose of the Fair Housing Act is to take people out of disinvested communities and put them into invested communities exclusively; I think it's to create those opportunities, but also to focus on the disinvested communities so that the opportunity is in those communities.

MR. SMITH: Absolutely. But --

MS. REYNOLDS: This is Angela. I'm going to jump in because I've been trying to jump in for the last ten minutes.

So to Molly's question, no, I'm not comfortable with the first paragraph to the point that you said, based on the discussion that has happened here today.

From what I'm hearing from Michael and David, and if I'm hearing you wrong, tell me, I'm hearing that you're saying that some of the aspects of fair housing are being included but are not being seen here, and I get that they may not be explicit, but we explicitly state in this first paragraph that it's missing.

I'm not comfortable with the current wording because it does suggest that there's a lack of fair housing consideration from the Affordable Housing Task Force; it may not be to the extent that we want it, but I'm not convinced yet that there's a lack.

And then the other concern that I have is that if we go to the end of that, the statement is: We want to bring attention to some of the issues that are missing from the

Affordable Housing Task Force recommendations -- to end it that way just keeps it way too open.

David made a comment earlier in terms of a more neutral statement that opens up the discussion, and I don't remember it because it was a while ago, but basically saying addressing considerations of affirmatively furthering fair housing within the policies that are going forward without being explicit at this point.

The next question that I have for Helen is, you said you don't want to wait two months, but what I hear from you is that you want this document to go out before the steering committee -- I'm sorry, before the task force meets again, and I have a concern about that as well.

MR. REDWOOD: Hi. This is Carl Redwood. I think the document is good. One of our duties as the task force is to do outreach and education, and it's a great document to get people thinking about affirmatively furthering when they may not have been.

I don't see it as just a document for the politicians or for the Affordable Housing Task Force; it's actually a document to get us all to think more about what it really means to affirmatively further fair housing.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I think that's a great point. You know, I come from the perspective of an activist, of a grassroots organizer, and so I really do want to help educate the community about the ways that we as a region can be really affirmatively furthering fair housing, because the damages are happening really fast, and I think that we need to move with real decision to help educate people about what's happening and about really constructive steps. We definitely have a difference of opinion here. I --

MS. NICHOLS: I'm just going to suggest -- I appreciate your comments about, how can we find a way -- there's some sense of urgency of being, like, we want to name this as, there are some limitations around the fair housing piece, but still be able to name how

the recommendations do address them.

I don't know if it would be feasible to get that in the next week or two, like, naming, here are examples of where the -- while they might not be explicit, that practice what you were saying with inclusionary housing are affirmatively furthering fair housing, but there are still concerns about the ways that they're not and name a few of those and then just name that.

But I don't know, I mean, the process of getting everyone from the task force, since we meet quarterly, to agree to it in between, we might not get there, but there could be a chance, if we're not going to agree to what this looks like right now, to -- it's kind of an occasion to say, oh, look, the task force already did this stuff that is including fair housing, saying it, and then also acknowledge the places where it could be better.

MR. KEENAN: Can I kind of offer a compromise?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Sure.

MR. KEENAN: If you want to pursue

this, sign the letter, and if you don't feel comfortable, just don't sign the letter. Just say, members of the Affordable Housing Task Force, don't put the whole task force name on it, and if there are certain members who want to work on this and feel strongly about it, they can sign on as members, but not endorsed by the whole task force. I mean, you can kind of move things out quickly and then not have to worry about everybody around the table approving it

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Do you have a concern about that?

MR. WEBER: I mean, we could also look at some modified language of that first section. Do people want to consider that?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I'm so sorry, David, I didn't hear you.

MS. GIBSON: Of modifying the language.

MR. QUISENBERRY: I'm willing to do that, if you want to see if there's a way to get the first paragraph to, you know, a workable paragraph today.

MR. KEENAN: Well, I really don't

think you're going to get everyone around the table to agree, so maybe we can just kind of let it --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yeah, I --

MR. QUISENBERRY: Could I just have two minutes and suggest what I would recommend and see what you think?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Okay.

MR. QUISENBERRY: In the first sentence --

MR. REDWOOD: This is Carl. We should --

MR. QUISENBERRY: This is Kevin Quisenberry. The first sentence that starts: The joint City-County Task Force -- when you get to the comma of that sentence, it says: But we are concerned about -- I think I would suggest: But we are concerned about a lack of focus on fair housing considerations in the AHTF recommendations -- not the lack of fair housing considerations, but concern about a lack of focus on fair housing considerations in the AHTF recommendations.

The next sentence, I think I would suggest leaving the first clause as it is:

When developing housing policies, et cetera -- and then when it picks up after the comma: The city is required to affirmatively further fair housing -- I think I would suggest putting a comma and saying: Including by focusing on such questions as -- and then --

MR. WEBER: Well, I would just suggest taking out the specifics. The city is required to affirmatively further fair housing by addressing significant issues facing historically disadvantaged populations -- I mean, that's part of what the law says.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Well, that's so general, though.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yeah.

MR. WEBER: Well, what we're saying is, we haven't done the homework to really get to the specifics of what we're going to recommend that's not included, so why call out these three items when there might be others?

MR. QUISENBERRY: Well, that's why I thought it should say: Including by focusing on such questions as -- I mean, patterns of segregation is --

MR. WEBER: Yeah, that's pretty --

MR. QUISENBERRY: It's been there forever, it's in every AI, it's still there.

MS. NICHOLS: And it's more concrete than just saying historically disadvantaged populations. Like, let's name it.

MR. QUISENBERRY: And then I think I would suggest striking the next sentence that says: These policy questions and other barriers should be addressed -- just strike that altogether.

And keep the next sentence to say: The AFFH Task Force will develop recommendations to city council in the coming months regarding the recommendations of the AHTF Task Force.

MR. KEENAN: And just say that we'd appreciate a seat at the table or something, too. I mean, it seems like that's one of the concerns we have.

MR. WEBER: Well, at this point, city council is the table.

MR. KEENAN: Right. Well --

MS. NICHOLS: The point you made about residents to move to areas of opportunity, is there a way to rephrase that

that it's not just about moving to a place, but making all areas more -- it seems too much like, oh, just move people.

MR. WEBER: From what I've seen, that is mostly what comes through HUD.

MS. NICHOLS: What if we just say: Live in.

MR. WEBER: To live in areas of opportunity. That's good.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Were the amendments noted, the suggested amendments?

MR. WEBER: Maybe somebody can write that version --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Is there a way you could -- I'm sorry, David.

MR. WEBER: I was going to say, maybe someone could sort of write that up to get a clean version and circulate it to the task force members.

MS. KINTER: I would suggest the task force review the first paragraph, and then that would be the official statement from the AFFH Task Force for those that sign on.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Well, I think not just for those who would sign off. I

think that we may have consensus as a task force that that first paragraph, as it has been amended -- Angela, are you more comfortable with it as it's been amended?

MS. REYNOLDS: Yes, I am.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I think we have a basic consensus, and we'll test that with a vote in a second.

Can you read that back to us?

THE COURT REPORTER: It's going to be really broken up, you know, because it came sentence by sentence, and there were comments, I don't know that there's, like, a full --

MS. GIBSON: He's got it.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Great.

THE COURT REPORTER: I mean, I can read you what I have, but it isn't all in one --

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Or Kevin, if you just want to read it as it is amended, and then we can vote on this amended version.

MR. QUISENBERRY: Okay.

MR. WEBER: Just the version of the first paragraph that --

MR. QUISENBERRY: I'm just going to

read the text of the first paragraph.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MR. QUISENBERRY: The joint City-County Task Force on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing -- then in parentheses, AFFH -- commends the Pittsburgh Affordable Housing Task Force -- then in parentheses, AHTF -- for addressing the city's affordable housing crisis, comma, but we are concerned about a lack of focus on fair housing considerations in the AHTF recommendations, period.

When developing housing policies such as those recommended by the AHTF, comma, the city is required to affirmatively further fair housing, comma, including by focusing on such questions as: One, how can the city address persistent patterns of segregation; two, how do choices and decisions about affordable housing policies and placement affect the ability of persons with disabilities to find accessible and affordable housing; and three, how does the placement of affordable housing units allow for residents to live in areas of opportunity.

The next sentence: The AFFH Task Force will develop fair housing recommendations to city council in the coming months, comma, pertaining to the recommendations of the AHTF Task Force.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I move to accept the amended version. Any further -- or does --

MS. NICHOLS: The one thing I -- I know you were saying, such questions as, and you name the three, but I guess historically disadvantaged populations, can we keep that in, so that at least we can -- like, what David was saying, that is what the law, in a general sense, says, and it's helpful to have some specifics. Like, I want those. Can we just keep the historically disadvantaged populations line?

MR. QUISENBERRY: Yes.

MS. NICHOLS: So instead of the, by addressing questions -- I don't know to -- the way you modified it.

MR. QUISENBERRY: The second full sentence of the paragraph, the second clause, the sentence should read: When developing

housing policies such as those recommended by the AHTF, comma, the city is required to affirmatively further fair housing --

MS. NICHOLS: For historically disadvantaged populations.

MR. JONES: David Jones, the PHRC. It should be left: By addressing significant issues facing -- I've read that several times in the law; we ought to keep that.

MS. NICHOLS: And then just say: Including questions such as --

MR. JONES: Including, but --

MR. QUISENBERRY: Last time. This is the second sentence --

MR. JONES: Including, but not limited to.

MR. QUISENBERRY: We should just type this out.

Okay. When developing housing policies such as those recommended by the AHTF, comma, the city is required to affirmatively further fair housing by addressing significant issues facing historically disadvantaged populations, comma, including by focusing on such questions as --

and then they're listed out.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Barney, I heard that sigh. Thanks for hanging in, everybody.

MS. NICHOLS: So you made a motion?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes, I made a motion. I now make a motion to accept this paragraph as we have amended it. Do I have a second?

MS. KINTER: I'll second the motion on accepting this paragraph.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: All in favor, say aye.

- - - -

(A chorus of ayes.)

- - - -

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Any opposed? Any abstentions?

MR. KEENAN: You know, Peter and I --

MS. SCHWARTZ: This is Gale. I abstain.

MR. WEBER: You know, we've hardly got anyone left here. You know, we don't -- we really don't have a majority of the task force members here to vote on this.

MR. DAMEWOOD: Well, somebody suggested earlier that we do, like, an electronic -- like, send it around to all the members and do an electronic vote.

MS. SMITH: Does that include the --

MR. WEBER: Sorry. It's a parliamentarian issue.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: No, no, no, it's an important point. It's an important point. How many people have we lost? We didn't lose that many, did we? Is Peter still --

MR. WEBER: If we have a 35-member task force, we need 18 for a quorum.

MR. SMITH: Question: The first paragraph has now been amended, but you are going to continue to work on the rest of the document?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: We're going to -- I think what has been agreed, if I understand correctly, is that we're going to work on the full recommendations over the next few months, to be sent out to the full task force in August, and that we would be basically meeting today here with the first

paragraph as our statement, as our response, our official response.

MR. SMITH: So that statement will be an official public response out of the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Task Force?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: As I understand it, yes.

MS. ROBERTS: Carlos says no.

MR. SMITH: Right, that's what I'm trying to understand. How does that jive with what you were saying earlier?

MR. TORRES: I'm sorry, I missed that last part. What was the question?

MR. SMITH: If this is going to be a formal statement out of the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Task Force, how does that mesh with what you said earlier?

MS. NICHOLS: He's saying that Carlos was worried about this, as a full document, going out as something the commission had created when it's still a draft, and I guess you're asking now if this is just this paragraph, is the commission okay with that -- although the task force doesn't

speak on behalf of the commission, right?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: No.

MS. NICHOLS: So it doesn't matter what the commission -- this is just a paragraph that the task force all, you know, votes and agrees on, then --

MR. TORRES: But I'm not necessarily sure that it's going to be published as just a paragraph.

MS. NICHOLS: I think we're saying it can.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Yes.

MR. QUISENBERRY: And then policy recommendations, targeted first to the trust fund and then to other things, would be coming in time.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I'm moving that we accept the amended paragraph as the official response of this task force, the AFFH Task Force, to the Affordable Housing Task Force recommendations.

There's been a suggestion that we send this out and that we have an electronic vote. Now, there is nothing in the guidelines about electronic votes. We've talked about

people participating by phone, you know, or in person.

At this point, we have four people on the phone, I believe, so there's Gale, Paul O'Hanlon, Carl Redwood, and La'Tasha Mayes.

La'Tasha, are you still there?

I think La'Tasha might be gone.

Raise your hand if you are a representative of this task force.

MS. SCHWARTZ: I'm a member of the task force.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Is that Gale?

MS. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: But Gale, you're abstaining; is that right?

MS. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So we have a quorum.

MS. GIBSON: Do we?

MR. DAMEWOOD: How many members are there?

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Well, we don't have an --

MS. NICHOLS: It's about 35 -- we do have a list, but I don't know the number.

MR. DAMEWOOD: If it's 35, a quorum's 18.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: 18. And we have how many people? Did you count how many we had?

MR. DAMEWOOD: I counted 11, plus people on the phone.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So that's not a quorum.

MR. TAGUE: So why can't we do it electronically? Is there something legally why we can't do it?

MS. NICHOLS: We need to modify the policy to say we can do an electronic vote.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: But we don't have a quorum to be able to modify the process that way.

I think that Chuck Keenan's suggestion might be the only kind of proper process possibility, basically we send out this suggestion to all the task force members and ask if they want to sign on. What do you think about that?

MR. HARVEY: So what is it presented as then?

MR. TAGUE: It's presented as members of the affirmatively furthering --

MR. WEBER: No, I don't think you --

THE COURT REPORTER: One at a time.

MR. JONES: I think it only spurs division, and I don't think that's purposeful at all. We've got to get consensus. If only some sign on, that's division, that's going backwards. I'd like to go forward. Let's wait until we get consensus.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Here's a thought: You know, the process guidelines --

MS. ROBERTS: Wait a minute. What is precluding electronic affirmation? What precludes that?

MR. TAGUE: Nothing.

MS. ROBERTS: Valerie Roberts. Are there any regulations that say you can't? The thing is, legally, if there is no reference to that specifically, no clear delineation of that, you can probably do it, okay? This is not like a budgetary thing, it doesn't fall into a category that you would need an open forum.

I think we're getting bogged down

with process, and I think we need to move forward with getting something done if you're going to do it. Electronic voting, I agree with you, I would just do electronic voting and give affirmation and call it a day.

MR. DAMEWOOD: Valerie, you don't speak much, but when you do speak up, you make really useful comments.

MS. ROBERTS: Thanks, Bob.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: Valerie, you are a member of this task force.

MS. ROBERTS: I know.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: So I would consider that a motion, and I second that motion.

All in favor?

- - - -

(A chorus of ayes.)

- - - -

MR. DAMEWOOD: Are you going to abstain, David?

MR. WEBER: I'm not going to abstain on that. I vote for voting.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I want to thank you all for hanging in there. I mean, we do

have new business on here. Does anybody else want to bring up new business?

MR. WEBER: No.

MODERATOR GERHARDT: I move to adjourn.

MR. DAMEWOOD: Do we need a quorum to adjourn?

- - - -

(The proceedings were concluded at 5:13 p.m.)

- - - -

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the transcript of the proceedings and evidence contained herein are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes taken by me at the time and place of the within cause; that the transcription was reduced to printing under my direction; and that this is a true and correct transcript of the same.

Sherri Kostante

Sherri Kostante

July 29, 2016

A

ABC's 52:13
ability 36:10 96:21
able 8:18 15:13 21:7 22:14 41:7 63:5 88:25 104:16
abroad 38:10
absolutely 14:9 63:17 66:2 85:25
abstain 35:12 99:21 106:21,22
abstaining 51:16 103:15
abstentions 33:17 39:17,18 51:15 99:17
accept 50:3 51:5 84:12 97:7 99:6 102:18
acceptable 23:9 39:4,5
accepted 38:17 42:24
accepting 42:22 99:10
access 17:25 76:14 77:11
accessible 96:22
accomplish 8:7
account 56:14,20
accurate 108:8
acknowledge 16:9 89:20
acknowledged 58:20
acknowledging 83:22
act 5:11 11:15 85:16,19
ACTION-Hous... 2:8 4:3
actions 58:14,16 75:9
active 81:25
actively 31:2
activist 16:16 54:5 56:17,18 56:23 88:9
activists 16:12
activities 69:17 77:7
activity 77:14
actual 11:15 54:8 58:20
add 21:8 54:17 85:6
added 29:5
adding 35:7
additional 38:4 46:19
additions 62:7
address 9:9 10:8 10:10 11:25 12:6,7 14:17,23 15:4 26:1 52:25 53:24 54:22,23 57:13,19,20,22 57:24 63:22 64:17 79:5 82:4 82:8,16,18 85:2 89:1 96:18
addressed 12:19 20:13 31:17 59:13 60:8 61:1 61:2 62:1 64:22 64:23 72:11 82:22 93:9
addressing 13:20 63:23 87:8 92:10 96:8 97:21 98:7,23
adjourn 107:5,7
adopt 24:1 45:3,5
advance 10:15 37:6 41:19
advocacy 15:9 16:12,16
affect 96:21
AFFH 22:10 56:1 60:8 79:13 93:12 94:23 96:6 97:1 102:19
affiliation 62:23
affirmation 105:14 106:5
affirmatively 1:2 8:3 11:16 12:11 20:4,12 23:22 48:17 51:20 55:19 59:22 72:8 73:3,14 77:3,6,8,19 78:3 87:9,24 88:5,12 89:7 92:3,9 96:4 96:15 98:3,22 101:5,16 105:2
affordability 57:12
affordable 52:6 54:12 55:20,24 56:11 57:10 59:7,9,13,18 60:6,9 61:3 64:16 68:7,24 69:6,14 70:1,20 71:9 72:15,19 73:1,11 75:10 77:14 79:16 80:15 83:2 84:18 86:19 87:1 88:2 90:3 96:7,9,20,22,24 102:20
afraid 22:20
afternoon 5:25
aggressive 84:25
ago 56:25 87:7
agree 14:9 20:17 33:19 59:24 68:4,18 69:22 70:15 80:10 85:13 89:13,15 91:2 106:3
agreed 100:20
agreement 20:10
agrees 102:6
ahead 23:16 29:13 34:15 45:7
AHTF 83:17 91:20,23 93:15 96:8,11,14 97:5 98:2,21
AI 29:11,16 42:3 42:5,16 81:1 93:2
Allegheny 2:11,13 2:16,19 4:12 5:1 5:13 13:16,24 14:1 42:11,13
Alliance 2:21 67:15 77:22
allow 84:18 96:24
allows 18:12
altogether 93:10
amend 39:9
amended 7:7 50:21,21 95:3,4 95:20,21 97:7 99:7 100:16 102:18
amendment 22:1 22:7 23:4 39:4,6 50:12 51:6
amendments 27:2 50:24 54:2 62:6 94:11,11
analyses 26:20
analysis 7:24 11:11,20 15:1,3 15:16 16:2,3,4 18:6,7 19:13,17 19:23 21:14 26:17
analyzing 11:17 16:3
Angela 2:18 13:10 86:1 95:3
answer 56:5 65:15 78:19
Antarctica 38:11
anybody 33:13,15 41:14 68:19 107:1
anyway 43:22 84:7
apologies 74:3
apologize 22:24
application 46:9 49:25 50:11
apply 21:19 45:2 52:23
appoint 41:2
appointed 66:1
appointee 5:13
appreciate 63:6 88:21 93:17
approach 8:3 11:25
appropriate 16:12 37:22 38:1 55:2 65:10
approved 43:11
approving 90:11
areas 84:19 85:5 85:9 93:24 94:2 94:8 96:25
arrive 60:2
artificial 31:11
asked 34:10 40:21 55:14 56:25 62:15
asking 28:1 53:4 58:14 101:23
aspects 72:25 86:11
assess 7:13,14 12:25 14:21 17:13 23:5
assessing 14:23
assessment 7:17 11:11 17:14,19 18:1,5 21:22,23 26:9,14 31:18 34:18
assessment's 14:21
assessments 21:18 21:20,20 22:11 23:8 29:20 33:8
associated 69:5,9 75:14
assumption 27:16 29:15
attack 73:19
ATTENDANCE 2:1
attention 59:11 79:24 86:24
August 52:2 60:18 61:8 62:5 65:21 82:25 84:1 100:24
auspices 66:22
authorities 42:12 44:5
authority 2:8,9 4:5,8 7:10 12:24 31:1 32:1 41:11 58:15
Avenue 1:9

avoid 70:5
aware 46:18 81:10
Awesome 6:23
aye 33:9 34:19 50:15 51:10 99:12
ayes 33:11 34:21 39:14 50:17 51:12 99:14 106:18

B

B 42:19 43:4,10
back 18:10 32:13 32:25 36:5 41:10 48:1 49:22 50:9 54:7 58:12,18 60:16 65:5,16 70:18 71:12,18,20 82:7 95:9
backwards 105:9
bad 38:20
bare 61:13
Barney 2:20 26:5 99:2
barriers 11:17 15:10,23 64:21 93:9
based 37:22 40:12 46:1 49:19 86:6
baseline 49:21 56:21
basic 19:20 31:7 31:14 32:3 52:21,22 95:7
basically 24:1 27:21 34:16 35:9 54:4 87:7 100:25 104:20
basis 40:6 45:25
becoming 71:25
began 44:8
beginning 29:24
begins 9:2
begs 56:24
behalf 41:7 62:20 102:1
belabor 16:8
believe 5:21 74:21 103:4
beneficial 17:20
best 20:2 52:15 83:12
better 15:24 20:24 73:20 80:11 81:3 89:21
beyond 14:7
big 14:24 30:18 40:4
bit 13:3 67:6
black 64:9
blind-copied 74:25
board 31:2,3 36:6
Bob 2:12 4:14 13:18 21:12 28:25 29:17 41:22 43:13 52:8 70:15 106:9
bodies 27:9
body 27:7 65:25 75:19 84:8
bogged 105:25
bolded 9:1 14:20
boss 40:21,22 71:19,20,22
both/and 85:15
bottom 20:18
bound 13:25
boundaries 14:8 31:11
breaking 10:21
bring 17:24 30:21 50:24 59:10 86:24 107:2
broadly 74:5
broken 95:11
brought 78:10
budgetary 105:22
bullet 36:18 78:16 79:10
bureaucracy 38:21
business 6:11 36:11 44:3,18 107:1,2

C

C 20:16 43:4 108:4,4
call 4:19 5:22 16:13,20 17:3,8 44:17 92:19 106:5
capital 36:19
care 29:16
Carey 2:16 5:12
Carl 2:4 3:8 10:22 10:23 18:21 19:9,21 21:7 23:11,13 78:17 78:23 79:7 87:19 91:11 103:5
Carlos 2:5 3:12 3:15,17 25:24 28:19,24 29:5 29:22 32:17 46:5 49:25 50:7 65:13 67:19 68:4 101:9,20
carried 12:14
carry 71:3
case 61:15
categorically 42:14
category 41:25 42:19 43:10 105:23
cause 69:12 108:10
CDBG 42:12 44:5 77:5
Celeste 2:20 26:3
certain 70:25 71:2 90:5
certainly 12:21 16:9,11 17:6 28:7 58:18
certify 108:6
cetera 92:1
challenge 67:17
chance 7:3 51:21 89:15
change 6:20 14:20 16:19 23:12 24:18 33:7 36:13,14 37:2,2 42:17 51:1
changes 35:15 36:4
charged 60:10
check 38:10,12
Cherylie 52:9
chief 4:7
choice 7:15,18 23:6
choices 96:19
chorus 33:11 34:21 39:14 50:17 51:12 99:14 106:18
Chuck 2:19 13:15 104:18
Churchill 10:2
circulate 46:17 94:18
cites 7:23
city 2:7,8,9 4:1,5 7:15 8:13 9:5 10:3 11:12,21 14:3,8,13 16:13 17:18 26:17 34:1 40:17,17 42:1,11 57:6 59:11,17 60:13 60:16 61:23 65:3 67:22 68:8 72:11,12,16,17 72:24 73:15 78:20,24 79:15 80:1,21 81:18 82:11,15 83:4 83:22 92:3,8 93:13,21 96:15 96:17 97:3 98:2 98:21
city's 21:20 75:9 96:8
City-County 2:14 5:4 40:18 83:16 91:15 96:4
clarification 43:17 73:21 74:4 80:23 81:17
clarifying 72:7
clarity 45:10 72:15
classes 21:5 64:19
clause 29:19 34:16,17 43:5 91:25 97:24
clean 94:18
clear 21:21 24:24 45:12,16 64:6 70:8 105:20
close 46:21
closest 22:17
closure 78:15
co-chairs 62:21 70:19
combat 21:2
come 4:20 69:3 76:3 79:20 88:8
comes 31:16 84:10 94:5
comfortable 9:19 66:15 86:5,16 90:2 95:4
coming 6:9 41:3 56:9,21 93:13 97:3 102:15
comma 91:16 92:2,5 96:9,14 96:16 97:4 98:2 98:21,24
commends 96:6
comment 15:6 55:3 87:4
comments 15:15 41:23 88:21 95:12 106:8
commission 2:3,5 2:6,11,16,17,21 3:6,11,18,21 4:13 5:9,14 31:22 40:17 43:18 46:5,8 66:19,23,23 101:22,24 102:1 102:4
commission's 66:25
commissioner 3:5
commitment 15:20
committee 3:7 6:8 6:15 13:14 15:1 15:19 16:1 36:16,22 37:6,8

44:7,8,12 47:15 52:4,20 53:7,8 53:10,12,22 87:16
communities 15:10,21 17:18 20:15,25 85:2 85:20,21,23,24
community 2:12 4:24 18:13 88:11
complete 7:17 26:9 46:10,11 46:13,20 47:2 67:1,21
completed 18:8
completely 31:9 54:10,19 83:11
compliance 20:11
component 83:24
comprehensive 48:5
compromise 89:23
concern 7:22 15:7 23:10 37:17 40:12,24 44:18 45:4,9 48:14 61:21 62:2 64:17 65:2 67:20 71:13 77:13 86:22 87:17 90:13 91:21
concerned 11:8 30:17 72:25 91:17,18 96:10
concerns 7:11 15:2,14,15,24 30:18 50:22 54:1 60:25 61:23,25 64:10 64:20 72:1 77:9 79:6 82:18 83:4 89:9 93:19
concert 14:17
concluded 107:9
concrete 68:14 93:3
conducted 44:3
conflict 13:3
consensus 2:4 36:10 67:23 95:1,7 105:7,10
consider 31:11,12 37:11,13,21 40:15 52:5 59:18,21 61:2 62:3 74:12 77:8 90:16 106:14
consideration 52:1 56:11 86:18
considerations 59:20 87:8 91:19,21,22 96:11
considered 60:6 61:6
considering 57:7 61:5 83:24
consistent 24:6
constrain 14:10
constructive 30:24 88:17
consultant 17:24
contact 67:3
contained 108:7
context 76:12
continue 84:9 100:17
conversation 12:15 63:16
conversations 30:24
convey 68:6
convinced 86:21
cooperation 11:10,15 30:15 30:25 31:6
correct 19:10 20:16 44:8,9 67:10,11 108:12
correctly 11:7,13 100:21
council 59:11,17 60:13 73:16 80:1 81:18 82:11,16,19 83:4,22 93:13 93:21 97:3
Councilman 71:12
counsel 4:5
count 23:25 82:15 104:4
counted 104:6
counties 9:20
country 52:16
county 2:11,13,16 2:19 4:13 5:1,13 7:16 8:13,15 9:5 9:16,18 11:12 11:21 13:16,24 14:1,14 17:15 17:17 20:5 26:8 30:19,23 41:1,2 42:1,11,13
county's 21:20
countywide 8:2 8:23 9:9,11,14 9:17,23 10:5 11:25 12:2 14:6 20:11
couple 7:11 83:8
course 19:11 26:18 30:21 31:23
court 6:3 13:9 19:2 26:2 33:20 33:23 55:7 57:17 58:6 73:23 95:10,16 105:4
covers 19:14,15
craft 83:5,6
crafted 84:22
crafting 76:21
create 46:8 52:7 56:3 85:22
created 10:8 12:5 13:22 56:6 69:8 101:22
creates 13:3
creating 52:13 85:8
creation 19:19
crisis 96:9
criteria 35:15 37:23 42:15 49:19
critical 30:25 64:16 65:9 82:21
critically 76:14
criticism 59:6,15
CROWD 39:7
crucial 83:24
crystal 64:6
culmination 75:20
Cummings 2:16 5:12,12,17
curiosity 68:23
current 7:14 21:18 22:11 23:6,8 33:8 37:4 86:16
currently 81:7 85:3
cycle 26:8,18

D

D-W-O-R-I-N 4:11
damages 88:13
Damewood 2:12 4:14,14 13:18 13:18 25:20 28:25,25 29:17 29:17 30:5 41:22,22 42:5,9 43:7,10,15 52:9 53:1,9,13,17 59:4 70:15,24 79:25 80:11 100:1 103:20 104:1,6 106:6 106:20 107:6
danger 18:23
date 35:7
dates 28:20 29:1,2
Dave 66:7
David 2:6,9,15 3:20 4:7 5:6 7:9 11:7 13:19 18:16,22 20:9 23:9 27:3 28:12 37:25 51:16 62:21 65:11 66:9 72:18 80:18 83:15 85:14 86:9 87:4 90:18 94:15 97:14 98:6 106:21
David's 21:12 40:12 63:14 85:7
day 79:20 106:5
days 36:17,23,25 37:6,9,20 38:18 38:20 39:4,5,10 46:11,12,16 50:8
deadline 74:9
deal 18:22
dealt 34:4
December 77:4
decision 38:9,14 80:5 88:15
decisions 96:19
definitely 70:19 88:18
definition 29:24
delay 69:12
delays 69:5,9
deliberated 41:18
deliberation 31:24
delineation 105:20
denial 77:11
denominator 25:8 25:9
department 2:7 2:13,19 3:24 4:1 5:1 13:16 34:2 60:17 81:6
DEPOSITION 1:20
descriptive 42:20
designated 38:14 40:25
details 58:4
determine 82:3
develop 16:17 41:20 64:5 93:12 97:2
developing 92:1 96:13 97:25 98:19
development 76:13
dialogue 67:4

difference 88:18
different 10:14 30:22 31:9 32:12 59:11 69:1 70:10 75:12,13 79:19
difficult 30:21
difficulties 55:10
direct 77:2
direction 75:23 108:11
director 3:10,18 6:6
disabilities 2:15 5:5 76:16 96:22
Disability 2:4 40:18
disadvantaged 92:11 93:4 97:12,17 98:5 98:24
disagree 57:5
disagreeing 30:3
discussed 53:7
discussion 7:5,8 28:23 50:25 86:6 87:6
disinvested 85:20 85:23
displacement 64:8
disrespectful 54:11 55:6,12
disservice 66:5
distressed 20:15
District 2:4
dive 6:10
divide 31:10
divided 39:1
division 25:8 105:6,8
document 7:4 19:18,24 20:1 42:6 50:21 52:14,18 53:24 55:5 60:4,20 62:4 69:23 71:19,22,23 75:20 78:5,13 87:15,20,23 88:1,3 100:18 101:21
documentation 61:14
documents 64:5 75:1
doing 4:20 11:10 12:24 13:1,2 14:22 16:3,14 16:20 20:18 21:3,22 23:25 24:2 25:8 58:1 73:13
dollar 56:1
double-checked 6:21
draft 6:19,25 37:5 53:5 67:20 75:2 75:2,3 82:23 101:23
drafting 78:12
drawing 36:6
dropped 28:5
due 63:24
duplicate 7:19 11:22
duties 87:21
Dworin 2:10 4:10 4:10 9:13 11:1 17:1,6,12 52:9 55:3,8 57:8,15 57:25 59:2 62:10 73:21 74:1

E

E 36:19,19 108:4 108:4,4,4
e-mail 38:13
e-mails 38:11
earlier 66:9 85:7 87:4 100:2 101:12,18
early 12:16 18:15
easiness 38:19
educate 88:11,16
education 87:22
educational 52:17
effective 10:17 68:20
efforts 58:21
eight 20:6,7 36:17 36:23 37:6
either 73:15
either/or 85:17
elected 31:25 65:25 67:22 69:24
electronic 100:3,4 102:23,25 104:14 105:14 106:3,4
electronically 104:11
element 79:18
endorsed 90:7
enormous 30:14 64:10
ensure 55:25
entered 13:7
entire 53:3
entities 8:14,15 13:24 30:22 40:17
entitlement 14:14 18:13 42:12 44:6
entity 41:14,20
envisioned 37:4
equation 85:15
essentially 17:3
establish 49:9
established 8:8
establishing 57:6
et 92:1
everybody 20:24 21:6 22:25 35:16 38:12 49:15 70:6 74:14 90:10 99:3
everyone's 81:10
evidence 108:7
ex 41:13,25
exact 23:25
exactly 27:11 85:13
example 48:12
examples 89:4
excellent 27:3
exclusively 85:21
Excuse 13:5
executive 3:10 6:6
expansive 43:2
expert 78:9
expertise 61:15 62:2 65:2 83:10
explains 52:14
explicit 86:13 87:11 89:5
explicitly 19:19 26:21 64:22,23 73:2 86:14
express 37:16
expressed 15:15
extended 8:15
extension 35:10
extensive 15:12 15:21 51:25 60:24 61:11 62:4 78:6
extent 86:20

F

F 108:4
face 15:22 59:6
facilitating 27:18
facing 64:21 92:10 98:8,23
fact 63:24
fair 1:2 2:10 4:10 7:14,17 8:3,23 9:13 10:9,15 11:12,16 12:1,3 12:11 15:11 16:19 20:4,12 20:19 22:11 23:6,8,22 26:14 29:20 30:10 31:18 33:9 34:18 46:22 48:18 51:18,20 54:13,18,22,23 55:12,22,25 57:8,8,13,15,15 57:20,22,24 59:22 61:5 63:8 68:10,11,14 69:11 70:2 71:7 72:8,20,20 73:14 74:16 76:16 77:3,9,19 78:3 79:17,21 80:24 81:2,3 82:6,21 83:1,23 85:10,16,19 86:11,18 87:9 88:5,13,24 89:8 89:19 91:19,20 91:22 92:4,9 96:5,10,16 97:2 98:3,22 101:5 101:17
fall 105:22
families 21:4
fan 69:22
far 38:16 51:24 52:11 60:23 61:11 62:3 78:9
fashion 18:14
fast 88:14
faster 75:23
favor 33:9 34:19 39:12 50:15 51:9 99:11 106:16
feasible 89:2
feedback 36:7 44:20
feel 5:17 10:15 15:12 37:23 83:9,14 90:1,6
feeling 30:14
feels 55:11
field 61:20
Fifth 1:9
figure 57:21 63:20
final 6:25
finalized 35:22
find 39:22 88:22 96:22
fine 7:1 11:5 23:14 54:24 59:8 62:19
finished 32:22
finishes 19:7
first 5:18 6:11 7:12 15:13 29:9 31:18 32:23 34:17 36:18 41:24 42:17 54:4 58:24 62:12 68:5 72:4 76:3 80:19

81:22 82:4,16 83:15,15 84:11 84:16 86:5,14 90:15,23 91:9 91:14,25 94:21 95:2,24 96:1 100:15,25 102:14
five 25:14
fix 20:20
flesh 52:12 61:12
floor 7:7 27:2 37:1
focus 14:6,10 19:18 20:11 21:1 54:13 79:11,23 85:23 91:19,22 96:10
focused 10:11,16 11:15
focusing 18:24 69:2 92:6,22 96:16 98:25
folks 70:19 71:14 71:15
following 72:24
force 1:3 2:2,14 5:5 6:8,13 7:19 8:7,10,21 9:8 10:16 11:8 12:4 13:4,22,25 16:15,24 17:3 17:25 18:22 19:15 20:24 21:21 22:10 23:5,23 24:8 29:24 30:1 31:15 32:19 34:5 35:4 37:7,9 37:18 38:16 40:16,19 41:15 41:15 43:12 44:17 45:20 48:18,21 49:4 49:24 51:21 52:1 53:4 54:12 55:13,18,20,22 56:9,12,20 57:1 57:11 59:7,14 60:7,10 61:3 62:5,22,23 64:17 65:1,8,12 66:19 68:7,25 69:4,8,11,11,16 70:14,18,20,23 71:4 72:16,19 73:1,12,12 74:17 75:10,18 75:19 77:15 78:22 79:1,3,16 80:2 83:2,16,23 84:25 86:19 87:1,17,21 88:3 89:13,18 90:4,4 90:8 91:15 93:12,15 94:19 94:21,23 95:2 96:4,7 97:2,5 99:25 100:14,24 101:6,17,25 102:5,19,20,21 103:9,11 104:21 106:11
force's 57:19
forces 74:22
forever 93:2
form 31:22 48:4 50:1,7,11 61:13 67:21 73:17
formal 32:17 40:11 101:16
forum 105:24
forward 18:9,12 49:12 50:2,20 67:4 71:4 75:23 78:6 80:16 87:10 105:9 106:2
four 28:3 103:3
frame 35:21 75:8
Friday 74:10
Friedman 2:6 3:20,21
front 80:5,12
full 27:7 28:6 37:20 41:15 52:1 95:13 97:23 100:22,23 101:20
Fuller 52:9 62:9
fully 52:12,14 68:4,18
fund 75:22 76:3 76:10 81:19 82:5 102:15
funded 76:10
funds 77:5
further 8:23 11:16 13:6 25:24 45:6 50:25 51:6 52:1 52:25 54:18 69:12 72:8 73:14 81:2,7 82:24 88:5 92:3 92:9 96:15 97:7 98:3,22
furtherance 12:3
furthering 1:2 8:3 12:11 20:4,12 20:19 23:22 48:18 51:20 55:19 59:22 73:3 77:3,9,19 78:3 87:9,24 88:13 89:8 96:5 101:5,17 105:2
future 50:6,22

G

Gale 2:21 67:14 77:21 99:20 103:4,12,14
Gale's 78:19
gaps 16:5,10
Gastil 34:11 71:13
general 29:10 41:17 92:14 97:15
generally 43:23 68:6
gentleman 66:8
Gerhardt 1:12 2:3 3:4,5,15 4:18 5:15,21 6:5 6:23 7:2 8:11 10:22 11:3,6 13:5,13 14:25 16:25 17:4 18:16 19:6,12 20:8,21 21:6,10 21:25 22:4,14 22:20,24 23:16 23:20,24 25:5 25:11,23 26:16 27:1,20 28:18 29:3,12 30:13 32:7,13,15,20 32:24 33:6,15 33:25 34:6,10 34:23 35:2,8,13 35:19,23 36:3 37:3,16 38:6,25 39:3,9,12,16,21 40:2,10 41:5 42:4,8 43:3,9,13 44:9,15 46:3 47:10,14 48:13 48:25 49:14 50:14,19 51:4,9 51:14 53:6,11 53:16,19,23 58:7,25 60:23 61:9,18 62:11 62:14 63:1,11 63:17 64:3 65:13 66:16 67:11,19 68:2 69:18 71:21 74:8,14,18,23 75:5,15 77:1,18 77:23 78:1,18 78:23 79:5,8 80:10 82:14 84:2,13,23 88:7 89:24 90:12,17 91:4,8 92:15 94:10,14,24 95:6,15,19 96:2 97:6 99:2,5,11 99:16 100:8,19 101:7 102:2,12 102:17 103:12 103:14,17,22 104:3,8,15 105:11 106:10 106:13,24 107:4
getting 85:1 89:12 105:25 106:2
Gibson 2:11 4:12 4:12 6:17,21 38:8,8 46:23,23 47:4 68:22,22 69:20 74:21 90:19 95:14 103:19
give 46:11 56:21 67:6,8,17 83:7 106:5
giving 50:8
glad 77:12
glaring 18:11
go 13:6 17:22 18:9,10,19 23:16 25:23 29:13 32:25 34:15 36:5 38:9 41:1 45:7 58:24 66:25 70:18 71:18,20 73:22 74:5,13 80:6 82:12 83:21 86:23 87:15 105:9
goal 7:12 8:4,7,21 8:25 9:2,18 12:6 14:20 21:17 22:9 23:4,5 33:7 34:17
goals 19:22 67:7
goes 38:3 63:16
going 7:7,20 8:7 12:25 18:19 22:21,25 24:2,3 24:10 31:23 34:13,25 35:3 38:11 40:10 41:17 43:20 44:11,16 46:8,9 46:11,12 50:2 55:25 56:17 60:1,21 61:10 63:8,13,15 65:24 67:8 69:25 71:3,18 72:17 76:12 78:1,2 80:15,24 80:24 81:6,23 82:7,11,16,20 84:4 86:2 87:10 88:20 89:15 91:1 92:18 94:16 95:10,25 100:17,19,21

101:15,21 102:8 105:8 106:3,20 106:22
good 5:20,25 6:22 21:13 23:14 28:13 31:19 47:16,18 68:6 75:4 79:21 82:10 87:20 94:9
gotten 58:4
governmental 42:2
GRANT 1:21
grantees 77:5
grassroots 88:9
great 7:2 31:5 32:7 50:2,11 63:1 72:22 73:6 73:14 87:22 88:8 95:15
ground 55:1
grounded 78:8
group 2:4 30:2 46:15,19 48:3 56:13 65:7,7 66:21 68:25 69:1,12 74:7,11 76:2 82:3
groups 48:2,4 68:8 70:10
guess 7:15 11:18 12:20 44:18 45:15 48:15 65:6 71:13 79:9 97:11 101:23
Guidebook 77:4 78:4
guidelines 6:12 19:24 24:1,13 24:14,24,25 27:5,16,24 28:14 41:6 45:5 49:10,10 102:24 105:12
GULF 1:20
guys 40:24 76:5

H

half 49:7 85:15
hand 13:23 40:14 53:15 103:8
hanging 99:3 106:25
happen 73:6
happened 67:10 86:7
happening 14:22 31:6 47:22 64:15 88:14,16
happens 70:4 72:23
hard 3:14 6:16 10:24 54:11 67:15
Harvey 2:13 4:25 4:25 29:8,14 30:9 104:24
hate 69:10
hear 3:14 6:3 10:19,21,25 14:5 19:3 21:7 22:7,15,18 33:23 87:14 90:18
heard 99:2
hearing 67:16 73:24 84:4 86:8 86:9,10
Helen 1:12 2:3 3:4 11:2 45:15 67:13 77:21 87:13
hello 4:16,18 32:8 36:12
help 7:13 17:13 18:1,8 20:24 21:18 22:10 23:5,7 33:7 64:4 65:3 69:5 70:12 79:3 82:19 88:10,15
helpful 97:15
helping 14:20 26:19 53:5 71:7 71:8
hesitant 44:17,20 82:24
hey 17:23 18:10 54:21 58:1
Hi 3:20 78:17 87:19
high 41:1
higher 41:11
Hill 2:4
Hills 8:17
historically 92:11 93:4 97:11,17 98:4,24
hold 19:2,2
homework 92:17
hope 25:20 35:23 36:13 37:17 52:11 69:15,15 69:20 70:11 71:11
hoped 58:19
housing 1:2 2:8,9 2:10,12,21 4:5,8 4:11,15 5:9 7:10 7:15,18 8:4,24 10:9,15 11:12 11:16 12:1,3,12 12:24 15:11 16:19 20:4,12 20:19 22:12 23:6,9,23 26:14 29:20 30:10 31:19,25 33:9 34:18 42:12 44:5 48:18 51:18,20 52:6 54:12,13,19,22 54:23 55:13,20 55:23,24,25 56:12 57:10,14 57:20,23,24 59:7,9,13,18,22 60:6,10 61:3,5 63:8 64:16 67:14 68:7,10 68:25 69:6,11 69:14 70:1,2,20 71:7,9 72:9,15 72:19,20,20 73:1,12,14 74:16 75:10,22 76:3,16,19 77:3 77:9,15,19,21 78:3 79:16,17 79:21 80:15,25 81:2,4,18 82:6 82:21 83:1,2,23 84:18,21 85:4 85:10,16,19 86:11,18,19 87:1,9 88:3,6,13 88:25 89:7,8,19 90:3 91:19,21 91:22 92:1,4,9 96:5,7,9,11,13 96:16,20,23,24 97:2 98:1,3,19 98:22 101:5,17 102:20
HUD 2:10 4:9 77:4 94:5
huge 69:22 84:20
Human 2:3,5,6,11 2:13,15,16,19 2:21 3:6,11,18 3:22 4:13 5:1,10 5:13 13:16 40:18 46:6

I

idea 28:13 40:1 50:2
identified 14:2,13
identify 8:22 9:10 11:24 24:21,22 68:14,16
ignore 10:12
imagine 36:22
impacted 15:10
impacts 64:21
impediment 7:23 7:25 9:8,25 10:1 10:10 12:4,6,7 13:21 14:11 17:18 21:16 28:21 30:15 42:6
impediments 7:14 7:17,24 10:9 11:11 12:13,18 14:2,13 15:2,4,5 15:17 19:14,17 19:23 20:6 21:19 22:11 23:6,8 26:9,17 26:20 30:10 33:8 60:7
implementation 71:1,9 80:14
implemented 55:1
implication 84:20
importance 76:21
important 59:1 69:17 73:19 76:14 82:18 100:9,9
impression 74:6
improve 76:14
inappropriate 54:19
inaudible 6:2 33:18
inclined 45:8
include 8:5 43:8 47:24 54:20 100:5
included 16:11 27:4 46:19 86:12 92:19
includes 77:10
including 9:14 26:14 65:11 89:18 92:5,22 96:16 98:11,12 98:15,25
inclusionary 76:19 84:21 89:7
inclusive 37:18
income 21:4
incomplete 60:13 60:14
incorporate 19:22
incorporated 15:6
increase 22:25
increased 75:24
incredibly 30:24
indicate 9:4
indicated 49:16
indicating 9:20
infancy 66:4
inform 21:18 22:10 23:7 26:19 33:8 82:19
information 18:15 78:8
initial 51:19,23

52:6,7 60:24 61:19 78:12 82:18
initially 66:23 69:9
initiated 66:24
instance 13:24 75:22
instances 73:4
institutions 30:16 42:2
intended 59:5,15 59:16
intent 59:7 63:20 79:14
interagency 11:9
interconnected 31:10
interested 8:18 71:25
intergovernme... 11:9
intern 2:6 3:21
introduce 4:22 5:24 26:1
introductions 4:20
invested 85:21
investigations 5:10
investigator 5:8
invitation 41:12 53:3
invitations 8:15 27:8
involved 7:12 31:1 64:11 68:24
Isaac 31:3
issue 80:12 82:5 100:7
issues 16:10 30:17 54:15 57:14,20 57:23,24 59:12 68:9 86:25 92:10 98:8,23
item 28:16,16 34:4
items 92:20
IZ 76:12

J

Jackson 2:8 4:4,4
Jansen 2:10 4:9,9
Jay 2:10 4:10 16:25 17:5 52:9 62:10 74:8 78:14
jive 101:11
job 16:21 84:25
John 2:14 5:4
joint 6:12 83:16 91:15 96:3
Jones 2:15 5:6,6 98:6,6,12,15 105:5
Jr 2:14
July 108:16
jump 86:2,3
jumped 60:18
jumping 82:9
June 1:6 2:2 3:1 32:4 35:1 84:1
jurisdiction 21:22
jurisdictions 9:12 14:15 21:15 42:13 44:6
Justice 2:12 4:24

K

Keenan 2:19 13:15,15 25:7 39:22 40:9,20 47:12 89:22,25 90:25 93:16,22 99:18
Keenan's 104:18
keep 29:23 47:12 49:15 93:11 97:12,17 98:9
keeps 87:3
Kevin 2:12 4:23 21:11 22:4 23:3 35:20 38:23 43:15,19 62:15 68:3 91:13 95:19
key 15:4
kind 10:20 31:22 43:1 55:15 59:16 61:13 62:1 66:24 70:12 89:17,22 90:8 91:2 104:19
kinds 60:5,7
Kinter 2:21 49:5 52:10 78:15 79:9 94:20 99:9
know 7:23 9:16 9:22 10:1,4,8,13 10:19 12:21,24 13:20 14:1,7,15 14:16,24 16:2,4 16:17,18 17:2,7 17:19 21:13 24:5,8,17 25:3,7 25:9 27:11,17 28:17 30:13 37:19 38:2,13 38:21 39:24 40:23 41:25 42:10,17 43:25 44:1,2,13,23 45:20,21,23 47:2,21 48:2,6,6 48:9 50:4 53:14 54:5,12 55:14 59:5,8,9,17,17 59:19 60:1,9,11 60:12,13 61:21 61:22 62:7,19 64:5,11,12,18 66:9 68:19 69:3 69:7,13,15,22 69:24 70:8,9,25 71:12,16,25 72:7 75:7,8 79:14,15,15 80:1,4,5,5,8,14 80:18,22 82:10 82:15 83:14 84:3 88:8 89:2 89:11 90:23 95:11,13 97:10 97:21 99:18,22 99:23 102:5 103:1,25 105:12 106:12
knowledge 61:14 62:2 65:2
Kostante 1:13 108:16

L

L 2:14
La'Tasha 2:17 4:17,19 5:23 6:1 6:5 22:15 32:10 36:13 37:12 39:3 103:5,6,7
labeled 75:2
lack 9:9 55:12 83:1 86:18,21 91:18,20,22 96:10
laid 19:16,22 31:16 49:20 61:12
language 17:8 18:4 55:15 56:22 66:10 90:15,20
large 42:5
larger 74:11 78:6
late 34:14
latest 15:3
laundry 42:20,23
Lavelle 71:12 84:5
law 52:22 72:8,9 72:24 77:13 92:12 97:14 98:9
laws 82:20 83:6 85:11
learning 5:19
leave 22:12 29:21
leaving 29:25 91:25
left 98:7 99:23
Legal 2:12 4:15
legally 104:11 105:19
legislation 64:24 72:18,23 73:17 81:18,20 83:25
legislative 81:25
legislators 61:2 62:3
legitimate 45:11
length 23:1 36:15
lens 55:23,24,25 56:2,7 68:10,15 83:1
let's 6:10 14:16 19:6 29:18 32:25 53:24 70:3 72:22 75:24 79:11 93:5 105:9
letter 90:1,2
letting 59:17 80:1 80:4,6
level 31:7 72:24
levels 11:12
LIHTC 75:25
limit 29:9 44:10
limitation 35:9
limitations 73:7 73:15 88:24
limited 48:1 98:16
limiting 26:24
limits 9:24 32:16
line 20:18 43:23 97:18
lines 64:15
list 20:5 25:6 28:6 28:8 40:4,11 42:20,23 44:11 44:13,16,23 45:23 46:1,13 47:2,12 48:5,16 48:20,24 49:1,5 49:7 50:3 103:25
listed 20:14 27:10 27:23 28:10 58:12 71:24 99:1
listen 72:3
listing 24:4 27:6
lists 45:17 47:19
little 13:3 34:14 58:23 67:6 72:14
live 20:25 94:7,8 96:25
location 9:6 76:6 76:7,7,13
long 35:4 61:20 69:13
long-term 63:25
longer 36:20,23 75:18
look 14:2,16 20:7

28:20 37:20 54:17,21 57:2 57:11 68:9,15 70:1,25 75:12 76:18 81:8 83:5 89:17 90:15
looked 53:25
looking 9:15,24 11:9 12:1 14:12 16:2 29:11 56:7 60:11 77:1
looks 63:10 89:16
lose 100:11
lost 100:10
lot 31:24 40:23 63:4 64:12,14 69:8 79:18
lots 10:14
loud 75:17
louder 17:5,15 73:25
low 21:4
Lyle's 5:8

M

Madden 2:7 3:23 3:23 39:20,20
main 45:9
maintaining 48:7
major 36:4,13 37:2 45:7
majority 24:2,10 24:15 25:13,16 25:18 27:12 28:9 99:24
makers 80:5
making 9:17 23:4 23:17 82:20 94:2
manage 36:23
manner 82:9
Mary 2:11 4:12 6:17,19 38:8 46:23 68:22
massive 64:8
matter 66:4,11 102:3
Mayes 2:17 4:16 5:25 6:1,5 10:18 22:6,16,23 23:15 32:14 36:12 37:15 39:8 103:5
Mayor 2:22
McDonald-Rob... 34:12
McKeesport 8:16 8:16 14:15
mean 10:12 13:19 16:7 17:1 18:18 24:21 27:14 28:17 29:10,20 38:2,20 42:6 43:1,7,25 47:5 59:2 62:18 63:3 63:8 66:15 69:21 71:18 75:2 76:5,6 80:17,19 81:5 84:17,20 89:11 90:8,14 92:12 92:23 93:18 95:16 106:25
meaning 9:14
means 37:7 88:5
meant 53:10
measure 77:25
measures 80:14
meet 62:24 78:25 79:3 89:13
meeting 1:3 2:2 5:18 16:8 23:1 25:4 36:17 37:7 37:10 38:3 40:8 41:16 43:24 49:1,12 50:25 55:18 69:4 71:3 100:25
meetings 5:7 15:18 16:1 28:3 40:5 41:3 47:5 47:20 56:25
meets 87:17
member 3:7 6:7 13:14 32:19 33:22 34:12 39:23,24 40:1,3 40:16 41:7,10 45:10,16,20 48:21 62:21 65:12 66:18 103:10 106:11
members 13:4 15:9 23:21 24:7 24:16,17,22 25:17 27:6,17 27:19,22 28:8 36:21 40:7 42:23 43:18 44:1,7,12,14 45:12,21,24 48:17 49:21 55:20 65:9 71:24 72:1 90:3 90:5,7 94:19 99:25 100:4 103:20 104:21 105:2
membership 35:15 40:12 41:23 42:15 43:8 44:17,23 45:2 46:9
mentioned 65:18 66:9
mesh 101:18
met 77:15,25 78:21
Michael 2:7,10 3:25 4:9 58:24 60:16 61:21 70:18 71:11,18 71:20 80:21 84:4 86:8
mid-term 63:25
Mike 66:6 81:14
millions 49:11
mind 29:23
minor 36:14
minorities 76:15
minute 105:13
minutes 47:5 86:3 91:6
missed 18:10 58:2 58:4 101:13
missing 7:6 17:8 86:15,25
Moderator 1:12 3:4,15 4:18 5:15 5:21 6:5,23 7:2 8:11 10:22 11:3 11:6 13:5,13 14:25 16:25 17:4 18:16 19:6 19:12 20:8,21 21:6,10,25 22:4 22:14,20,24 23:16,20,24 25:5,11,23 26:16 27:1,20 28:18 29:3,12 30:13 32:7,13 32:15,20,24 33:6,15,25 34:6 34:10,23 35:2,8 35:13,19,23 36:3 37:3,16 38:6,25 39:3,9 39:12,16,21 40:2,10 41:5 42:4,8 43:3,9,13 44:9,15 46:3 47:10,14 48:13 48:25 49:14 50:14,19 51:4,9 51:14 53:6,11 53:16,19,23 58:7,25 60:23 61:9,18 62:11 62:14 63:1,11 63:17 64:3 65:13 66:16 67:11,19 68:2 69:18 71:21 74:8,14,18,23 75:5,15 77:1,18 77:23 78:1,18 78:23 79:5,8 80:10 82:14 84:2,13,23 88:7 89:24 90:12,17 91:4,8 92:15 94:10,14,24 95:6,15,19 96:2 97:6 99:2,5,11 99:16 100:8,19 101:7 102:2,12 102:17 103:12 103:14,17,22 104:3,8,15 105:11 106:10 106:13,24 107:4
modified 90:15 97:22
modify 104:13,16
modifying 90:19
Molly 2:14 5:2 39:11 48:13 72:4
Molly's 82:7 86:4
month 37:13
months 6:14 35:25 44:21 52:11 61:10 82:25 87:14 93:14 97:4 100:23
motion 28:22,24 32:17,21 79:10 83:14 84:14 99:4,6,6,9 106:14,15
move 18:11 21:25 27:13 34:15 39:9 43:14 50:20 51:4 67:4 78:6 84:11,19 85:2 88:15 90:9 93:24 94:3 97:6 106:1 107:4
moved 33:4 50:14
moving 46:7 49:11 75:23 85:8 94:1 102:17
multiple 46:2
municipal 42:2
municipalities 9:15 20:14 26:8 31:9
municipality 8:16 9:21,25 10:2 20:3

N

name 5:6 9:6 13:8 30:1 66:25 73:2 73:5,7 84:8 88:23,25 89:10 89:10 90:4 93:5 97:11
named 26:18 42:2
names 39:19 48:16,19
naming 83:23

89:4
necessarily 10:4 102:7
need 8:2 11:23,25 19:4,21 21:1,2 22:17 24:22 25:16 27:10 28:23 29:1,6,18 36:5 37:8,20 43:25 44:1,2 47:17 48:2 49:8 50:20 54:22,23 56:19 60:8 61:4 63:19 64:19,22 64:23 66:10 70:2 71:1 73:9,9 82:23 88:15 100:14 104:13 105:23 106:1 107:6
needed 51:6 75:19 80:2,3
needing 35:22
needs 6:20 10:4 10:16 18:22 20:10,13 25:5,7 27:6,15,18 38:22 60:13 64:20 65:17 73:16
neighborhoods 85:3
Neither 31:3
Network 1:20 2:4
neutral 87:5
new 2:17 3:10 6:6 28:8 32:9 44:14 44:25 61:10 107:1,2
Nichols 2:14 5:2,2 8:25 9:4 14:19 25:12 35:6 39:11 45:8,15 48:15 49:6 50:13 51:2,8 72:6 74:13,16 74:19 81:11 83:13,20 84:3 88:20 93:3,23 94:6 97:9,20 98:4,10 99:4 101:19 102:3,10 103:24 104:13
Nicole 2:8 4:4
nine 35:25
noes 51:14
nominated 42:24 43:11 45:1,2
nominating 42:22
nomination 24:7 37:11,21,22 43:4 46:21
nominations 36:15,21 37:5 37:14 38:15 46:24
note 61:25
noted 15:8 52:19 60:21 94:11
notes 5:18 6:22 108:8
notice 29:4
number 6:14 8:14 16:5 19:14 24:5 25:21 27:2 48:10 61:22 64:19 103:25
numbered 36:19
numerous 36:7,8

O

O 108:4
O'Hanlon 2:4 3:9 6:16,24 7:1 32:11 52:8 62:9 103:5
objective 8:9
obligation 56:1 57:1,5 78:21,25 79:4
obligations 59:23 82:22
observation 30:2
obtain 85:4
obviously 47:6 68:25 70:9 79:18 81:17
occasion 84:7 89:17
off-site 76:12
offer 89:22
office 2:22 66:1
officer 4:8
official 25:6 27:5 41:20 47:8 65:20 75:19 94:22 101:2,4 102:19
officially 27:11
officials 31:25 67:22,22 69:24
officio 41:13 42:1
oh 35:2 40:2 57:23 62:13 66:2 89:17 94:3
okay 19:8 28:18 34:6 40:4 55:23 61:17 62:13,18 84:10 91:8 95:22 98:19 101:24 105:21
omissions 62:7
once 31:17 80:7
ones 53:14
ongoing 31:21
open 7:5,7 29:21 29:25 51:6 62:16 87:3 105:23
opens 87:5
operating 30:20
operation 35:5
operations 4:8 77:7
opinion 80:13 88:18
opportunities 76:15 85:8,22
opportunity 20:25 65:23 67:9 72:22 73:6 73:11,20 77:11 84:19 85:4,5,10 85:24 93:25 94:9 96:25
opposed 33:13,16 34:23 39:16 42:16 99:16
option 23:2
order 6:11 10:16 23:19 24:16 43:16
organization 13:8 16:16 28:2,4 41:8,14,19 48:22 49:18
organizations 12:22 15:9,22 16:6,13,23 30:16 32:2 40:5 44:25 46:10,14 47:3 48:9 49:3 50:8 54:9
organizer 88:10
original 44:12
ought 98:9
Oursler 2:20 26:5 26:5
outlined 64:2
outreach 15:11,21 47:18 87:22
outside 65:25 68:19
overcoming 77:10
overlap 9:11 70:11 74:22
overlaps 10:13
oversights 6:18

P

P 108:4
p.m 3:2 107:9
PA 1:10,21 2:18 13:11
page 7:12 36:18 41:24 52:21
paragraph 54:4 80:19 83:15,16 83:21 84:11,17 86:5,14 90:23 90:24 94:21 95:2,24 96:1 97:24 99:7,10 100:16 101:1,24 102:5,9,18
paraphrase 11:4 19:9
parentheses 96:6 96:8
parliamentarian 100:7
part 7:21 12:9,10 12:15,17,23 28:13 30:1 41:5 46:15,18 47:6 48:3 49:3,16,23 50:10 62:15 72:21 77:12 80:25 81:1 92:12 101:14
participants 24:4 24:6 44:16 50:5
participate 24:9 28:4 41:9 45:19 53:5 80:13 83:9
participated 27:22 74:15 78:12
participating 24:15 25:17 27:9,23 40:6,15 103:1
participation 27:25
particular 9:7,20 9:24 14:11 21:4
particularly 17:21 66:21 67:7 84:17
partnership 2:10 4:11 81:2
pass 41:12 81:18
passage 78:2
pattern 15:8
patterns 72:11 77:10 92:23 96:18
Paul 2:4 3:9 6:16 6:24 10:22 23:11 32:11 52:8 62:9 103:4
Peduto 2:22
Penn 8:17
Pennsylvania 2:15,18,21 5:10 13:11
people 5:22 13:6 16:20 17:22 20:25 25:14,21 25:25 28:1 37:20,23 45:18 45:18,24 46:1 46:13 47:6,21 47:23 48:2,8,25 49:7 50:4 52:5

54:1 58:15 61:19 62:22 64:13,14,25 67:16 68:8,24 69:6 71:6,24 72:25 74:20 76:15 82:19 83:14 84:10 85:9,19 87:23 88:16 90:16 94:3 100:10 103:1,3 104:4,7
perceived 16:5
percent 75:25
Perfect 32:6
period 36:20 96:12
permission 40:22 41:11
persistent 72:11 96:18
person 19:3,7 32:9 38:14 49:18 56:4 103:2
personal 80:13
personally 56:15
persons 96:21
perspective 71:7 88:9
perspectives 79:19
pertaining 97:4
Peter 2:13 4:25 30:5,7 99:18 100:11
Petrucci 81:14
phone 6:17 19:3 32:12 103:1,4 104:7
PHRC 98:6
Piatt 1:7
picks 92:2
piece 76:16 88:25
Pittsburgh 1:10 1:21 2:3,5,6,9,9 2:17,20,20,21 3:6,11,18 4:6 6:7 10:3 14:3,8 21:14 26:4,6 42:11 46:6 96:6
Pittsburghers 2:14 5:3 64:9
place 1:7 5:8 9:5 46:22 71:1 82:10 94:1 108:9
placeholder 59:16
placement 84:18 96:20,23
places 52:17 89:20
plan 31:20
planning 2:7 4:1 34:1 60:17 61:23 77:7,14 80:22,23
plate 6:10
plays 82:5
please 3:13 17:11 19:10 41:10,12 50:23 62:15 67:5 68:2 75:16 85:6
plenty 73:4
plus 38:25 104:6
point 4:21 5:22 11:23 13:19 14:3,19 17:2,2,7 17:23 21:12,13 23:18 24:8 27:4 37:4 42:21 43:16,17 44:4 50:5,6 52:3 53:18 59:4 60:5 61:24 63:15 67:24 73:21 74:4 75:4 78:5 78:16 79:11 80:22 82:8 83:12 85:7 86:6 87:11 88:8 93:20,23 100:9 100:10 103:3
policies 8:23 16:17 31:12,13 52:16 64:1,23 81:4 82:20 83:5 87:10 92:1 96:13,20 98:1 98:20
policy 8:22 12:2 28:16 52:13 54:8,17 57:6,20 57:22 58:5,20 59:12 73:9 76:22 79:22 84:9,21 93:8 102:13 104:14
politicians 88:2
populations 92:11 93:5 97:12,18 98:5,24
Port 31:1
posed 55:21
position 41:13,21 66:1 85:1
positions 85:4
positive 65:4 68:17
possibility 83:12 104:20
possible 36:1 62:6 75:18
potential 27:2 28:20 51:1
practical 68:20,23 70:8
practice 31:13 81:3 89:6
practices 52:15
precisely 73:5
preclude 26:19
precludes 105:15
precluding 105:14
prefer 35:11
preparation 68:5
prepared 83:21
presence 55:13
present 15:13 24:3,19 25:13 25:17,19 78:8
presented 104:24 105:1
pretty 6:10 92:25
preventing 21:3
previous 47:5 69:4
primarily 5:9
primary 11:19
printing 108:11
probably 40:9 56:16,18 76:4 105:21
problem 25:9 38:18 41:4,4
problems 20:20 45:7 55:4
procedural 28:16
procedures 35:22
proceedings 107:9 108:7
process 6:12 16:10 18:2,9 19:23 24:1,7 27:5 28:14 36:24 41:6 42:22 43:4,20 44:25 45:5 46:7 46:21 49:9 60:2 69:8 80:7,7 82:1 89:12 104:16,20 105:12 106:1
product 65:17 66:20
Project 2:12 4:24
promote 12:2 54:18
proper 104:19
proposal 51:17
proposed 35:14 54:2
protected 64:19
provide 17:14 62:1 65:1
provided 42:25
provides 61:15
providing 61:13
provision 41:24
public 2:14 5:3 15:5 83:21 84:4 101:4
publicly 80:20
published 77:4 102:8
purpose 9:22 11:20 20:2 46:4 70:9 85:18
purposeful 105:6
purposes 19:16 19:20 46:6 68:23 70:11
pursue 89:25
put 31:12 36:25 43:23 44:21 54:13 63:4 70:3 81:9 84:12 85:20 90:4
putting 92:5

Q

quarterly 36:17 37:7,9 43:24 89:13
question 12:9 25:22,24 31:14 32:3,18 33:1 34:25 35:3,18 48:8 55:16,21 56:25 72:7,10 72:12 75:7 77:20 78:20 86:4 87:12 100:15 101:14
questions 92:6,23 93:8 96:17 97:10,21 98:11 98:25
quickly 39:19 90:9
Quisenberry 2:12 4:23,23 21:8,11 21:11 22:9 23:3 35:17,20,21 36:1,9 38:23,23 43:16,19,19 44:10 45:14 62:15 67:25 68:3,3,13 75:6 76:1,6,23 85:6 90:21 91:5,9,13 91:14 92:13,21 93:1,6 95:22,25 96:3 97:19,23 98:13,17 102:13
quite 15:25 44:24 67:1 69:13
quorum 24:15,16 24:19 25:1,18 33:3 44:1 48:10 49:8 100:14 103:18 104:9,16 107:6
quorum's 104:2

quote 77:2

R

R 108:4,4,4,4
racial 64:15
raise 40:14 54:1 61:21 103:8
raised 23:10 43:16 53:15 60:25 67:20
raises 27:3
range 19:16 71:23
Ray 34:10 62:20 63:18 66:14 71:13
reach 47:18,20 49:21
read 7:4 51:21 63:6,7 68:4 76:8 95:9,17,20 96:1 97:25 98:8
ready 49:7 65:18
real 15:2,6,19 52:17 54:24 60:8 77:13 79:11 88:15
realistic 58:14
realistically 63:22
really 6:16 7:4 11:10 15:13 16:1 17:9 20:10 22:23 28:1 29:6 30:25 31:5,10 45:16 47:17,20 49:17 52:4 56:13 60:24 61:6,12,13 64:6 64:12,19 67:15 70:13 73:18 78:7 82:19,21 83:5 84:25 85:11 88:5,10 88:12,14,17 90:25 92:17 95:11 99:24 106:8
reason 13:21 14:1 21:15 45:3 55:5 69:21 71:5
reasonable 38:5,7 58:17
reasons 40:20
receipt 50:8
received 27:8 75:1
receiving 77:5
recognize 17:14 17:17 73:16
recommend 42:10 65:24 91:6 92:19
recommendation 7:25 8:1 12:5 13:20 36:24 58:5 60:9 75:13 76:20 85:1
recommendatio... 8:22 12:2 16:18 34:5 51:18,19 51:25 52:7,12 54:7,14,15,18 54:25 56:9 57:13,22 58:9 58:11 59:10,19 59:25 60:1,3 61:4,11,16 63:4 63:21,25 68:16 71:4,8,10 72:16 73:3 75:9 76:2 78:7 79:12,17 79:21,22 80:15 81:8 82:12 83:2 83:17 87:2 89:1 91:20,23 93:13 93:14 96:12 97:3,5 100:22 102:14,21
recommended 96:14 98:1,20
recommending 36:20
red 43:23
reduced 108:10
Redwood 2:4 3:9 10:24 17:10 18:21,21 19:11 19:25 20:17,23 23:13 78:17,19 79:2 87:19,20 91:11 103:5
refer 42:21 43:5
reference 24:14 76:20 105:19
referenced 8:9
references 7:25 76:24
referencing 24:25
referring 42:16
refine 81:7
reflect 16:4 54:8
reflected 15:16
regarding 7:13 79:12 93:14
region 20:22 88:12
regional 2:12 4:15 14:7 18:13
regular 40:6
regulations 105:18
relates 57:2
Relations 2:3,5,6 2:11,15,16,22 3:6,12,19,22 4:13 5:11,14 40:18 46:6
relocate 85:9
remain 50:22
remember 40:8 87:6
reminder 54:22
remove 28:21 34:16
removes 35:9
Renee 2:8 4:2
repeat 11:1 22:3,7 22:17
rephrase 93:25
report 63:5 75:12
Reported 1:13
reporter 6:3 13:9 19:2 26:2 33:20 33:23 55:7 57:17 58:6 73:23 95:10,16 105:4
represent 15:14 15:22 34:1,7 48:22
representation 15:24 42:1
representative 28:2 34:11 65:6 84:5 103:9
representatives 8:19
represented 8:12 32:2 55:22
representing 3:24
represents 75:20
requested 36:7
requests 44:20
require 9:15 63:15 81:17,19
required 11:21 12:13 77:6,8 92:3,9 96:15 98:2,21
requirement 7:16 27:25
research 58:10 78:8
residents 84:19 93:24 96:24
respectful 55:16 55:17
respecting 56:11
respond 62:6
responding 65:10
response 8:1 51:19,24 52:8 60:21,24 61:19 63:14 65:14 79:11 82:25 101:1,2,4 102:19
responses 8:17
responsible 30:17
rest 22:12 100:17
review 12:12 65:23 70:3 94:21
revise 45:6
revision 29:4
Reynolds 2:18 13:10,10 22:3 32:22 33:1 86:1 95:5
rid 29:9
right 6:10 9:7 12:20 13:25 14:4,17 21:24 24:24 26:13,13 26:23 27:25 29:5 35:8 42:4 42:14 43:1,2,7,8 45:13 48:10 51:17 53:4,16 56:15,18 59:17 65:24 69:23 71:2,8 72:9,13 81:19,24 84:23 89:16 93:22 101:10 102:1 103:15
rightly 69:2
Rights 2:4
Roberts 2:22 75:4 101:9 105:13,17 105:17 106:9,12
Robinson 2:8 4:2 4:2
role 12:11,16,17 12:23 16:22,24 80:23
room 13:7 19:5 21:7 22:19 39:23,24 68:19 72:25 83:21 84:10
roomful 17:21
running 34:14

S

S 108:4
sake 48:12
Sarah 2:21 52:10 79:8
saw 6:19 76:23
saying 9:6,17 11:14,19 12:9 14:5,21 17:7 19:21,25 20:1 25:2 30:4 45:22 54:21 55:6,9,11 61:8 66:20 67:16 72:18 86:10 87:8 89:6 89:19 92:5,16 93:4 97:10,14 101:12,19 102:10
says 7:14 17:12 18:7 25:15 36:16 43:8

48:16 91:16 92:12 93:8 97:15 101:9
schedule 75:21
Schwartz 2:21 67:13,14 77:20 77:24 79:7 99:20 103:10,13 103:16
scope 35:9,10
Scott 2:20 26:3,3
seat 93:17
second 7:22 11:23 22:1,2 30:5 39:11 42:19 51:7,8 56:19 84:13 95:8 97:23,24 98:14 99:8,9 106:14
seconded 33:5 50:15
section 9:1 42:16 90:16
Sections 20:15
see 6:24 12:12,21 12:23 16:23 38:3 45:3 49:17 62:5 63:9 65:13 71:17 73:19 74:25 80:17 88:1 90:22 91:7
seen 30:23 31:4,5 48:16 86:12 94:4
segregation 56:4 57:3 72:12 77:10 92:24 96:18
selecting 44:14
self-nomination 50:10
semi-regional 18:14
send 8:19 28:2,6,7 34:11 37:8 41:14,16,18 44:22 47:25 48:1,3 50:9,20 50:23 62:6 74:10 77:12 78:2 100:3 102:23 104:20
sending 40:11
sends 14:15
sense 18:17 35:16 50:9 56:21 76:8 78:11 88:22 97:15
sent 6:13 27:6,10 27:21 28:11 34:1 36:6,15 37:5 40:4 44:19 45:17 46:2,10 49:10 51:25 62:4 71:22 100:23
sentence 91:10,14 91:16,24 93:7 93:11 95:12,12 97:1,24,25 98:14
service 10:20
Services 1:20 2:12 2:13,19 4:15 5:1 13:17
set 9:8 61:11 66:14,22 74:9 78:7 79:3 82:17
setting 78:21,25
seven 37:9 38:18
Shaina 2:7 3:23 39:20
shape 71:7,8
share 67:5,21 68:18
shared 71:14,14
sheet 58:13
Sherri 1:13 108:16
shocked 38:17
short 43:24
short-term 63:24
show 24:9 28:1
sigh 99:3
sign 90:1,2,7 94:23,25 104:22 105:8
sign-in 47:19
significant 37:1 92:10 98:7,23
silos 30:20
simple 24:15 25:13,16 27:12 28:9 46:9
simply 9:17 57:11
single 20:3 49:18
siting 76:9,11
sitting 22:16
situation 56:6,8 70:12
slap 59:5
slow 70:13
small 52:5,24 65:7,7 74:6
Smith 2:7 3:25,25 33:18 34:3,9 60:15,16 61:7 61:17 62:8,13 62:18 63:3,12 63:19 65:4,20 66:2,7,13 69:19 70:22 75:11,17 76:5,18,25 77:16 80:21,21 81:13,21,24 84:15,24 85:25 100:5,15 101:3 101:10,15
solid 79:21
solution 85:16
somebody 14:16 38:13 40:25 41:1,2,16 94:12 100:1
someone's 38:2
soon 4:20
sorry 6:4 10:18 22:6,8 30:8 36:18 55:8 58:22 65:15 67:13 74:1 87:16 90:17 94:15 100:6 101:13
sort 52:13 54:5 55:12 94:17
sorts 75:13
sound 38:6
sounds 20:8 45:9 60:17
Southwest 2:18 13:12
Southwestern 2:18 13:11
speak 3:13,16 17:10,15 19:4,8 54:6 55:7 56:17 56:18,23 73:24 75:15 102:1 106:7,7
speaking 10:19 19:5,7 29:22 62:20
special 15:1
specific 9:15 54:16 55:23 58:4 59:25 61:25 64:1 77:17 84:9
specifically 8:2 10:10 11:24 55:14,21 77:18 105:20
specifics 92:8,18 97:16
speculative 54:6
speed 38:19
spell 10:5
spent 56:2,2
spoke 56:15 63:18
spurs 105:5
stack 59:12
stacked 6:10
stages 18:15
stake 66:19
standard 28:5 77:15
standing 50:23
standpoint 79:23
start 81:12
started 49:20
starts 91:14
state 13:7 39:19 42:14 65:23 86:14
stated 7:11 8:4,21 9:22 26:22
statement 68:1 80:20 86:24 87:5 94:22 101:1,3,16
states 18:4
stating 56:23
stay 35:4,5
steering 3:7 6:7 13:14 15:19,25 36:16,22 37:6,8 47:15 52:3,20 53:7,8,9,11,22 87:16
stenographic 108:8
step 65:5
steps 31:17 71:1 75:8,12,14 88:17
stop 43:20 58:22
strategies 9:9,11
STREET 1:21
strike 29:19 93:9
striking 93:7
strongly 90:6
structured 82:9
studies 16:14
stuff 44:2 54:20 70:2 89:18
subcommittees 71:2,6
subgroup 52:5,25 53:2,13
submit 48:4
submitted 65:21
subscribe 21:16
suggest 31:19 43:22 45:1 46:7 72:3 78:4 83:3 86:17 88:21 91:6,18,25 92:4 92:8 93:7 94:20
suggested 23:3,7 28:19 50:7 94:11 100:2
suggesting 27:15 37:12
suggestion 32:8 32:16 42:18 47:17 49:15 72:5 83:7 102:22 104:19 104:21
suggestions 36:4
Suite 1:8
summary 67:17
summer 3:22 84:6
supposed 13:1,2

sure 3:17 7:18,21 12:18 15:20,23 18:9 20:2 23:20 28:10 35:19,23 43:15 47:18,21 49:4,21,22 60:19 62:17 67:3,23 70:6,7 70:20 72:23 73:4 81:9,13 89:24 102:8

T

T 108:4,4,4
table 4:21 32:2,3 34:25 35:3 47:13 48:9 64:4 71:17 78:5,10 79:10 82:17 90:10 91:2 93:17,21
tabling 83:11
Tague 2:14 5:4,4 12:8 24:12,18 24:23 34:7 81:16,22 82:2 104:10 105:1,16
take 5:18 16:8 31:22,23 32:16 34:15 36:23 41:10 56:20 58:15 65:5,16 66:12 71:1,11 72:17 76:18 85:19
taken 29:15 108:9
takes 46:22
talk 8:12 21:13 29:18 62:25 65:6,8 70:18,24
talked 19:19 74:9 79:18 102:25
talking 9:1 43:20 49:13 50:1 55:15 64:12 68:9 76:9,11 83:18 85:8
talks 7:12 41:25 43:3 44:4
targeted 102:14
task 1:3 2:2,14 5:5 6:8,13 7:18 8:6,10,21 9:8,10 10:15 11:8 12:4 13:4,21,25 16:15,24 17:2 17:25 18:22 19:15 20:23,23 21:21 22:10 23:4,23 24:7 29:24 30:1 31:15 32:19 34:5 35:4 37:7,9 37:18 38:16 40:16,19 41:15 41:15 43:12 44:16 45:20 48:18,21 49:3 49:23 51:20 52:1 53:4 54:12 55:13,18,20,22 56:9,12,20 57:1 57:10,18,19,19 59:7,13 60:7,10 61:3 62:5,22,23 64:16 65:1,8,12 66:19 68:7,25 69:4,8,11,11,16 70:14,17,20,23 71:4 72:15,19 73:1,12,12 74:17,22 75:10 75:18,19,21 77:15 78:22 79:1,3,16 80:2 83:2,16,23 84:24 86:19 87:1,17,21 88:3 89:12,17 90:3,4 90:8 91:15 93:12,15 94:19 94:21,23 95:1 96:4,7 97:1,5 99:24 100:14,23 101:5,17,25 102:5,19,20,20 103:9,11 104:21 106:11
tasked 29:10 57:11 72:20
team 62:8
tearing 21:1
technique 82:13
telephone 3:8
tell 56:12 86:9
ten 48:2,3 86:3
terms 20:21 21:4 24:11 52:15,21 52:22 64:18 69:6 81:25 87:5
test 95:7
text 96:1
thank 6:9,15 23:15 35:13 39:21 79:7 106:24
Thanks 99:3 106:9
theirs 14:16
they'd 48:19
thing 6:11 10:21 14:24 22:17 29:23 46:20 47:9 53:2,2 58:8 64:5 66:24 68:6 68:21 76:7 81:23 85:7 97:9 105:19,22
things 7:5,6,13 10:13,14 11:19 21:2,3 30:25 41:18 52:19 58:12 60:5 68:15 69:1 73:13 82:8 90:9 102:15
think 5:7,19 7:5,6 8:21 10:7 13:1 13:19,23 14:9 14:12,25 16:15 17:8,20 18:3,5,6 23:1 24:20 26:23 27:3,16 28:13,15 29:5,6 29:12,14 30:1 30:23 31:5,8,20 32:24 34:13 35:2 37:12,19 37:25 38:4,9,12 38:15 39:5 40:7 40:25 42:6 43:5 43:22 44:4,22 47:16,17 50:1 50:11,19 54:10 54:19,23 55:1,4 55:16 56:6,22 56:24 57:25 58:16 60:4 61:1 61:24 62:19,19 62:24 63:3 64:25 65:4,18 66:5,9,11 68:10 68:13,17 70:9 70:17 73:16 74:2 79:14,25 80:1,3,11 82:7 82:15,17,23 83:11 84:16,24 85:14,15,18,21 87:20 88:4,7,14 91:1,7,17,24 92:4 93:6 94:24 95:1,6 100:20 102:10 103:7 104:18,23 105:3 105:5,6,25 106:1
thinking 16:1 52:4 87:23
thinks 78:20 80:3
thought 12:17 21:12 31:24 34:24 46:24 58:13 68:6 92:22 105:12
thoughts 23:11
three 5:22 28:3 44:21 92:20 96:23 97:11
throw 71:16
throwing 48:11
time 7:4 19:5 29:9 31:20 32:16 35:21 36:15,21 37:24 38:1,4 41:20 43:21 57:17 58:6 61:20 63:7 67:7 67:15 68:5 69:13 74:1 75:7 75:8 82:17 98:13 102:16 105:4 108:9
timeline 26:13 31:16 32:4 60:18 61:7 70:4
timelines 26:21
times 6:14 36:7,8 44:24 46:2 49:11 61:22 98:8
timing 34:16
today 8:19 22:22 24:21 31:4 34:11 35:24 36:2,11 43:21 46:1 49:8 55:16 67:8 68:5 86:7 90:24 100:25
top 41:24
Torres 2:5 3:12 3:17,17 25:22 26:7,12,23 28:19 29:22 30:7,11 32:6,18 39:2 46:4 47:1,8 47:23 65:15,22 66:3,8,18 67:20 101:13 102:7
touched 85:13
TOWER 1:20
training 80:24,25 81:3,11
transcript 108:6 108:12
transcription 108:8,10
Transit 5:3
translator 22:21
Transport 2:14
travel 38:10
tried 52:16 55:17
trouble 73:23
true 108:7,11
trust 75:22 76:3 76:10 81:19 82:5 102:14
try 25:4 31:21 43:23 68:14
trying 11:24 14:23 15:20 16:4,17 31:12 41:17 69:5 78:24 81:7 82:2 82:8 86:2

101:11
turn 58:1
twice 25:21
two 7:13 11:19 13:6 25:25 41:23 46:20 70:5,10 74:22 82:25 87:13 89:3 91:6 96:19
type 98:18

U

unanimously 38:17
understand 8:20 18:19 38:7 55:10 73:8 100:21 101:7,11
understanding 9:21 11:7,13 48:19 52:23
understandings 52:22
understood 19:13
United 2:18,20,20 13:11 26:4,6
units 76:9,11,13 84:18 96:24
upcoming 26:13 29:9,20 31:18 34:17
URA 2:7 3:24 32:1 39:20
urge 50:23
urgency 88:23
use 32:12 45:25 50:6 73:10 82:13
useful 68:20 106:8

V

vacation 38:2
Valerie 2:22 34:8 34:12 105:17 106:6,10
valid 13:19 40:12
valuable 83:3
value 79:25 80:4
varies 75:21
various 31:25
version 94:13,18 95:21,23 97:7
versions 15:3
Voices 2:17 6:6
volunteers 53:20 53:21 62:12
vote 19:24 20:1 23:17 25:19 33:7 41:7,15,17 45:11 46:1 49:7 49:9 51:5 67:9 95:8,21 99:25 100:4 102:24 104:14 106:23
votes 24:2,11 73:9 102:6,25
voting 25:1 39:25 39:25 40:23 41:10 51:2 106:3,4,23

W

wait 19:6 56:19 58:7,7 82:24 87:13 105:10,13
waiting 69:16
want 3:16 6:14 9:23 16:7 18:4,5 20:19 28:21 36:25 46:14,25 47:6,24 48:20 49:2,3,16,23 54:1 59:2,4 61:25 63:12,13 65:1 66:25 69:24 70:5,7,13 71:19 72:3,6 79:12,20 81:16 82:4 85:11 86:20,24 87:13 87:15 88:10,23 89:25 90:5,16 90:22 95:20 97:16 104:22 106:24 107:2
wanted 34:3 53:4 53:17 56:16 60:15 71:16 74:10 81:8 85:12
wants 41:9
wasn't 53:14 59:5 60:10,19 72:19
way 2:18 13:11 18:12 22:12 58:21 65:11 66:21 73:24 74:25 78:20,24 87:2,3 88:22 90:22 93:25 94:14 97:22 104:17
ways 15:5 20:9 63:23 73:2 88:11 89:9
we'll 17:13 30:9 46:16,17 48:5 51:24 95:7
we're 9:6 10:9,14 11:24 12:24,25 12:25 13:1,2,2 14:22,23 16:17 20:4,18 24:2,10 25:8 27:25 41:17 45:11 46:11,12 49:13 51:2 56:6,10 61:10 63:13 69:25 72:24 75:7 78:22 81:7 89:15 92:16,18 100:19,21 102:10 105:25
we've 24:5 31:4 31:16 35:24 38:16 49:20 52:19 54:16,24 58:4 79:18 99:22 102:25 105:7
Weber 2:9 3:13 4:7,7 7:9,9 8:20 9:3,7 10:6 11:4 11:18 12:20 16:7 18:18,25 21:24 22:2 23:10,18,21 24:14,20 25:2 25:15 26:11 27:14 28:15,24 32:5 33:4,13,19 33:21 34:24 35:11 37:25 51:16 53:21 54:3 57:4,10,18 58:3,8 68:12 74:24 83:19 90:14 92:7,16 92:25 93:20 94:4,8,12,16 95:23 99:22 100:6,13 105:3 106:22 107:3
week 37:10 89:3
weeks 46:20 83:8
welcome 4:19 32:13 64:4
went 53:3 71:23
weren't 59:12 60:6
whoever's 10:19 16:14 22:16 27:18
wide 71:23
widely 73:22
wildly 10:21
willing 17:22 45:19 62:16,24 90:21
witness 64:14
witnessed 49:17
Wonderful 63:2
wording 86:17
words 12:10
work 6:1,12 7:10 7:19,21 11:22 18:8 54:11 58:10,20 59:3 62:17 63:9,14 65:17 66:10 70:14 81:23 82:24 83:8,9 84:9 90:6 100:17,22
workable 90:24
worked 6:15 56:13 58:23
working 10:14 31:2 35:24 51:24 61:10,20 62:9 64:25 65:8 69:13 81:1,6,14
worried 101:20
worry 90:10
worth 58:10
wouldn't 68:18
write 82:12 94:12 94:17
wrong 19:10 60:12 80:17 86:9

X

Y

yeah 11:3 18:18 20:17 33:19 34:24,24 40:9 73:18 76:25 79:2 91:4 92:15 92:25
year 28:3 31:17 70:3,5
year's 58:10
yelling 74:2

Z

0

1

10 38:24 43:3
11 104:6
1101 1:20
12 38:24
15 38:24 39:4,5 39:10
15219 1:21
15222 1:10
16 39:2
18 100:14 104:2,3

2

2 39:1 41:24
2-1-1 2:18 13:12
2013 7:24
2015 77:4
2016 1:6 2:2 3:1 61:8 108:16
2017 26:14,24 32:4 34:18 35:1
2017-2018 17:24
2018 26:15,25 34:18
29 108:16

3

3 36:18 84:17
3:18 3:2
30 36:25 37:20 38:20,24 39:1 46:11,12,16 48:9,11 50:8
301 1:9
35 48:19 74:19 103:24 104:1
35-member 100:13
390 1:8

4

4 75:24

5

5:13 107:9

6

7

7 1:6 2:2 3:1 7:25 13:21 18:23,24 19:19 21:16
7-A 7:25 8:11 20:15 42:7
707 1:21
7th 84:1

8

8 38:24,25

9

9th 52:2 60:19 61:8