

Town of Framingham

PILOT/Impact Study Committee

Report of the Minority

May 2006



Bob Berman
Dawn Harkness
James Palmer
Wes Ritchie

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
What the Majority and Minority Agree On.....	3
What the Majority and Minority Disagree On.....	5
Police Department.....	5
Fire Department.....	7
Framingham Public Schools.....	7
Property & Income Study.....	10
Taxed vs. Non-Taxed.....	12
Recommendations of the Minority	13
Appendix.....	17

I. Introduction

Why the need for a minority report?

Town Meeting asked the PILOT/Impact Study Committee to conduct an important study on the impact of social services in Framingham. While there is a great deal of information that the members of both the minority and majority of the committee agree on, there are real concerns about the inclusion of some data that appears in the final report of the committee. The inclusion of this data was a primary factor in why we, the minority, voted against the report.

Based upon our interpretation, the primary charge given to the PILOT/Comparative Study Committee by Town Meeting was to determine the impact of social service programs, sites and agencies on the Town of Framingham. Our committee worked extremely hard early on in creating, discussing, and agreeing on questionnaires that were sent to both social service agencies and town departments. Unfortunately, many of the questions went unanswered for a variety of reasons, including concern that answering the questions would be time intensive as well as concerns about releasing private information regarding clients, residents and students. In addition, we did not have the cooperation of all departments and agencies, as the majority of the questionnaires were not returned.

While we agree with the majority on many things, there are also a great number of items included in the final report with which we strongly disagree. The primary concern that we have regarding the final report of the committee is the use of “plausible” data. When statistical data that proved a direct connection between social services and impact to Framingham was not available, the majority of the committee felt it wise to include data that may lead one to a certain conclusion that is not statistically proven. We disagree with this tactic. Town Meeting requested, and the town deserves, hard data that either proves or disproves certain claims. Concerns on the use of plausible data were raised numerous times by each member of this minority group throughout the course of our committee work, but the majority did not agree and in the end included an entire section on plausible data that we feel is misleading.

Ultimately, the committee did an incredible amount of work compiling an amazing amount of data and established relationships with the state, agencies, and other municipalities that will hopefully lead to future communication and collaboration. The PILOT/Impact Study Committee worked hard to get to the point that we are now presenting to Town Meeting. The work, however, should not be considered done. There are still many questions that remain. The PILOT/Impact Study Committee was made up of a group of committed volunteers, many of whom put in significant hours over the past ten months working towards our charge, but in the end we are just that, a group of committed volunteers with limited time and resources. We look for the leadership of Town Meeting and the Board of Selectmen to continue the important work started by this committee.

II. What the majority and minority agree on

The majority and minority groups agreed on a great many facts over the course of our work together, many of which we find to be quite significant, such as:

- Framingham hosts a significantly greater number of social service agencies, programs and sites than any of our neighboring communities. Framingham is a regional hub of services.
- There has been extensive growth of social service programs and sites operating in Framingham since 1990.
- Historically there has been little communication between town officials and agencies.
- Framingham currently has no single town employee who is tasked with coordinating and communicating with social service agencies.
- Not all recipients of social services in Framingham originate from the town of Framingham.
- While we object to the singling out of one particular program for scrutiny, as the majority report has done, we concur that there are many concerns and issues with hosting the “wet” portion of the Common Ground shelter in town. These concerns are shared by the Framingham Police Department and the agency which runs the program because the clients served there have inherently difficult issues to address.
- Current state law allows for little say from town officials (and residents) in the siting process for social service programs
- There are many benefits to hosting social service programs that operate in Framingham such as convenience for Framingham residents to access services for Framingham residents, from our youth to our seniors, to access services including domestic violence counseling, emergency health care, mental health care, home heating assistance, and Headstart to name just a few. Social service agencies also provide employment opportunities and dollars spent in the community by both employees and clients as well.
- Many social service sites in Framingham are currently taxed, including some administrative offices, some residential properties, and some shelters.
- The vast majority of social service sites in Framingham operate south of Route 9, many within a one square mile radius of the Memorial Building.
- There is a minimal impact on our tax rate due to non-taxed social service agency owned properties, as verified by the Town Assessor.
- There are no known municipalities singling out social service agencies for PILOT programs.
- Non-profit agencies are under no obligation to make PILOT payments.
- After ten months of work, the PILOT/Impact Study Committee was not able to determine direct cost to many of the most significant town departments as a result of social service agencies operating in Framingham. These departments include the Police Department, Fire Department, Department of Planning and Economic Development, and Department of Public Works.

- There is little to no impact caused by social service programs, sites and agencies on the Town of Framingham Health Department, Building Commissioner and Assessor's Office or ambulance service. There is also no impact to the McAuliffe Regional Charter Public School and Keefe Regional Vocational School, both of which have no students enrolled that live in residential social service programs.

III. What the majority and minority disagree on

As shown in the previous section, there is a great deal that the committee agrees upon. The major difference of opinion between the majority and minority groups can be found often in methodology, primarily the use of “**plausibility**” in determining the impact of social services on the town. In basic terms, the majority report admittedly makes many assumptions based upon data that does not specifically support those assumptions. The minority group has continually resisted the temptation to tie-up loose ends in an attempt to paint a specific picture.

Unfortunately, no Town departments fully complied with the PILOT/Impact Study Committee’s requests by answering all of the questions submitted to them. Only 9 of 40 agencies provided answers to enough of our questions to be analyzed in the report. In the absence of comprehensive responses from the agencies and departments, the majority of the committee then decided to include data and arguments of a plausible nature instead of a direct impact nature.

For the minority, the point of the methodology is very simple. Data used for the final report of the committee should show a demonstrated relationship with the impact of social services to the Town of Framingham. In several cases in the final report brought forth by the majority of the committee, this is not the case.

1. The Police Department.

It is true that statistics indicate that 40% of the arrests in Framingham occur in a 1 square mile of downtown. It is also true that statistics indicate that a large percentage of Framingham’s social service programs operate within that same 1 square mile. However, there is no statistical viability that these two separate statistics have any demonstrated relationship to each other. According to Police Chief Carl, there are several factors, including poverty and the fact that Framingham has 94 liquor licenses for a 25 square mile area that contribute to crime and arrest rates. The existence of social service programs may possibly be a factor, but there is no statistical evidence to prove that argument.

In order to make an unbiased analysis, the Police Department was asked specifically to give the PILOT/Impact Study Committee the top 200 addresses to which they are most often called to respond. This information, had it been provided, would have given a clear picture of which Framingham properties demand the most services of the town police department and how social service agency properties compare to non-social service properties. Unfortunately this information was not provided by the department despite repeated requests so we feel that a fair analysis is not possible.

Instead, the majority of the committee has linked the Chief’s map of the one square mile of downtown with the map demonstrating the general location of social service properties giving the impression that the social service agencies and their clients are directly

responsible for 40% of the arrests in the Town of Framingham. This analysis is speculative at best and deliberately misleading at worst.

Rather than make questionable links between data with no demonstrated connection between social service agency programs and crime, we offer some notable comments from Chief Carl.

Chief Carl on how class issues affect crime and calls to the police:

"Sometimes we deliver services because people don't know who else to call. Policing is a blue collar industry. Not that we aren't professionals, not that we don't have college educations, some more than others. Blue collar. Ok. Because when the average person husband slaps their wife or someone's daughter is beaten up by her husband, they call the police. But you know what, when you live up at the top of Carter Drive, and you are making million dollars a year and your husband slaps you in the face you don't want to jeopardize that million dollars of your income, you call the family attorney to straighten the problem out. You don't call the blue collar police. We're a blue collar service. You might call us for a car accident, you might call us for a whole variety of things. But you know what, people with a lot of resources have resources they can reach to other than the police and other than social service agencies to provide for their families and their own needs. "

Chief Carl on how the town benefits from having a wet shelter:

"When we find people stumbling around downtown intoxicated, homeless, intoxicated is the key, we can bring them to the Police station and put them in protective custody where we have to care for them. We can bring them to the shelter where someone else cares for them and the liability doesn't fall to the government entity. So we bring them right to that shelter. Ok. The other thing is we find them intoxicated to the point where we can't care for them and they are lying on the ground. And we call an ambulance and the ambulance brings them to the hospital. The hospital calls us later on begging us to take them out. And we will when they are medically cleared. Then we take them to the shelter. We try not to take people into protective custody. The difference is this: for someone who has a real bad alcohol problem, homeless, not good nourishment, not good health, they sometimes die because their bodies give out. Now when they die in a cell, No one says they died in a warm cell with a blanket and pillow, What they say is they were just turning their lives around and the police allowed them to die. When they die in the shelter, their families say, well at least they had a warm place to live. There is a huge huge liability by taking these people who are habitual alcoholics habitual with huge huge health issues, and taking them and taking them and putting them in a police station where we do monitor them, we do check them every 15 minutes but no one gets a deep sleep, you have to look in on them through the glass like this to see if their chest is rising and it becomes again the police department is doing more than... We aren't a shelter but we're becoming a shelter, that's why there are shelters."

Chief Carl also acknowledged that SMOC officials meet with his department weekly to work on solving whatever difficult issues the program and their clients present to the community. We believe that this spirit of communication and co-operation between an agency and town departments is movement in a positive direction and should be encouraged

2. The Fire Department

While Chief Gadsen was clear in his comments to the committee that social service agencies did not present any particular difficulty for his department, the majority has presented an analysis which implies that they do present a disproportionate impact on the town. We find that this simply isn't so and can be demonstrated by the data the committee was able to collect. Unlike the Police Department, Chief Gadsen actually did provide the 200 properties that they respond to the most. The minority group has included the entire data provided by the Chief in the appendix of this document.

The majority's report only highlights calls made to social service agencies. However without including information about all the properties that the fire department responds to most often, the majority's report skews the information to make it appear that social service agency properties have a disproportionate impact on Town services. Furthermore without taking into consideration which properties are taxed and which are not, the majority report is delivering misleading data to support their recommendation for singling out social service agencies for PILOT programs.

Very few social service locations were in the top 200, and of the ones that were, the vast majority were sites that pay property taxes. The top properties are: Summerville at Farm Pond, a senior living facility; Shoppers World on Route 9; St. Patrick's Manor, another senior living facility; a number of state owned properties, including Framingham State College & MA Turnpike Authority; property owned by the Town of Framingham, primarily the schools; as well as residential apartment complexes.

3. The School Department

Perhaps one of the most interesting summaries presented in the final report was the section titled "Impact on the Framingham School System." The final report indicates that there is a cost of \$1.68 million to the Framingham Public Schools to educate students who "qualify under the McKinney Vento Homeless Act or reside at one of the sites on our inventory list" We feel that this number is not accurate. It came about after factoring average per-pupil cost and includes additional spending in the form of grants and aid from the state and federal government. Unfortunately, these numbers were never discussed by the PILOT/Impact Study Committee or with Superintendent Martes before being included by the majority in the final report. We find the data to be false and misleading for a number of different reasons outlined below. When asked his opinion of the "data" presented in this section, Superintendent Martes stated in an email that "*It seems like the interpretations [in the final report] don't match up with the information that we provided.*"

Following are the reasons that we believe that the Framingham School System data in the Final Report is incomplete and incorrect:

- **Differences in the way data is collected by the Framingham Public Schools and the specificity of questions asked by the PILOT/Impact Study Committee: How the committee arrived at 155 students and why that number is not accurate.**

This problem illustrates the differences between the specific information that was requested by the PILOT/Impact Study Committee and the way the Framingham Public School collects data relating to its students. The McKinney-Vento Homeless Act definition of “homeless individual” is:

- (1) An individual who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence; and
- (2) an individual who has a primary nighttime residence that is--
 - (A) a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations (including welfare hotels, congregate shelters, and transitional housing for the mentally ill);
 - (B) an institution that provides a temporary residence for individuals intended to be institutionalized; or
 - (C) a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings.

Clearly, while this definition may apply to some students who are served by social service agencies, it is likely that there are circumstances where many students were included in the Final Report calculation that are not serviced or housed by social service agencies. Again, because of the way data is collected by the schools and the specific nature of PILOT questions, it was not possible for the PILOT Committee to come up with an accurate calculation of the costs associated with educating students who live in social service owned property.

- **Distinction between taxed and non-taxed properties.**

The minority understands that in order to have an accurate calculation of the costs of social services to the Town of Framingham, it is necessary to determine separately the services used by properties that are paying taxes and the services used by properties that are tax exempt. This distinction is entirely absent from the Final Report despite repeated requests that it be included by members of the minority. This is particularly striking in the section of the Final Report that deals with the Framingham Public Schools. It is true that homeowners in Framingham who have students in the schools (as well as homeowners who don't) pay property taxes that include, among services like trash and yard waste pickup, education for all of Framingham's students. As indicated earlier in the Minority Report, as well as briefly in the Final Report, many social service-owned properties do pay their full-share of property taxes.

The town has a mixture of residential social service properties that pay their full-share of taxes as well as some that are exempt. The importance of this distinction is that while the Final Report draws conclusions based on 155 students who “qualify under the McKinney Vento Homeless Act or reside at one of the sites on our inventory list,” there is no distinction between students who are living at properties that are contributing to education in the form of property taxes and students who live at properties that are not paying property taxes. We find this distinction is an important one, and just one of the many reasons why *the* true cost and impact to the Town of Framingham associated with social service agencies were unable to be determined, or even accurately estimated.

- **How per-pupil costs are really determined and how the number of students enrolled actually impacts the cost of educating Framingham’s students.**

When the per-pupil costs were tabulated in the 2005 School Benchmarking Study, the figure of \$10,518 was a snapshot in time that represented all of the costs that go into running all of the Framingham Public Schools, including utility costs, health care, building maintenance, salary, and other fees. This benchmark number does not represent the actual dollar amounts associated with the educating each individual student. As such, when you look even at the inflated number of 155 students that were used in the Final Report, they are with all likelihood not coming from the same classes, grades, or even schools. They are coming from any variation of the 8 elementary, 3 middle and 2 high schools, each from various programs and grade levels and do not individually cost \$10,518 to educate. To put it simply, if these same 155 students left the Framingham schools, we would not see a decrease in expenses equal to $155 \times \$10,518$. There would be no change in building maintenance costs, energy costs and other building related costs. In all likelihood, salary costs would not change significantly, nor would associated costs such as health insurance of staff. In addition, transportation costs would also not be affected greatly.

With an enrollment of over 8,000 students, it is likely that less than one percent of Framingham’s students are actually receiving housing from social service agencies, especially housing that is tax exempt.

- **The truth about SPED costs, as articulated by the Framingham Public Schools.**

According to Pamela Kaufmann, the director of Special Education in Framingham, *“Framingham does not maintain records of students living in group homes nor does the MA DOE require any reporting of such. We cannot release any data due to State and Federal confidentiality requirements. In summary, we are not aware of any situation where a special education student living in a group home and attending Framingham Public Schools has resulted in increased costs to Framingham.”*

We as a minority were disappointed that this quote was not included in the final report, even though it was made available to the committee. It can be deduced by this statement

there are no special education programs offered by the Framingham Public Schools that would not be offered if students who live in social service owned property did not attend the Framingham Schools.

- **Outplacement Data**

The PILOT/Impact Study Committee looked closely at the costs associated with out of district placement, and particularly out of district placement of special education students. According to Pamela Kaufmann, the director of Special Education in Framingham, *“If a special education student resides in a group home, attends Framingham Public Schools and the parent lives in another school district, Framingham bills the ‘home’ school district for the costs of special education. We are very aggressive on this matter. If the student attends an out of district placement, the ‘home’ school district pays the tuition.”*

- **The Final Report fills in gaps with guesses, rather than admission and acceptance of unknown costs.**

As was the case with other aspects of the PILOT Report, we feel that the majority has presented incomplete and potentially misleading data. Unfortunately, the PILOT/Impact Study Committee was not able to receive all of the information requested of the schools.

Due to the way data is collected and the specific nature of the PILOT/Impact Study Committee’s questions, there was no way for the Framingham Public Schools to provide answers to some of the questions the PILOT/Impact Study Committee asked. As such, the minority feels that, as voted unanimously on our meeting of April 24, 2006, the committee should have simply stated that “information is not available” for the Framingham Public Schools rather than attempting to craft answers that are not accurate.

4. Property & Income Study

Another major example of differences in methodology between the majority and minority can be found in the report of the Property & Income working group. This working group undertook an extensive research project to determine the effect that agencies play on the property values of properties neighboring social service sites. While the group put in extensive time and hard work, they unfortunately were not able to accurately determine the effect of which they were looking for. The following paragraphs are quoted directly from their report of January 6, 2006:

“The Property & Income working group identified numerous factors that affect property values: among these are crime, education, location, income, environment, property taxes, perceptions, etc. To determine the impact from properties owned by social service agencies would require a thorough statistical analysis with numerous controls.

While causality is not feasible to determine, it is possible to identify trends and growth rates for properties owned by social service agencies and their neighboring properties,

and determine if these values are consistent with the trends and growth for Framingham as a whole.”

The data brought forth by the Property & Income working group is based on potential plausibility of the impact of social services on a particular measure. As the working group entailed, several other factors that could also plausibly lead to the same result were neither explored nor adequately controlled due to the committee’s limitations. Therefore the data brought forth in the Final Report could be misleading to those making decisions and drawing conclusion from it.

A second major issue with the Property Value and Income report can be found in the analysis of trends in property values. The working group compared the growth rate of a subsection of Social Service properties with their neighbors. 70% of these social service properties chosen located south of Route 9 and 30% are north. A more statistically viable study would have done separate growth analysis of properties in different neighborhoods, but that was found to be impossible given our limited resources. The result was a set of data that was skewed when compared to the townwide growth rate of 83%, according to Town Assessor Mike Flynn, the fluctuation of rates differs between neighborhoods in Framingham. The Assessor presented to the entire PILOT/Impact Study Committee that the proximity of Social service agencies is not taken into consideration when assessing property values, however, an assessment is affected by the neighborhood a property is in. Therefore, the data brought forth by the working group carries with it this significant flaw.

It is the belief of the minority that determining the true impact of social service agencies on the property values of the town is one of the most important aspects of our work, yet due to the limitations of time, expertise, and resources, we as a committee were not able to succeed in completing that work. Therefore, we will be making a recommendation later in this document that the Board of Selectmen assign Framingham’s Town Assessor’s office the task of continuing on with that study

Additional examples of data used in the Property & Income report that the minority does not find a demonstrated relationship with the impact of social services to the town include:

- Residential Growth
- Median Household Income
- Population Growth

5. Tax vs. non-taxed

We are also concerned that the majority's final report made little distinction between social service programs on property that are tax exempt and those that pay taxes. The committee focused on 242 social service agency properties. The minority was able to establish that taxes are not paid on approximately 88 properties (36%) with approximately 93 properties (38%) paying taxes. 61 (25%) properties have confidential addresses and we could not establish their tax status. We believe that this distinction is an integral part of understanding the impact of social services on the Town of Framingham.

IV. Recommendations of the Minority

As mentioned previously, the minority members of the PILOT/Impact Study Committee acknowledge that there is a significantly larger population of social service programs operating in Framingham in comparison to all of our neighboring and similar communities that we studied. The result is approximately \$39 million in non-taxed properties owned by social service agencies in the town. In addition, the town provides many of the same services to the clients of residential programs that it provides to every other resident of the town. While we were not able to determine direct costs associated with providing services, we understand that there are costs associated with every public safety call and trash pickup, as well as providing education for children who are residents of our town.

In that light, the minority offers the following recommendations to the Board of Selectmen, Town Meeting, and all town officials and residents:

- **We strongly recommend that our State Legislators, along with the Board of Selectmen, work to build a coalition of community representatives from the other municipalities in the state that host a disproportionate number of residential social service programs.** These communities include Boston, Springfield, Waltham, Lynn, Taunton, Worcester, New Bedford, Pittsfield, Brockton and many others. This could potentially be a powerful coalition in the state house that could provide much needed relief to these communities that are housing facilities that are used by residents from throughout the state. Framingham should not continue to act alone on this issue. We ask that this coalition work towards the following:
 - Cherry sheet reimbursement to municipalities who provide a certain threshold of services within their community to cover the costs of lost tax revenue as well as expenses of providing services that are benefiting an entire state or region.
 - Pooling resources to hire professionals to lobby the state legislature and Governor's office
 - Review of siting procedures used by state agencies
- **We recommend that the Board of Selectmen immediately create an ongoing Social Services Roundtable Committee** to be made up of the following:
 - Representatives of the Board of Selectmen
 - Representatives from social service agencies
 - Framingham's State Legislators
 - Town officials including, but not limited to, the Police Chief and the Director of Planning & Economic Development

In the opinion of the minority, one of the strongest positive outcomes of the PILOT/Impact Study Committee work was bringing many different parties to the

table of discussion to educate the community on resources and concerns. We believe that this can and must continue if we are to build consensus within the community on how to meet the needs of those who need services, while building Framingham into a positive future that our leaders envision.

- **We, like the majority, recommend that the Town of Framingham become an active member of LOHSC (Local Officials Human Services Council),** the human services arm of the Massachusetts Municipal Association. This organization is already active and lobbying the state to provide more aid and technical assistance to Massachusetts communities. Framingham should become an active member of this coalition.

- Understanding that we are in the midst of a multi-million dollar deficit, **we, like the majority, recommend the creation of a Human Services Coordinator for the town who will act as a proactive liaison between the town and the agencies, as well as work as a resource to members of the community that are in need of services.** Until the town budget allows for this position to be created and filled, we recommend that the new Town Manager or his designee begin, or in some cases continue, work in these areas.

- Based on the suggestion of Town Assessor Mike Flynn, **we recommend that the Board of Selectmen create and implement an “ILOT” program.** An ILOT would be something paid or provided by agencies in lieu of taxes, which would specifically benefit Framingham and its residents. ILOT’s may include, but are not limited to, specific services, programs, fees or donations made to the town for a particular use. There are several factors that led us to agree with Mr. Flynn’s suggestion:
 - Andrea Dodge, Chief Administrative Officer of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) stated in a meeting with PILOT/Impact Study Committee representatives that “the vast majority of social service programs in the state run at a deficit”.
 - Research conducted by PILOT/Impact Study Committee member Nicholas Sanchez, PhD of Guidestar (from IRS Tax data) information indicates that many agencies that operate in Framingham run at an operational deficit. This report is included in our appendix.
 - Of the 33 social service agencies that Dr. Sanchez was able to obtain financial information on, 10 ran at negative net revenue for the year reported.
 - Also of the 33 agencies, 15 reported net revenue of less than \$25,000 for the year reported.

While some agencies operating in Framingham report positive net revenues, we feel that it would be in the best interest of the town to provide the flexibility that an ILOT program could offer, rather than just asking for money. ILOT’s are already being provided in Framingham, an example is the Police Jail Diversion Program. Other examples of possible ILOT’s that can be negotiated between the Board of Selectmen and the agencies can include, but are certainly not limited to:

- providing drug and alcohol counselors to the schools
- providing emergency office space to the town departments
- The creation and operation of joint programs run in conjunction with town departments that will fill specific needs in the Framingham community that will benefit our residents
- Added employment for town residents
- Coordinate and operate public service projects

We recommend that the Board of Selectmen begin meeting with representatives of social service agencies immediately to begin discussing the needs of the town and where the agencies may fit in with helping to provide for those needs through ILOT's.

- An important part of understanding the work that the PILOT/Impact Study Committee undertook is being able to put that work in perspective to the Town of Framingham's financial and infrastructural situation. The PILOT Committee focused only on the \$36,546,350 of tax exempt property that is owned by social service agencies in FY06 because of the limited charge of the committee. What is unknown to many in town is that Framingham is host to \$860,041,500 of tax exempt property. Thus, the PILOT/Impact Study Committee was responsible for studying only 4.2% of all tax exempt property in Framingham.

Members of the minority feel that it is important to note that if Framingham's fiscal health is to be remedied through a future PILOT (strictly payment), Town Meeting should reconsider the issue of restricting a PILOT program to Social Service agencies and consider a PILOT program that extends to all tax exempt property. We look to Town Assessor Mike Flynn's report of 1997 to the Board of Selectmen that recommends a PILOT program be created for all tax exempt properties. If a PILOT program is to have any significant impact on Framingham's financial operations, it must implement a sweeping PILOT program instead of a narrow one targeting only social services, or 4.2% of the non-taxed properties in the town.

As outlined in the final report, the total tax waiver of the non-taxed social service properties alone is estimated to be \$515,751 in FY06. The total tax waiver of 100% of the non-taxed properties is estimated to be \$3,251,822 in FY06.

Therefore, we recommend that the Board of Selectman establish a working group to examine the costs to the town of Framingham for hosting all tax exempt property, with the possible goal of establishing a town-wide PILOT program that is inclusive of all tax-exempt property in the town of Framingham.

- As stated previously in this minority report, we feel that determination of a statistically reliable relationship between social service agencies and property values was beyond the abilities of this committee. We feel that identifying a statistically valid connection between social services agencies operating in Framingham and changes in property values is absolutely instrumental in determining the true impact of social services on the town of Framingham.

We recommend that the Board of Selectmen assign the Town Assessor's office the task of implementing a study that will monitor the appreciation of property values in Framingham and research the causes of any material difference between the rate of appreciation in Framingham and the median rate of appreciation for a peer group of communities. The Board of Selectmen or the Town Assessor shall provide regular status reports on the findings to Town Meeting.

- **We recommend that the Town Manager, Chief of Police and Board of Selectmen should continue to work with the South Middlesex Opportunity Council to minimize public safety concerns at the Common Ground Shelter, working towards a common goal of eventually closing its doors.** It is important to note though that we feel that the closing of the wet shelter should not be completed without alternatives for those in need.

We agree with the majority that the closing of the “wet” portion of the shelter may make clear that we have a need for a detoxification center in Framingham where people who are willing to try to get sober can do so. Police Chief Carl shared in these concerns. We disagree though on the location of the prison being offered by the majority. Any detoxification center should be placed in a location that is easily accessible and centrally located. In addition, we feel that by placing a detoxification center at a prison location that it will likely not be utilized by many who need it the most, as they may in many cases either be too afraid or embarrassed to ask for help at a prison.

V. Appendix

A. Financial Data for Social Service Agencies Operating in Framingham (From IRS Tax data found through Guidestar)

1. Revenue and Expense

Name	Revenue	Expenses	Net	Year
A Suitable Image	\$51,698.00	\$34,576.00	\$17,122.00	6/30/2004
Advocates	\$31,345,338.00	\$30,106,746.00	\$1,238,595.00	6/30/2004
BayPath Elder Services	\$5,408,363.00	\$5,504,978.00	-\$96,615.00	6/30/2004
Bethany Health Care	\$7,862,772.00	\$9,639,118.00	-\$1,776,346.00	12/31/2003
Bethany Hill School	\$603,306.00	\$588,795.00	\$14,511.00	6/30/2004
(Bethany) Adult Day Center	\$410,061.00	\$402,219.00	\$7,842.00	7/31/2004
Big Brother Big Sister Central MA/Metrowest	\$263,591.00	\$402,374.00	-\$138,783.00	9/30/2003
BirthRight	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Brandon Residential Treatment Center(Natick)	\$7,743,557.00	\$7,602,194.00	\$141,363.00	6/30/2004
Center for Living and Working	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Eliot Community Services(Lexington)	\$23,454,642.00	\$23,527,928.00	-\$73,286.00	6/30/2004
Framingham Coalition Prevention Drug Alcohol	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Framingham Community Daycare (Southside)	\$198,454.00	\$218,426.00	-\$19,972.00	6/30/2004
Framingham Court Mediation Services	\$97,840.00	\$119,845.00	-\$22,005.00	6/30/2003
Genesis Rental (Counseling Services)	\$253,810.00	\$274,660.00	-\$20,850.00	6/30/2004
Great Brook Valley Health (Worcester)	\$18,067,482.00	\$16,684,088.00	\$1,383,391.00	6/30/2004
Health Awareness of Central MA (Worcester)	\$2,083,068.00	\$2,021,396.00	\$61,672.00	12/31/2003
jewish family services	\$1,695,075.00	\$1,538,488.00	\$156,587.00	6/30/2004
Justice Resource Institute(Boston)	\$79,102,262.00	\$77,167,851.00	\$1,934,411.00	6/30/2004
MA Alliance of Portuguese Speakers	\$2,332,050.00	\$2,389,241.00	-\$57,191.00	6/30/2004
MCIL MetroWest Center for Indep. Living	\$545,663.00	\$545,320.00	\$343.00	6/30/2004
Metrowest Human Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Metrowest Outreach Connection	\$50,432.00	\$9,594.00	\$42,951.00	12/31/2004
MA Society for Prevention Cruelty to Children	\$31,566,813.00	\$29,780,655.00	\$1,786,158.00	6/30/2004

New England Center for Children (Autism)	\$32,984,906.00	\$32,222,841.00	\$762,065.00	6/30/2004
New England Atftercare Ministires iNc	\$699,592.00	\$670,307.00	\$29,285.00	6/30/2004
Programs for People	\$668,806.00	\$688,946.00	-\$20,140.00	6/30/2004
Reed Academy	\$1,455,894.00	\$1,379,118.00	\$76,776.00	6/30/2004
Rehabilitative Resources	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Resource Consortium	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Samaritans (Suburban West)	\$139,087.00	\$133,282.00	\$5,805.00	12/31/2003
SMOC	\$40,466,479.00	\$40,341,409.00	\$125,070.00	6/30/2004
South Middlesex Legal Services/rental	\$1,217,750.00	\$1,064,893.00	\$152,857.00	6/30/2004
South Middlesex Non-Profit Housing	\$5,536,050.00	\$5,058,575.00	\$477,475.00	6/30/2004
Spectrum Health Systems (Worcester)	\$32,091,080.00	\$32,761,723.00	\$329,357.00	6/30/2004
The KEY Program, Inc (FRAMINGHAM)	\$47,949,136.00	\$47,636,611.00	\$312,525.00	6/30/2004
Toward Ind. Living and Learning				
Wayside	\$16,168,233.00	\$15,335,315.00	\$832,918.00	6/30/2004
Metrowest Latin American Center	\$660,627.00	\$686,939.00	-\$26,312.00	6/30/2004
Trinity (Mental Health)	\$1,954,912.00	\$1,918,334.00	\$36,578.00	6/30/2004

2. Assets and Liabilities

Name	Assets	Liabilites	Net	Year
A Suitable Image	\$19,147.00	\$3,000.00	\$16,147.00	6/30/2004
Advocates	\$14,520,223.00	\$10,570,509.00	\$3,949,714.00	6/30/2004
BayPath Elder Services	\$1,266,396.00	\$470,879.00	\$795,517.00	6/30/2004
Bethany Health Care	\$6,781,665.00	\$4,025,958.00	\$2,755,707.00	12/31/2003
Bethany Hill School	\$2,222,580.00	\$1,942,387.00	\$280,193.00	6/30/2004
(Bethany) Adult Day Center	\$99,341.00	\$31,533.00	\$67,808.00	7/31/2004
Big Brother Big Sister Central MA/Metrowest	\$490,766.00	\$45,272.00	\$445,494.00	9/30/2003
BirthRight	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Brandon Residential Treatment Center(Natick)	\$9,722,223.00	\$7,712,082.00	\$2,010,141.00	6/30/2004
Center for Living and Working	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Eliot Community Services(Lexington)	\$3,746,275.00	\$2,691,631.00	\$1,054,644.00	6/30/2004
Framingham Coalition Prevention Drug Alcohol	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Framingham Community Daycare (Southside)	\$16,569.00	\$8,582.00	\$7,987.00	6/30/2004
Framingham Court Mediation Services	\$17,553.00	\$11,611.00	\$5,942.00	6/30/2003
Genesis Rental (Counseling Services)	\$41,434.00	\$3,262.00	\$38,172.00	6/30/2004
Great Brook Valley Health (Worcester)	\$15,311,238.00	\$4,515,305.00	\$10,795,933.00	6/30/2004
Health Awareness of Central MA (Worcester)	\$130,638.00	\$132,900.00	-\$2,262.00	12/31/2003
jewish family services	\$1,732,760.00	\$484,648.00	\$1,248,112.00	6/30/2004
Justice Resource Institute(Boston)	\$43,158,210.00	\$19,598,223.00	\$23,559,987.00	6/30/2004
MA Alliance of Portuguese Speakers	\$662,642.00	\$515,857.00	\$146,789.00	6/30/2004
MCIL MetroWest Center for Indep. Living	\$115,669.00	\$51,847.00	\$63,822.00	6/30/2004
Metrowest Human Services	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Metrowest Outreach Connection	\$55,301.00	\$12,350.00	\$42,951.00	12/31/2004
MA Society for Prevention Cruelty to Children	\$44,434,781.00	\$4,930,060.00	\$39,504,721.00	6/30/2004
New England Center for Children (Autism)	\$31,623,744.00	\$24,031,865.00	\$7,591,879.00	6/30/2004
New England Atftercare Ministires iNc	\$687,736.00	\$289,265.00	\$398,471.00	6/30/2004
Programs for People	\$815,895.00	\$237,793.00	\$578,102.00	6/30/2004
Reed Academy	\$463,813.00	\$57,009.00	\$406,804.00	6/30/2004

Rehabilitative Resources	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Resource Consortium	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Samaritans (Suburban West)	\$76,869.00	\$6,008.00	\$70,861.00	12/31/2003
SMOC	\$6,631,254.00	\$3,520,106.00	\$3,111,148.00	6/30/2004
South Middlesex Legal Services/rental	\$1,202,402.00	\$235,129.00	\$967,273.00	6/30/2004
South Middlesex Non-Profit Housing	\$31,811,594.00	\$26,739,633.00	\$5,071,961.00	6/30/2004
Spectrum Health Systems (Worcester)	\$11,498,747.00	\$6,373,862.00	\$5,124,885.00	6/30/2004
The KEY Program, Inc (FRAMINGHAM)	\$16,204,067.00	\$7,108,359.00	\$9,095,708.00	6/30/2004
Toward Ind. Living and Learning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Wayside	\$10,002,252.00	\$4,816,331.00	\$5,185,921.00	6/30/2004
Metrowest Latin American Center	\$104,802.00	\$99,613.00	\$5,189.00	6/30/2004
Trinity (Mental Health)	\$780,155.00	\$122,759.00	\$657,396.00	6/30/2004