

Social Service PILOT and Comparative Impact Study Committee  
Conference Room 2 7:30 PM Memorial Building Framingham, Ma

Minutes

November 8, 2005

**Note:** If a word or sentence is blue and underlined click for the link.

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

Meeting called to order at 7:30 PM. by Chair Berman

Corrections to minutes of 8/30/05 meeting. The vote for the following motion:

*I move we suspend the use of Robert's Rules unless there is a majority vote of a quorum of the committee to resume, for a stated period of time, the use of Robert's Rules. The suspension and/or resumption of the use of these rules may be used as frequently as needed to allow the meetings to be conducted in an orderly fashion.*

Recorded as 6 in Favor, 3 opposed, 1 abstain was incorrect.

The actual vote was 3 in favor, 6 opposed and 1 abstain.

**Motion** to amend the minutes of 8/30/05 meeting to read the correct Vote: 3 in favor, 6 opposed and 1 abstain

**Vote: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstain**

Approval of the minutes of 10/25/05.

Dawn Harkness listened to half the tape and has a lot of corrections to make. She would like another week to finish listening to the tape.

**Dawn moves to table the minutes for one more week.**

John Speranza asked why we were doing this.

Dawn explained that she hasn't finished listening to the tape and that there are a number of corrections that she wanted to make already and that she is sure there will be more. It was a very contentious meeting.

**Vote: 8 in favor 2 opposed and 0 abstain**

Minutes from November 1, 2005 discussed and approved and corrected.

**Vote 10 in favor 0 opposed and 0 abstain**

**Other Business**

Bob announced that the first response to the social service survey was received. It was from the Metrowest Outreach Center.

Nick asked if this will be public record.

Bob said yes. This is a response to the survey and it will be used in the overall discussion when we put the data together.

Bob reported that he has sent the cover letter and the social service survey to town counsel and he is in the process of reviewing it and will get back as soon as he can.

Laurie discussed the corrections to the list of communities. She reviewed the email she sent out which listed all the communities in the HUD district and their 2000 population, and the changes that need to be made to the list. She passed around another copy of the original HUD list of communities and suggested the group continue to double check the lists.

**Corrected Communities:**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>Population 2000 census</b>	<b>Median Household Income 2000 Census</b>
Beverly	39,862	\$53,984
Salem	40,407	\$44,033
Arlington	42,389	\$63,344
Revere	47,283	\$37,067
Peabody	48,129	\$54,829
Plymouth	51,701	\$54,677
Weymouth	53,988	\$51,665
Medford	55,765	\$52,476
Taunton	55,976	\$42,932
Malden	56,340	\$45,654
Brookline	57,107	\$66,711
Waltham	59,226	\$54,010
Framingham	66,910	\$54,288
Somerville	77,478	\$46,315
Newton	83,829	\$86,052
Quincy	88,025	\$47,121
Lynn	89,050	\$37,364
Cambridge	101,355	\$47,979

**Nick moved to accept the changes made to the list of communities:**

**Vote: 10 in favor 0 opposed 0 abstain**

Dawn Harkness asked if the committee was going to discuss the issue that was raised in the MWDN and by SMOC and the actions of Steve Orr, a member of this committee, dropping by the 105 Irving Street shelter to do research.

Bob said this would fall under other business if the committee decides to take this on.

Yaakov objected to take this issue up. He doesn't see why this committee has to respond to the Metrowest news. It would bring us to a halt.

Dawn said that it was her understanding that the Chair has had indication from the BoS that it is up to this committee to deal with this issue as we need to, if we need to. The chair was going to consult town counsel to see what if any options we have. Has the chair received an answer on that?

Bob received as the chair on behalf of the committee a letter from SMOC about the incident. Based on that and another email Bob received from one of the other social services that had some serious issues with what happened, and questions with what happened, he would also like to see us address the issue.

Bob also has a response from town counsel that is a list of possible actions that could, or could not, be taken by this committee.

Dawn asked if we could know what they are.

Bob said that he would like to take a vote on whether we are going to proceed before.

John asked if we are going to address the issue regarding the publicity. In other words, in view of what Yaakov said, we should not have to be raising issues in regard to the publicity.

Bob agreed. He wanted to discuss it because of the official letter form SMOC.

Nick raised a point of order. The way he understands the issue, this would mean checking if there has been any type of conduct that might be perceived as inappropriate. He thinks that any type of discussion regarding any member of this committee that could be perceived as inappropriate, should be considered in executive session.

According to Robert's Rules of Order anyone who is said to have had conduct which is inappropriate, it is in the interest of our body, to discuss that in executive session.

He thinks it would be totally inappropriate to even mention names of anybody at this juncture. He has no objection, although he thinks it would be unwise, to consider this issue. But if we consider it, it has to be done in executive session. It cannot be done in an open session.

Bob spoke to that. In his reading through Robert's Rules he saw nothing that indicated we need to work in that way. His personal preference for dealing with this is that it is something that should be out in the open and as part of the public record of what we do as a committee.

Nick appealed the decision of the chair. He wanted to go into detail of why he thinks we need to go into executive session.

Cynthia second.

Wes asked for clarification of how the appeal works.

Nick said it is an appeal of the chair. It needs to be passed by majority.

Page 67 of Robert's Rules: Appeal of the decision of the Chair

Nick said that the point of the rule is that whenever an issue that is perceived as misconduct is taken up, such an issue, should be considered just by the members of the body. Obviously the reputation of the person may be at stake. Since the reputation of the person is at stake, it is very important that be done in executive session. Statements can be made in such a way that people have freedom to talk, that people have the right to express their opinions, and is important that be done in executive session.

This is why Nick appeals the decision of the chair. Nick thinks it is very important that we do not just trash or just harm an individual. In addition, it is based on the issue of fairness that it should be discussed among ourselves.

Dawn respects his sensitivity but thinks it is important that the discussion be open. It is the integrity of this committee that has been questioned. However this gets decided it would be better for the community to know what our thoughts were and what went into whatever decision we may or may not make. She didn't think anyone would say anything pejorative about anyone's character. We are talking about actions and how they reflect on this committee. Her intention is to discuss that.

Yaakov supports Nick. He doesn't think Dawn's speculation about the meeting being calm is warranted. He thinks it will be a heated discussion and what is revealed to the public at the end could be discussed at the end of the discussion. This should be done in private.

Jim asked, given that this is a public committee, is there anything in Open Meeting Law that we would be going against if we don't open this?

Bob read from the Open Meeting Guidelines section relevant to the issue:

## **Open Meeting Law Guidelines**

### ***Commonwealth of Massachusetts Office of the Attorney General***

**Tom Reilly**  
**Attorney General**

<http://www.cbsys.ago.state.ma.us/pubs/oml.htm>

Meetings Covered By The Open Meeting Law.

## **D. Executive Session**

### **1. Definitions**

An executive session is defined in the Open Meeting Law as "any meeting of a governmental body which is closed to certain persons for deliberation on certain matters." The Law defines nine specific purposes for which an executive session may be held, often referred to as "exemptions" from the open meeting requirement, and emphasizes that this list of nine is an exclusive one.

### **2. Purposes**

The nine purposes or exemptions for which a governmental body may vote to hold an executive session are:

- (1) To discuss the "reputation, character, physical condition or mental health rather than the professional competence" of a particular individual.

This purpose is designed to protect the rights and reputation of individuals. Some of the concepts included here -- physical condition, mental health -- are clear; others are less so.

It is difficult, for example, to draw any bright lines between "professional competence" on the one hand, and "reputation" or "character" on the other. Nevertheless, it appears that at least in the case where a governmental body is considering applicants for a professional job position, the discussion would center on "professional competence" and could not be conducted in an executive session on the basis of this exception.

The Law affords certain rights to the individual who is the subject of the discussion at an executive session called for the purpose described here. See Section II. D. 3. below.

(2) To consider the discipline or dismissal of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against a public officer, employee, staff member, or individual.

Again the purpose of this exception is to protect individual rights, as well as to promote the public interest in efficient personnel management. While the proposed imposition of disciplinary sanctions by a governmental body on an individual calls forth this section, the section does not apply if, for example, the governmental body is laying off a large number of employees because of budgetary constraints.

As is true of the first purpose, an executive session called for this second purpose triggers certain rights on the part of an individual who is the subject of the discussion. See Section II. D. 3. below. The individual's rights to have his or her dismissal considered at an open meeting takes precedence over the general right of the governmental body to go into executive session to consider collective bargaining matters. *Bartell v. Wellesley Housing Authority*, 28 Mass. App. Ct. 306 (1991).

### **3. Rights of Individuals**

When a governmental body holds an executive session to discuss an individual's reputation, character, physical condition or mental health (exception (1)), or to consider disciplinary sanctions against an individual (exception (2)), the Open Meeting Law affords the individual concerned the following rights:

- (a) to be present at the executive session during discussions or considerations involving the individual;
- (b) to have counsel, or another representative of his or her own choosing, attend the session with the individual, to advise the individual, but not to participate actively in the executive session;
- (c) to speak in his or her behalf;
- (d) to receive written notice at least forty-eight hours in advance of the proposed executive session;
- (e) to request that the meeting be open rather than closed.

Bob thought that the possibility of an executive session might be warranted but not at this point. But the first thing that needs to happen is for this committee to get a copy of that letter from SMOC and discuss that. And see if we want to proceed with what we are talking about here.

Wes said that his understanding is that this is just a discussion and maybe have options on the table. It cannot hurt to be heard in open session, as a first discussion. Maybe should go into executive session late, but he sees no reason to go into it tonight.

John asked if the person involved wants to have a neutral person present. Steve wasn't sure what he was talking about but if he was asking him, no.

Nick thought that since this is going to involve issues of various personalities, it would be totally inappropriate to discuss.

Dawn asked if Mr. Orr wanted to have an open session or executive session.

Steve didn't think it was appropriate for him to answer that.

Dawn said that it was one his rights to ask that.

Steve respectfully declined to answer; that is whatever you want to do.

Cynthia agreed that it should be in executive session. She felt that it is unfortunate that it was already in the press; unfortunate for the committee and for everyone, that executive session is the most effective and fairest, way to deal with a situation like this.

Nick said that he thought most of what was read answers Mr. Palmer's question. That it is not in violation of open meeting law to discuss this in executive session. Mr. Sanchez asked if that was his understanding.

Mr. Palmer said no.

Bob reviewed what was on the floor: The motion to appeal the decision of the chair that we do not need to go into executive session at this time.

The actual motion is to sustain the chair. To vote to sustain the chair, a yes vote will do that. To vote to overturn the decision of the chair, and take this up in executive session, a no vote will do that.

There was a question as to whether we go into executive session right after if that is the vote.

Bob said we haven't even voted to discuss the issue

**Motion to sustain the chair:**

**Vote: 3 in favor, 6 opposed, 1 abstain**

Jim Palmer moves that the chair set an appropriate time for this committee to go into executive session following the rules and regulations.

Yaakov thought this was premature since we haven't decided whether we should proceed with the discussion at all.

Bob took the motions that we are proceeding.

Jim said the motion allows us to go into executive session

Dawn thought the motion allowed us to get all the information to decide whether we were going to proceed or not.

Nick asked to hear the motion.

Laurie asked if the motion could be written because she has noticed during the writing of the minutes that the motions change during each reading and after discussion.

Jim commented that we have an issue before us which we are trying to decide how to handle and we have never asked for a written motion before.

**Jim moved that the chair, establish a time when we can have executive session after all members of this committee have received all the materials that the chair has.**

Seconded

**Vote:**

**10 in favor 0 opposed and 0 abstain**

Bob handed out the letter he received from James Cuddy from SMOC dated October 28, 2005.

Cynthia asked if this wasn't supposed to come out in executive session. Bob said we have to get all the information the chair has to the committee and then at a later date we will have the executive session.

Dawn noted that she already distributed her statement of November 1, 2005 to the committee.

Nick said he understood Dawn's statement that was sent to George King and Mr. Cuddy is already part of the public record.

Bob said the same is the case of the response from Mr. Orr to the committee.

Nick asked if Mr. Steinberg's letter of resignation was is also public record. It was sent through the PILOT email link but was labeled personal Is that public record.

Bob thought that because it was sent to the committee it is, although this is not relevant to the current situation.

Yaakov asked for clarification on what documents exist and are available to us:

- Letter from SMOC to the BoS dated October 28, 2005
- Dawn's statement that was circulated via email:

Yaakov asked if that was clarification of an earlier statement. Was there earlier communication between Dawn and SMOC? Dawn said there was only one statement. In the letter she made reference to a conversation she had with SMOC, but there was no other written statement.

- Email that was sent from a social service agency in Framingham
- Letters from TMM's
- Mr. Orr's letter to the committee
- Copy of the MWDN articles ( Yaakov will provide)
- Town Counsel options for committee

Bob said that all of these will be public records and sent to the members of the committee prior to discussion.

Dawn asked if there was a written statement from Andy.

Bob said that he will ask Andy to submit one to the entire committee.

Yaakov asked if there is a statement from the shelter manager.

Bob will write out the options that town counsel told him the committee has if action is desired.

### **Social Service Addresses**

Laurie emailed the group the list of Social Service addresses. The list includes addresses and owners. If an address is rented, it is noted. For all of the owned properties, each address was checked numerous times using the 2003 assessors list, the 2005 assessors list, the 2003 and 2005 tax exempt property list. In addition, the list was brought to the assessor's office and confirmed using the computer there. Everyone in the group is encouraged to check for themselves using the town website.

Discussion of the list included a comment about the high number of taxed properties versus untaxed, the request by town meeting to create a list of all properties as part of the impact study, a list of properties that are still under study and might be brought in for approval and the need to accept the list of social service properties thus enabling the work groups to send out the questionnaires.

Nick summarized what we were trying to do: we should move on with what we have and if there is anything missing we can make additions to the list.

Discussion continued some changes were made to the list: transfer Commonwealth property to unfinished list, transfer Salvation Army to unfinished list, although there was some disagreement about the status of the Salvation Army services.

Nick moved that we accept the list with the removal to unfinished list, the properties mentioned.

The salvation army needs to be contacted and asked about the nature of their social service programs and the religious function of their organization.

Some organizations also use space at religious facilities, but they are included because they are a verifiable organization providing services.

A complete list of social service programs will be developed.

There was some discussion and confusion as to what information should be included regarding social service programs and the site that such programs occur at.

Bob reminded the group that there are two jobs for the committee: one is the comparative impact piece and the other is the PILOT. This list is the larger view, considering the impact, from which we will derive the PILOT list.

Discussion of voting on the list, which is a "living" document that is likely be changes to it. There was concern that we will accept the list, and we will have to vote on a new list every time there is a change.

Nick thought that most likely there will be an addition or subtraction, similar to the list of communities, and that we can vote just on accepting those changes.

**Motion to accept the social service address list as written with two changes: transfer the Dudley Road properties and Salvation Army property to the undetermined list of properties and agencies.**

**Vote: 7 in favor 3 opposed 0 abstain**

### **Reports from Working Groups**

John Sperenza asked if the Chair will determine a date certain for the executive session and let the group know. Bob said yes, he will research the details and rules and regulations and then set an agreed upon time.

### **Education**

Wes reported that they are setting up meetings with the parent information center and the superintendent, the charter school and Keefe Tech to ask the questions that Wes asked Dr. Martes previously.

Laurie said that she thought the group had established a procedure that the groups got together and wrote up questions based on the Action Plan and then the questions came in to the committee to be approved, and then were mailed out to the appropriate persons for written answers.

Dawn agreed that she was confused. She thought the questions asked of Dr. Martes were along the lines of initial inquires that others had done that was more general.

Bob said that is what they were going to do.

Jim said that Martes said to contact the information center and they will give the answers to the questions.

Wes and Bob agreed to do that for the next meeting.

### **Public Safety**

The AMR questionnaire needs to be approved.

**Motion to approve the AMR (ambulance) questionnaire as is**

**Vote: 10 in favor 0 opposed 0 abstain**

The other questionnaires were already approved and were waiting for the approved property lists to be sent out. The letters were previously approved. They are the same with name changes.

### **Legal**

Dawn and Bob said that they have been waiting for a response from Chris Petrini for a few weeks.

### **Property and Income**

Nick discussed that the group with two additional members met. We seemed to agree on three points:

- We are interested in property values at various levels; community, near SSA, neighborhoods (we are checking if the town has a standard definition for such)

- Taxes i.e. tax rates, as they impact property values should be considered ( there was some disagreement here)
- Since we are property and income, we will look at household income, median values etc., but we want to look at the structure of how that income is generated. This would highlight different types of businesses. A measure of how income is generated and the impact that types of businesses have on the community

There was significant discussion related to another issue. When you look at property values, they are impacted by crime, education, and other factors. Nick was concerned that other working groups would feel conflicted with the overlap. The property group could get the information they need separately or in conjunction with the other working groups. Ultimately, no matter how the data is determined, the information is relevant to property values.

Dawn said she was glad to be at the property meeting because it was her perception based on the reports from the group that there is a big disconnect. Her view of the Action Plan was that the group decides what data to look for and the individual groups do the legwork to gather the data and bring it back. This group in particular is going off on its own to volunteer on the issue of property values and trying to figure out property values far beyond what this committee agreed to. She felt she was constantly bringing the group back to the action plan. The one thing we did all agreed on were the things already in the action plan. And this group has done no work towards that, until this last week when we decided to talk about definitions of what adjacent means, definitions of in the neighborhood means; that is the first time that this group has really touched on that.

She re-iterated that we are supposed to focus on the action plan and do the legwork to get those numbers. Dawn also noted that when we are talking about resources, it doesn't mean we get to study anything on the resource list; such as realtors. It doesn't mean we can study their values, opinions and perceptions just because they are on the list. We need to know what is the value of a home next to a social service agency, in the neighborhood and in the town. Dawn commented that she is only one of a group of 5 on this committee and is not making much headway.

Steve was not sure where she is coming from. The whole point of looking at property values is to look at the impact to neighborhoods but also to look at a town and municipal wide impact.

Dawn said that the group agreed on that.

She also said there may not be any drop in value to a house next to a shelter. But that has not even been started.

Laurie said that Dawn is entitled to her opinion but she highly objects to the picture Dawn painted of the work group. This was the first meeting of the group that Dawn went to and she has no idea what they have been doing. Laurie said the survey was a small part of what the group did. They spent time learning what the Warren group could offer and how to use it running trials on sample communities while waiting for the committee to approve a list of comparative communities. Much of their work was laid out and discussed and the actual data collection needed more information from the committee.

Laurie also noted that ideas such as tax rates came up in group discussions. When one is gathering data and doing research you tend to find other things that become interesting and even relevant to the work at hand. It is fine not to approve looking at them, but it is part of the process that these ideas come up.

The way the group has been portrayed is not really accurate.

Dawn said that her opinion is exactly what her observations have been. She bases them on what the group brings back and the discussions. She thought the property group is one of the easier more clear groups in terms of what the larger group is looking for. This committee spent a lot of time discussing complicated studies with controls such as: controlling for crime, taxes, and other issues. This is beyond the scope of what the larger committee agreed on. Let's focus on what the larger committee asked for.

Cynthia objected to Dawn's comments. She said the committee essentially had some brainstorming sessions and anything done will be brought before the committee. We have proved that we are conciliatory and more than willing to work together. There were objections to the real estate survey and it was pulled.

Cynthia said that she still thought there was relevance in the opinions of professional realtors. She also thought that when considering property values, there are other factors that influence property values that have nothing to do with social services, and we may have to look at those in order to determine the impact of social services. Some effect may have nothing at all to do with social services.

Wes asked how social services fit into what the committee is doing? Are you on the road for figuring out a mechanism for how social services could possibly affect the tax base? The only document he has seen, which isn't a lot, is the survey. He was unsure what downtown has to do with anything and although previously told by Cynthia that there are many social services downtown, he thought the group was making leaps without any mechanism to gauge the impact of social services on property values.

Nick said there is very extensive literature that property values are affected by externalities.

We said it is impossible to quantify that.

Nick said one can find statistical correlations. He also said the literature quantifies it, but a study like that is too big for our group.

Wes did not like the idea of academic studies. All the other data is from actual data.

Nick agreed. Absolutely. We have already dismissed the idea of using academic studies. However, there are some statistical techniques that are simple and require zero assumptions and can give us information. Whether the group decides to accept the statistical tests or not is fine.

Nick said he has been very careful not to know too much about any of the communities so as not to bias his judgment.

Wes asked to confirm that there is no technical mechanism for measuring social services.

Nick disagreed. There is. But it would not be possible for us to do. It is beyond what we are here for.

Jim Palmer thought we were going into a lot of stuff that we don't have to. The things we laid out were the tangible costs associated with social services to Framingham. Normalized data. Not subjective data.

Yaakov asked if normalized and subjective were opposites/ Jim said subjective can't be backed up by facts and figures. Normalized is based on figures.

This whole thing started because smoc bought a place on Winter Street. People are worried about their property values going down. When SMOC moves out of where they are can we say the property values will be increased?

The real estate guy can tell you one way or another. No matter what the studies show. It is what happens that is important. To go beyond what we set out here is asking more than we can do.

Nick said he has not problem to limit to strictly data. He thinks taxation is part of it. The number of social service agencies, and workers in agencies is relevant. The income is relevant. However, Nick's opinion is that crime statistics, educational statistics etc. would shed some light on what is happening.

Jim did not think the group should do that until they accomplish the other items.

Cynthia said the group was still in the process of working on items in the action plan.

Dawn said the group didn't even start what was in the action plan. The group started with something that was totally off the wall.

Cynthia said that the group came up with the survey because it was something discussed at committee. Bob even offered to help put it together.

Sending the survey to 250 realtors required yes or no answers and patterns might develop that will reveal information about property values. The survey would have been taken for what it was.

Laurie reminded the group that we tabled the survey. She also said that everything the group is gathering is numbers. In the process of discussing what they are doing the issue of tax rates came up. It is not a big deal when you are gathering data to include another number. It might not even be used.

Bob asked for additional comments

Nick asked if there was any resolution and if it is appropriate to gather the numbers discussed?

- Property values
- Taxation
- Income
- Social service

Dawn said that Nick has effectively rewritten the action plan. She wants them to focus on the action plan. The only important thing is now, that the addresses are known, define proximity and get the numbers associated

Bob suggested that neighborhoods without programs also be considered. Dawn said that is in the plan.

Jim moves that the property group follows the mandate of the plan

Second

Nick commented that different people can have different interpretations. He suggested a friendly amendment, which he will vote against, that the working group interpret the action plan in a narrow way.

But he disagrees that there is not another interpretation of the action plan and objects that only one interpretation of the action plan is being taken. Such as the relevance of realtor opinions.

Dawn said that the realtors opinions on property values are no more relevant than the police chief' and officers opinions on factors affecting crime. We have steadfastly said we are not asking those kinds of questions. We are not asking this group to be any more narrow than any other group. She just wants all groups to be all equally narrow in getting the data. We will determine what the factors are. Soliciting opinions and subjective data has been ruled out as part of our study.

Dawn agreed we discussed poling realtors but her understanding of what we were asking them was not what was done.

Jim did not see Nick's suggestion as a friendly amendment. We know what adjacent is. We can use census information for establishing precincts. Those are areas we can use.

John Sperenza said that the list of addresses are duplexes or triplexes and are not adjacent to private homes. The individuals who own them are in business to rent, not own. His experience with properties in Framingham gives him this understanding. This information is not relevant.

Wes said that he understands Jim's motion as keeping the action plan and to vote against it is to let the property committee come up with their own.

To stray from the action plan versus keeping narrowly.

Bob suggested this is more a resolution of the committee than a motion; that it is the will of the committee that the working groups stick to the action plan.

Yaakov asked if there is another way to say this about whose judgment we refer to, to rely on?

Wes thought Jim's motion was clearly about this working group sticking to the action plan outline or letting them stray from it. If they aren't sticking are they loosely interpreting?

Bob said that his take is this: he will vote in favor of the motion but he feels from what he heard that there is already attempts to do that and move in that direction, i.e. continue with the action plan.

Jim said that a resolution allows them to do what they want. He wants a motion to stick to the plan.

Dawn brought it up because Nick and others want to study other factors that are not in the action plan like taxation rates and other factors that impact.

She thought the committee made a baby step after protest on her part. They are still talking about issues that the group didn't agree on.

**Motion: The property committee should stick to the specifics of the action plan**

**Vote: 4 in favor 5 opposed 1 abstain**

**Additional Municipal**

**Motion to accept BOH questions**

**Vote 10 in favor 0 opposed 0 abstain**

Jim presented his questions to the building department. He was concerned that the information would opinion of the commissioner; however he can answer some of the questions but not with much hard data. He said we will see what we get.

Steve said that the building commissioner's opinions are extremely important and has value.

Jim said that he would like to send a list of the properties along with these questions.

Some corrections and suggestions were made.

Jim is going to make corrections and bring it back next week

Yaakov had some concerns about Wes's motion about distributing material to be voted on 24 hours in advance. He did not want to see that used as a vehicle for lobbying.

Wes asked if Jim could make adjustments to the BOH questions, similar to the building department.

All agreed.

Cynthia asked Bob about the agencies that he said contacted him last week. She wanted to know for the record who the agencies were and who the contacts were. How many.

Bob said there was a motion last week that he would get everything in writing. He has not been able to do that.

**Motion to adjourn**

**Vote: 7 in favor 3 opposed 0 abstain**