

Social Service PILOT and Comparative Impact Study Committee
Conference Room 1 7:00 PM Memorial Building Framingham, Ma

Draft Minutes

April 27, 2006

Attendance: Bob Berman, Yaakov Cohn, Cynthia Laurora., Laurie Lee, Nick Sanchez, Steve Orr, John Speranza, Wes Ritchie, Dawn Harkness Absent Jim Palmer

An audiotape of this meeting is available upon request

Bob Berman called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Bob asked if everyone received the report from Laurie. All said yes.

Steve Orr commented that everyone in Framingham received it.

Bob said excellent.

Steve said it is on the MWDN website

John Speranza asked if that is legal.

Bob Berman said it is a public document.

John asked "even if it wasn't approved by the committee before?"

Bob Berman said yea, it is a public document.

John said he was thinking of approval by this committee

Bob repeated, it is a public document

John said that doesn't answer his question.

Bob said, yes it is allowed, because it is a public document.

Laurie said she hasn't had much sleep, so she might be incoherent. She said that what she did today after it was sent out was to of course find some mistakes and changes which she passed out. And she wanted to go over those and make corrections.

Laurie continued that the first thing was the school cost data. She was a little confused trying to figure it out and she misread the benchmarking report. She thinks, page 28 the fourth paragraph, and should be removed. She totally misunderstood the benchmarking. She thought the indirect service costs they were differentiating between what we as a committee defined as expenditure per student and indirect cost per student. But then, when she was reading it again today, she thinks the report is saying that the indirect costs are included in the expenditure. So that entire section needs to be removed, down to \$2.5 M.

Nick said, you want those two removed? Laurie said the entire section.

Nick said it remains \$1.86M.

Laurie said yes. That is with the grants as Dr. Martes said. The one above is without the grants.

Laurie said it was her misunderstanding trying to figure out what it was at 2 Am. She thinks that it would be good to add a suggestion that the town manager determine the additional per pupil costs to the town, because we can't do that. It is too hard. We could add that recommendation instead.

Nick asked what is FHA?

Laurie said that is Framingham Housing Authority. Laurie said that she included that section in the report but we had to discuss that.

Cynthia presented the signed letter from Beth O'Grady and some answers to questions.

Beth also made a quick correction to a statement sent out on April 14th. The maximum number of disabled in senior housing is 13%, but FHA are now running at 17%.

Bob said based on that does anything need to be changed in the report?

Laurie asked if they get in trouble running that number over.

Laurie asked if we are supposed to add that in.

Bob asked if that was important information to include.

Wes said no matter where you put it, it has nothing to do with social service agencies.

Cynthia said that it shows impact.

Dawn said they don't say they are from SSA's.

Cynthia said that 70% of applications for housing are from SSA's.

Laurie said that is not in the report, should it be added?

Cynthia said we could merge some of this information .

Nick asked the clerk if the statement as it stands "approximately 70% of the FHA applicants for public housing are from the SSA's and 30% are from other sources" should be added?

Laurie thought yes.

Nick moved that the above sentence be added. He did not see why there is a need to add the 17% number. The question raised is what is the connection between what FHA provides and the SSA's and that above sentence describes it.

Bob asked who regulates that 13% number.

Cynthia wasn't sure. There are federal and state guidelines of how many disabled can be mixed in with senior housing.

Laurie seconded Nick's motion but wanted to add the first paragraph which clarifies what we asked from FHA. That is, that the FHA clients are coming from Framingham shelters.

Nick clarified where those paragraphs should go and Laurie agreed.

Dawn asked, you asked what % of clients are from the SSA. They didn't answer that.

They answered how many applicants come from. That is not the same number. Do you know how many clients are from the SSA's?

There was discussion to clarify this point.

Dawn reiterated that Cynthia needs to get clarification about the number of "clients" from SSA's vs. the number of "referrals" from SSA's. Beth answered that 70% of applicants for public housing come from the social service agencies 30% from other sources, but she didn't answer the question asked: what % of clients are from the SSA's?

The group agreed that this information should not be put in the report.

Nick moved that we add the first paragraph from Beth O'Grady's latest information clarifying the fact that Framingham agencies refer clients to FHA.

Second
Vote 6-0-3

Bob asked Laurie if she wanted a motion to make the changes to the school section.
Laurie asked if she need it.
Bob said yes, why don't we do it.

Steve so moved
Second
Vote: 6-1-2

Bob said, lets move on.

Laurie said that Linda Dunbrack might not make the meeting but she sent Laurie some recommended changes.
She recommended getting rid of acronyms.
Steve asked why
Wes said, didn't she say to get rid of acronyms that were used just a couple of times?
Nick agreed.
Laurie said yes, less than 3 times.
She said on page 5, substituting for disturbs us.
Her point about the 40,000 unit approximation in the police information was something already approved by the committee.
Laurie explained that it was a very round approximation if the group remembers. We have about 27,000 housing units. The assessor was not able to give a precise number fo commercial units, only parcels and in conversations with the chief we came to a round number of 40,000. Very broad approximation.
Nick said, but that has already been approved.

Laurie will make changes the other Linda suggested to the best of her abilities.

Nick asked about page 8. Is this the exact wording of the motion from town meeting?
Laurie said that she took this out of the approved Findings of 3/23.
Laurie did not bring in because she didn't have time to finish, a brief summary of the report because it is long.
She also had no time for a glossary of terms.

Bob asked about page 9. Is there a reason that religious institutions weren't on this list?
Didn't we receive from town counsel.
Laurie understood that to be a very blurry point that was not voted on. For example Bethany is accepted.
Bob asked if there were various reasons we didn't accept the Salvation Army?
Nick said yes.
Bob asked what were the others.
Steve said that one was we couldn't separate the religious from the social function.

Nick said that he thought religious exclusion was not strong enough for his vote. However, he still felt that given how far we had advanced we had to resolve the issue and he voted to exclude the SA but not necessarily for the religious reasons. The SA in the literature has been blamed for engaging in activities that does not separate Church and State.

Bob asked to see some of that literature. Can Nick forward that to him?

Nick asked about the Summary, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations. IS this a summary based on the report or in general?

Laurie said she wanted to make a summary of this report, so if someone doesn't want to read the entire report, they can read it.

Nick asked if that is a motion she would like to have?

Nick moved that the clerk has authorization to add a summary of the report in no more than a page and a half

Laurie said no way, She needs at least 2

They said 2 pages

Second

Vote: 6-2-1

Laurie explained that she mis-wrote a section on grant funding, another case of late at night, and described the change.

Laurie moved to change the wording mistake on page 48 for grant funding

Second

Vote: 7-0-2

Nick said that on the front page we have prepared by the PILOT committee. Since this will be approved by some people and not others, the front page should specify the votes taken. Also Nick wanted to move that since Jim is not hear, the rules be put aside so Jim is given the opportunity to express his opinion on approval or not approving the report.

Nick moved that the rules be put aside so Jim can give his opinion on whether he supports or doesn't the report

Dawn suggested removing the "Prepared by the" in the title page and just list the members of the committee.

Steve is curious why Nick wants to do this.

Nick thought Dawn has made a good report. This is a report rather than prepared by. Several times we have taken roll call votes and given that this may be the last vote, it should be a roll call vote and put in the report so town meeting can know who accepted it and not.

Laurie suggested that we do as Dawn say. We could put the votes in the back with the other votes.

Bob said it should be in front.

Steve said that it is moot if we are not having a roll call vote.

Nick said town meeting should know.

Steve said he would call for a roll call vote.

Nick wanted it right in front.

Wes said it was prepared by Laurie. He added that we voted for Laurie to prepare it.

He agrees with eliminating prepared and have a roll call vote.

Steve suggested wording it with Final report of the P/I Committee accepted by roll call vote of the members and list it on the front page.

Bob disagreed because whether he votes for this or not, it is the final report of a committee that he is on. He suggests we remove prepared by and the very first page is how the committee voted.

Dawn said that the front page simply lists who served on the committee and contributed in a variety of capacities. She has no problem with a roll call vote.

All agreed.

So moved

Second

John wondered if the remarks imply a fear of culpability of error.

Bob wasn't sure what he was saying.

Vote: 7-1-1

Laurie wanted to clarify that while she put this together she got tons of well written submissions from many members of the committee and she wanted to say it for the record.

Nick moved that below the roll call vote should be the charge of the committee from the foreword

Second

Vote: 9-0-0

Bob asked for additional comments.

Nick said he is not sure we are going to vote on this report today or not but thought it was a good idea that if someone wants to vote for this report and add qualifications at the end, they be allowed.

For example, if Jim Palmer wants to vote for this report but with certain qualifications, he be given the opportunity to write a piece describing those, and it is included in the report. That would apply to anyone. Do people think that is a good idea?

Nick explained the option to allow for those who voted to support the document, also be able to write 2 pages describing why they support and what they may disagree with.

Yaakov said the vote is open until Monday so we can give it until then.

Wes thought along the lines of Yaakov. He wanted the vote to stand by itself and add a section on individual thoughts. He wanted a section for anyone, even those who voted against the report, to write something. He didn't want to just qualify votes.

Dawn asked if these 2 pages get added to the report regardless if the majority accepts them or not? Could Dawn write 2 pages about what she thinks is so wrong about this report and that it is automatically accepted without a vote?

Wes thought that everybody needs to have a vote. He would vote to support everyone's conclusions because we all contributed a lot. He would like his two pages in it. He would hate to see some people's defeated.

Yaakov could support it, even though he might disagree with Dawn's conclusions.

Nick said that one of the nice things about this report, there is no personal attacks. That is why he says there has to be approval and then qualification. There have to be bounds, civility.

Dawn said that is very subjective.

Wes said right.

Nick said if people prefer to just have a majority, minority fine.

Wes said that even if he did do it his way, he would still want a minority report.

Nick said that is not what he was suggesting. He was thinking of the Supreme Court, where someone says he will vote for this but not for the reasons. Nick thought Wes is suggesting something else. You want to have your inclusion even though you don't agree with the report. He can't agree with that.

John asked why the minority report wasn't prepared for approval of the committee.

Wes said the committee doesn't have to approve a minority report.

John asked why they did not present something.

Bob said a minority report is a result of the overall report, not prior to the final report.

Dawn discussed the Supreme Court.

Nick thought that Bob agreed that the minority report will be included in the final report.

Bob didn't recall that.

Nick moved this report with the all the changes discussed be approved tonight, however if anyone else wants to approve the report (for different reasons) they be given the opportunity until Monday to add his or her reasons as a separate page, to include in the report and people who disapprove can and should include a minority report.

Second

Bob clarified that we approve this tonight, and that anyone who wants, has until Monday to prepare a written statement as to why they voted the way they voted.

Nick said not exactly. That is only for people who vote to approve the report; furthermore, anyone who disagreed should include a minority report.

Nick referred to the Supreme Court.

Bob wondered how anyone would know why other people approved it?

Nick said, because it is stated.

Bob said that if he approved it for reason J and Laurie approves it for reason L, we might have different reasons for why we approved it, but how would he know that his was different from Laurie's.?

Nick said that is the point: for example, while he might not agree with everything in this report, it is sufficiently close to his viewpoint and thus he sees no reason for stating a separate opinion. However, He might want to write something to make his reasons explicit.

Linda Dunbrack from the audience added that for example somebody might say that they like 70% of the report but thinks the plausibility section is really ridiculous and should be left out.

Bob said so it is an opportunity of a member of the majority to have a minority report of the majority report.

Nick agreed. That is it exactly.

Wes liked the spirit but amended that it will be for anyone who approved or disapproved. He wants anyone to be able to have the same opportunity.

Nick said that is already taken into account in the minority report, as discussed last time: it can be included with this report if you want.

Wes said that if he votes no he wants the same opportunity as someone who voted Yes.

Nick said that if he votes no, it is a different opinion and that goes into a minority report.

He said that if you want to say that you agree with 70% but want to vote yes, you can write why you disagree with the sections you don't approve.

Wes said that he understands Nick's motion. But, even though he might not agree with a lot of this, he helped to contribute to it and he wants a page to explain why he voted the way he did. If he votes yes he gets it. If he votes no he doesn't.

Nick said, you get that in the minority report.

Laurie asked for clarification: Does the minority report get published separately?

Nick said he thinks it should go together.

Bob said there is no rule.

Laurie said that when this is bound,

Nick said it should be both the majority and minority reports.

Laure thought that takes care of what Wes is saying because he will get to include his reasons in the minority report which will be bound with the final report.

Laurie said that we need to have a timeline for receiving the minority report because it needs to be printed. If you want to do this, we need it by Monday.

John asked why we can't call it dissenting remarks instead of minority report?

Like the Supreme Court.

Dawn said this is not the Supreme Court.

Nick said that people who are voting for this report are trying to follow the guidelines of the moderator.

Wes said that if he votes against it will he be not following those guidelines.

Nick said that there was a motion to get this done. If you want to take more time, you have that right. But if you want to approve this, his motion is that by Monday your statement has to be in.

Wes again spoke to his amendment. He felt that he contributed, as did all of us, to what went in here and he wants the same deadline to go to those who don't vote for the report so they can submit a page expunging their vote. It is a matter of fairness and opportunity. Nick said that he is willing to have that but not if Wes will write another report. That would be writing two reports.

Wes said not necessarily. A minority report might be different findings.

Nick would speak against this amendment because it is like having your cake and eating it two.

Yaakov said or two or there.

Nick said he would very much support the motion about contributions to the committee. Members of the Supreme Court don't say they agree and disagree and write two reports. They don't count both yes and no.

Dawn disagreed with his interpretations of the Supreme Court.

Dawn said it is about fairness. She doesn't recall any guidelines from the moderator on how to write a report. She thought the suggestion about a minority report came from town counsel when it became clear how divided we are.

Dawn spoke in favor of Wes's amendment and said the information has previously been voted on, section by section, and much of it approved, near universal especially the background section and how services are delivered so if the majority want to slice and dice the sections they disagree with, it should be allowed to all members of the committee.

If people want to also write a dissenting report, even the majority, you can write your own report.

Nick disagrees because the majority would write the report and basically not intervene in the interpretations of the minority. She is suggesting a never ending process. He stands by his motion. Wes is trying to have it both ways.

Bob agreed with Nick

Wes reiterated his reasons and that he felt we all contributed to the work of this report.

Bob said that his answer to Wes is that our names are on the front as being members of the committee. This means that the entire committee contributed to portions of this report. Approval or disapproval doesn't mean that you are against the whole thing. Bob also will vote No to Nick's motion because he thinks it is very similar and he differs in that sense.

Wes repeated himself one more time. He thinks allowing one set of members an opportunity is not OK. He misses an opportunity.

Vote on amendment: 2-6-1

Nick's Main motion: 6-3-0

Nick moved to add a third section to the first page stating: the committee members strongly feel that every member has been a major contributor to the drafting of this report Bob spoke against this. He doesn't think it is true that every member has put significant work into it.

Into the drafting.

Nick changed the motion to be "into the work of the committee"

Bob said he will vote against

Second

Yaakov asked if this will look fishy?

Wes said that although everyone is a good person not everyone is entitled to the same space. Wes said he will vote against it.

Dawn asked if the pages people write will go into the report unapproved or voted on by the committee. Even though every other section got voted on by the committee?

Nick said that if they vote yes, it seems to him that they can say whatever they want.

Bob said it will change the document.

Nick sees no problem if someone wants to say what they think.

Dawn said that except that every other page in every section has been voted on.

Vote: 5-3-1

Nick asked Laurie if she can communicate with Jim that he can have until Monday to decide his vote and contribute to the report.

She agreed and she will contact his wife anyway to give her a copy of the report.

Bob said it doesn't really matter because he won't be here Monday.

Nick said that he can communicate with us.

Dawn said that he can't vote for the report so he can't add anything.

She added, believe me, he is not voting for it.

John asked if his vote changes anything here?

No

Bob said he won't be here.

Nick said that in his suggestions there will be a statement of how people vote, he will be listed as absent, unless he communicates. Bob said he still can't vote. Nick suggested we overrule the rules by a 2/3 vote so he can vote by Monday. He should at least have the opportunity.

Nick moved that Mr. Palmer be given the opportunity to express whether he wants to vote yes or no on this report and that if he wants to vote yes he be made aware he could write something, by Monday.

Second

Vote 8-0-1

Dawn asked on Page 6. She hates the quote it is cryptic.

Steve likes the one on the statue in Animal House "Knowledge is good"

Dawn said that would be fine. Better than this.

For the record she thinks it is a poor way to start this report.

Wes asked if people mind omitting it. It is cutesy and nice but it doesn't mean anything, Dawn said he is one of her gay heroes.

Inaudible

Nick said that Oscar Wilde is a hero to a lot of people regardless of their sexual orientation. He is delighted that something from Oscar Wilde is here.

John Said we can add a rose is a rose

Dawn moved to remove the Oscar Wilde quote

Second

Vote: 2-6-1

Laurie was confused if Nick's motion was to approve this report with changes but it is open until Monday?

The group clarified that we are giving Jim the opportunity to vote yes or no and if he says yes he can add 2 pages by Monday.

Bob asked if we have additional questions.

Nick asked if we have to meet on Monday?

Bob moved that this committee recommend that at the conclusion of the presentation of our reports this committee be dissolved.

Second

Steve asked if there are any circumstances we need to talk about before doing that?

Nick spoke against it. He said our work is so tremendous and we have gotten along so well, maybe town meeting wants us back to study illegal immigrants or something else.

Yaakov said we could be a permanent investigating committee.

Vote: 5-2-2

Nick thanked Joe for his great work filming us. Round of applause.

Nick moved that the clerk, with the assistance of Ms. Laurora, be in charge of the presentation of the final report to town meeting.

Second

Wes moved (1) to amend that in the absence of the chair, the vice chair present to town meeting as the next ranking member.

Yaakov supported Nick's motion.

Wes moved (2) to amend that if his first amendment fails, Laurie does the presentation with the assistance of the Voce Chair.

Vote on Wes amendment 1: 1-7-1

Vote on Wes amendment 2: 1-7-1

Vote on main motion: 6-1-2

There was some confusion as to whether we voted to accept the report as final. All agreed to disregard that part of the motion and revote.

Bob entertained a motion to accept the final report.

Nick added with changes. Steve moved to accept the final report with changes.

Second

Roll call vote to accept the final report with changes

No	Bob Berman, Chair	Yes	Steve Orr
Yes	Yaakov Cohn, Vice Chair		Jim Palmer absent
No	Dawn Harkness	No	Wes Ritchie
Yes	Cynthia Laurora	Yes	Nick Sanchez
Yes	Laurie Lee, Clerk	Yes	John Speranza

Steve moved that Laurie put in for all expenses. Laurie mentioned she has quite a few receipts and will submit them. Anyone who has a receipt should send it to her. The group agreed.

Motion to adjourn

Second

Nick thanked the audience

Vote: 8-1-0