

CITY OF



Worcester
MASSACHUSETTS

TIMOTHY P. MURRAY
MAYOR

City Hall - Room 305
455 Main Street
Worcester, MA 01608-1892

Office: 508-799-1153
Fax: 508-799-1156
e-mail:
Mayor@ci.worcester.ma.us


October 11, 2005

City Clerk David Rushford
Office of the City Clerk
Worcester City Hall, Room 206
Worcester, MA 01608

Dear Mr. City Clerk:

Yesterday, the Mayor's Social Service Task Force released it's report concerning the siting and tax impact of taking properties off the tax rolls. I would appreciate it if you could forward this transmittal to the City Council for review and recommendation.

Yours truly,


Timothy P. Murray
Mayor
City of Worcester

TPM/cm

Enc.

MAYOR'S SOCIAL SERVICE TASK FORCE REPORT

**Balancing Quality of Life Issues of Neighborhoods and the City
with the Fair Housing Rights of Individuals Living with
Disabilities**

October 2005

Members of the Mayor's Social Service Task Force

Maurice Boisvert, co-chair

State Representative Robert Spellane, co-chair

Robert Allard

James Broadhurst

Maritza Cruz

Jill Dagilis

Brian D'Andrea *

Margaret Darling

Deborah Ekstrom

David Forsberg

Barbara Haller

Stephen Patton

Michael Perotto

Nadia Totino-Beard *

Gary Vecchio

Carlton Watson

*** Mr. D'Andrea and Ms. Totino-Beard had to leave the Task Force for professional and/or personal reasons. Ms. Cruz was asked to join the Task Force in July.**

I. Introduction	p. 1-2
II. Federal and State Law	p. 3-5
III. Recommendations	p. 6-15
A. Best Practice Model of Siting Social Service Programs	
B. State and Municipal Recommendations	
C. Mapping Social Service Agencies	
D. Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT)	
IV. Addendums	p. 16-20
A. Public Testimony	
B. Worcester Social Service PILOT Calculation	

I. Introduction

On March 7, 2005, Worcester Mayor Timothy Murray announced that 15 members of the community would participate in a Task Force that would look at the myriad issues surrounding the siting of nonprofit social service programs and examine ways to prevent erosion of the city's tax base with the acquisition of properties where programs had been located.

Several neighborhoods had raised concerns that they had been negatively impacted from a high concentration of these agencies. In addition, City Assessor Robert Allard released a report revealing that since January 1995, 116 tax-generating properties had been taken off the city's tax rolls when nonprofit charitable agencies, many of which are social service agencies, bought them with the intention of expanding their programs and then applied for tax-exempt status. In January 2005, this accounted for an estimated loss of \$1.6 million per year in tax revenues to the City.

"There is little or no public process or notification," explains Mr. Murray "causing legitimate concerns in the neighbors and creating a fear of the unknown. Often, one agency is not aware of what other agencies are doing in regards to siting so they are locating in the same neighborhoods and sometimes on the same block."

In addition, Mr. Murray expressed concern over the steady erosion of tax dollars. "Property taxes are the lifeline for how municipalities provide services," he says, "and anything that erodes that lifeline needs to be understood. The loss of \$11.7 million over 10 years is a concern for everyone, including nonprofits, because they rely on our services, too."

Co-chaired by Maurice Boisvert, President and CEO of Y.O.U. Inc., and State Representative Robert P. Spellane (D-13th Worcester District), the Mayor's Social Service Task Force included neighborhood activists, elected officials, members of the City administration, and representatives of social service agencies.

At its first meeting on March 23, the co-chairs stressed that their goal was to prepare a report, ready for October 2005, which would reveal findings and make recommendations on both a local and state level. At all times, they emphasized a balanced, respectful, reasoned approach to the issues.

As was explained and discussed in initial meetings, both state and federal statutes specifically protect nonprofit social service agencies from discriminatory practices when it comes to siting their programs in any community. These protections provide the framework within which the Task Force proceeded.

The Task Force met 13 times over the next 8 months. Several guests were invited to share their experiences and expertise, including John Ford, former deputy commissioner of the

state Department of Mental Health and undersecretary of Health and Human Services; City Solicitor David Moore; and Grace Carmark of the Central Mass. Housing Alliance.

In addition, more than 84 people spoke at two June hearings set up specifically for the public to air their concerns or support about the issues (see Addendum A). Flyers about the hearings were sent to various neighborhood centers and notices were posted in the daily newspaper to try and elicit as much public input as possible. In addition, both hearings were advertised and broadcast on Worcester's government cable television station.

While members of the Task Force debated the various sides of the complex issue, sometimes heatedly, Mr. Boisvert suggested the importance of finding the balance between protecting the rights of the people who need these programs and protecting the quality of life for the neighborhoods impacted by the siting of such programs.

In July and August, Representative Spellane met individually with each commissioner of the pertinent agencies within the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) to inform them of the Task Force's work and to solicit their ideas and input. These meetings included the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Mental Retardation, the Department of Public Health, the Department of Youth Services, and the Department of Social Services. These are the major state agencies that contract with providers that in turn establish residential and day programs in municipalities to address such issues as substance abuse, mental health, and other social service concerns.

In July, the Task Force formed subcommittees to prepare recommendations in four major areas, all the while understanding that social service programs enjoy specific and broad protections under state and federal statutes:

- Best practices model for siting**
- Legislative and municipal changes**
- Mapping nonprofit agencies**
- Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) Program**

As Mr. Murray articulated his expectations: "It will be a blueprint for all the stakeholders, it will help to avoid the flashpoints and will provide transparency to recognize financial limits. If we're truly serious about addressing chronic homelessness and substance abuse, we have to have a collective way of dealing with these issues. There has to be a regional approach and spirit. There has to be more willingness to take up an approach so the City of Worcester alone doesn't bear the responsibility. We do have a major responsibility, but we need to have a regional approach to the solution."

The recommendations by the Mayor's Social Service Task Force follow.

II. Federal and State Law

The rights of persons with disabilities to live wherever they choose are explicitly defined and protected in several state and federal statutes, including the Federal Fair Housing Amendments of 1988; Chapter 722 of the Acts of 1989 (the "Housing Bill of Rights for People with Disabilities"); Chapter 106 of the Acts of 1989; as well as Article 114 of the Massachusetts Constitution.

The Fair Housing Act¹

The federal Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq., prohibits discrimination by direct providers of housing, such as landlords and real estate companies as well as other entities, such as municipalities, banks or other lending institutions and homeowners insurance companies whose discriminatory practices make housing unavailable to persons because of race or color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status, or disability. In cases involving discrimination in mortgage loans or home improvement loans, the Department of Justice may file suit under both the Fair Housing Act and the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

Under the Fair Housing Act, the Department may bring lawsuits where there is reason to believe that a person or entity is engaged in a "pattern of practice" of discrimination or where a denial of rights to a group of persons raises an issue of general public importance.

Where force or threat of force is used to deny or interfere with fair housing rights, the Department of Justice may institute criminal proceedings.

The Fair Housing Act also provides procedures for handling individual complaints of discrimination. Individuals who believe they have been victims of an illegal housing practice may file a complaint with the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) or file their own lawsuit in federal or state court. The Department of Justice brings suits on behalf of individuals based on referrals from HUD.

Discrimination in Housing Based upon Disability Group Homes²

Some individuals with disabilities may live together in congregate living arrangements, often referred to as "group homes." The Fair Housing Act prohibits municipalities and other local government entities from making zoning or land use decisions or implementing land use policies that exclude or otherwise discriminate against individuals with disabilities.

The Fair Housing Act makes it unlawful—

¹ U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Housing and Civil Enforcement Section. *The Fair Housing Act* (2000) www.usdoj.gov/crt/housing/housing_coverage.htm

² U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Housing and Civil Enforcement Section. *The Fair Housing Act* (2000) www.usdoj.gov/crt/housing/housing_coverage.htm

- To utilize land use policies or actions that treat groups of persons with disabilities less favorably than groups of non-disabled persons. An example would be an ordinance prohibiting housing for persons with disabilities or a specific types of disability, such as mental illness, from locating in a particular area, while allowing other groups of unrelated individuals to live together in that area.
- To take action against, or deny a permit for, a home because of the disability of the individuals who live there or who would live there. An example would be denying a building permit for a home because it was intended to provide housing for persons with mental retardation.
- To refuse to make reasonable accommodations in land use and zoning policies and procedures where such accommodations may be necessary to afford persons or groups of persons with disabilities an equal opportunity to use and enjoy housing. What constitutes a reasonable accommodation is a case-by-case determination. Not all requested modifications of rules or policies are reasonable. If a requested modification imposes an undue financial or administrative burden on a local government, or if a modification creates a fundamental alteration in a local government's land use and zoning scheme, it is not a "reasonable" accommodation.

There has been a significant amount of litigation concerning the ability of local governmental units to exercise control over group living arrangements, particularly for persons with disabilities. To provide guidance on these issues, the Departments of Justice and Housing and Urban Development have issued a Joint Statement on Group Homes, Local Land Use, and the Fair Housing Act.

Violations of the Fair Housing Act are enforced in federal court under the statute that requires the losing party to pay the attorneys' fees of the prevailing party.

Massachusetts Law (a.k.a. the Dover Amendment)

In addition, section 3 of Chapter 40A of the General Laws states:

"Notwithstanding any general or special law to the contrary, local land use and health and safety laws, regulations, practices, ordinances, by-laws and decisions of a city or town shall not discriminate against a disabled person. Imposition of health and safety laws or land-use requirements on congregate living arrangements among non-related persons with disabilities that are not imposed on families and groups of similar size or other unrelated persons shall constitute discrimination..."

The genesis of the court cases on this issue may well be "Gardner-Athol Area Mental Health Association, Inc. et al v. Zoning Board of Appeals of Gardner et al, 513 N.E.2d 1272, 401 Mass. 12, 42 Ed. Law Rep. 381 (Mass. 1987). A nonprofit mental health corporation brought action to challenge the decision of the local zoning board of appeals that its zoning ordinance could prohibit the corporation's use of premises for a residential care facility for adults with mental disabilities. The Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court held that the nonprofit mental health corporation was a "nonprofit educational corporation" within the meaning of the statute, which prohibits zoning ordinances that

bar use of land for educational purposes by the nonprofit educational corporation. Other
cites are: *John Campbell & others v City Council of Lynn & others*, 616 N.E.2d 445, 415
Mass. 772, 84 Ed. Law Rep. 442 (Mass 1993); and *Gary Watros & another v Greater
Lynn Mental Health and Retardation Association, Inc. & others* 653 N.E.2d 589, 421
Mass 106 (Mass. 1995).

III A. Best Practice Model of Siting Social Service Programs

The Task Force recognizes that this best practice model for siting social service programs is not a panacea. However, the model utilizes input from the two public hearings that were held in June 2005 as well as the current successful policy and procedures of selected agencies. In this model, the Task Force attempted to address the concerns of both the agencies and neighbors around areas of notification, openness of process, and "guarantees" about the integrity of the final outcome. **Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS), through its procurement process, adopt this model for the siting of all future social service residential programs.**

Background

- I. Notification: There is a consensus that all the affected parties should be informed about program plans as early as possible. Elected officials, neighbors, and purchasing state departments will all be interested in planning a successful outcome. Timing of notification is a critical issue. Clearly, early communication with all the stakeholders is vital to a successful process.
- II. Openness of Process: In some siting situations, notification through flyers and one-to-one discussions adequately resolve siting concerns. Often, however, public meetings are expected. It is important for everyone's point of view to be heard in a civil environment. Everyone involved needs to agree to have a respectful, open discussion.
- III. Guarantees: Neighbors often seek assurances and want to negotiate accommodations. Perhaps the most consistent assurance is that the program's original plan of operations not be changed over time without additional open discussions with neighbors. Including local residents on advisory or governing bodies as well as posting bonds are suggestions for resolving this issue. In addition, neighbors often seek to ensure adequate safety or other measures through staffing or additional facility renovations for lighting, etc. If a true dialogue has been achieved these issues can be successfully identified and resolved.

A Model for Siting Social Service Residential Programs

All residential programs need to establish a set of criteria for selecting a building and location to meet the requirements of their program design and the specific population targeted for care. Phase I outlines the criteria to be assessed:

- I. Defining the building requirements and finding a suitable site. (At least 3-5 sites reviewed)

- a. Appropriateness of potential program space (e.g. size, number of bedrooms, number of offices, classrooms, handicapped accessibility, code requirements, etc.).
- b. Location requirements (e.g. public transportation; access to amenities and services; recreational area; parking).
- c. Costs (include purchase price and costs for any required upgrades to meet codes or program expectations).
- d. Assessing appropriateness of this community and neighborhood (e.g. Is this a neighborhood with the appropriate resources, density of social service programs, and/ or adverse conditions or entities present?).

When a possible site has been identified, it is important to involve all appropriate elected officials at the earliest possible point. Phase II outlines this process:

- II. Early Identification of Site – Notify state representative, state senator, and congressman; notify local authorities such as selectmen, city councilors, school administrators, and local police and fire chief (if appropriate), of possible site and explain the intended use.
 - a. Explain purpose of program; staffing; experience the agency has with this service and target population; identify the organization's contact people; and why site is desirable.
 - b. Ask for the names of any local neighborhood activists who should be contacted early in the process to explain the program and seek support.

For the nonprofit, organizing some level of site control indicates their interest in moving forward with a particular program at a specific site. At this point, it is important to meet with neighbors to establish a working relationship that will allow for open communication. Phase III outlines some of the possible steps in this process:

- III. Site Control Secured through Purchase and Sales Agreement, purchased, and/or lease.
 - a. Inform the local neighborhood (i.e. with or through neighborhood associations) and make direct communication with abutters (through e-mail, phone calls, or visits) to explain the proposed use of this facility, staffing, etc. (see above).
 - b. To address reasonable accommodations for neighbors such as parking, betterments, lighting, fences, etc. The preferred process is to meet with the affected neighbors one on one. If a public meeting is held, ensure that appropriate leadership and security is present to moderate and mediate. Require nametags and that individuals speak one at a time after they identify themselves.
 - c. Offer to include neighbors on an advisory committee or governing board.
 - d. Discuss possible Site Incentive Financing (SIF) (i.e. an incentive to the neighborhood, town or city to accept the facility such as posting a bond that will be collected if the facility is not operated according to plan or a

cash payment for specific improvements to the neighborhood (parks, trees, safety, etc.). (Proposed recommendation from public hearings.)

Assess depth and potential impact on clients of local opposition!

- e. Provide/offer site visits to other agency programs/sites.
- f. Provide references of neighbors and town officials of other sitings.

The final task is to open the program and schedule an open house or other process to engage neighbors and begin to be integrated in the neighborhood. Phase IV outlines the last tasks necessary to neighborhood integration:

IV. Occupy Property.

- a. Complete renovations to meet code and program needs, including accommodations and neighbors.
- b. Acquire occupancy permit.
- c. Provide open house to the community.
- d. Begin program.
- e. Maintain communication with neighborhood through additional open houses, advocacy committees, and/or other mechanisms of collaboration.

III B. State and Municipal Recommendations

The Task Force recommendations listed below are intended to ensure that providers seek housing and integration in all communities throughout the Commonwealth with the main goal of providing their clients a range of housing choices in all communities especially those under-represented. In addition, there is need for a strong collaboration with all Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EOHHS) agencies and contractors to share information regarding current and future program development so that communities can better prepare, integrate, collaborate, serve and welcome clients.

- I. **Changes and Recommendations for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts**
 - A. Through the Request for Responses (RFR) process and subsequent contract specifications, EOHHS will require that any agency responding to an RFR be required to include a list with distances from other social service agencies and/or a map of all social service agencies operating within a ½ mile radius of the proposed facility. EOHHS will review what the impact of these other agencies would be within the ½ mile radius.
 - B. Effective immediately all new RFR/contracts issued by EOHHS agencies shall not exceed eight clients per residence. The premise for this recommendation is that larger contracts promote the re-creation of institutional living within a residential setting and is not desirable for individuals living with a variety of disabilities.
 - C. The Task Force believes that social service programs should be more evenly distributed throughout the state. Our recommendation for siting incentives in the PILOT section of our report is a positive approach to encouraging EOHHS and communities to welcome clients living with a variety of disabilities. Any municipality that has federal- and EOHHS-sponsored residential beds that represent at least a percentage equal to the total number of residential beds in the Commonwealth divided by the population of the Commonwealth shall be deemed a "Caring and Responsible Community." Once adopted, this will be known as the "Caring and Responsible Community Statute." EOHHS will be expected to review the impact of programs in communities that have already reached this Caring and Responsible benchmark. In addition, EOHHS will develop policies and other incentives to encourage agencies and communities to be Caring and Responsible.
 - D. EOHHS will coordinate the creation of a Residential Program Inventory for all communities within the Commonwealth. The inventory will be for all programs funded/and or operated by all agencies of EOHHS. The Department of Revenue's Bureau of Local

Assessment last updated the "Property Type Classification Codes" during November 2002. The BLA should create a new exempt class code to identify the specific use of tax-exempt social service residential programs.

II. Recommendations for the City of Worcester

- A. The City of Worcester will appoint a Social Service Agency Liaison. This individual will be responsible for, but not limited to, the following:
1. Communicate community needs and assessments with state agencies and local social service providers.
 2. Establish an inventory of all social service agency programs within the city. Assessors will properly classify each with the new code provided in I-D above.
 3. Once inventoried and properly codified, the liaison will transmit each municipality's list to the appropriate state agencies and local social service providers who need to submit information about other sites as part of a response to an RFR. The list will not be made available for other use.
 4. Social service agencies will provide an annual report/summary of all services they are providing within the City of Worcester. The liaison will be responsible for receiving and updating this information.
 5. Social service agencies are requested to notify the liaison if a particular residential program is changing its program at a specific site.

III. People in Peril (PIP) Shelter

The Task Force recognizes that longstanding, seemingly intractable problems associated with the PIP Shelter have affected the views of many community members about siting social service programs and, in particular, about services for people with substance abuse issues. The Task Force made a deliberate effort to distinguish the PIP's operations and issues from other programs. For example, the PIP Shelter at 701 Main Street is licensed by the City as a lodging house. Its site and operations are not subject to the protection of Chapter 40A, which is also known as the Dover Amendment. Many complaints about the Dover Amendment were raised with the Task Force, indicating that the state should not have this level of protection in place for "wet shelters" such as the PIP. The Task Force, therefore, believes it is important to clarify that the Dover Amendment does not cover the operation of a homeless shelter such as the PIP, whether the shelter accepts clients under the influences of substances (a.k.a. "wet") or not. Rather the Dover Amendment protections extend to programs that have a specific "educational" purpose.

The Task Force is interested in assuring that the problems associated with the PIP Shelter do not inappropriately color the public understanding of public policy about other social service programs. The Task Force finds the ongoing specific concerns about the PIP Shelter significant enough to make the following recommendations:

- A. The Task Force recommends that the PIP Shelter run by South Middlesex Opportunity Council (SMOC) located at 701 Main Street downsize to a population of 50 individuals per night.
- B. The PIP shall relocate with the consent and advice of the City to a new location and cease shelter operations at 701 Main Street no later than June 30, 2007.
- C. The Mayor and City Manager shall appoint a regional committee within 60 days to work with SMOC to accomplish the objectives outlined above.

III C. Mapping Social Service Agencies

This map gives a visual representation of where social service agencies are located within the City of Worcester. The Task Force used the property classification system established by the Massachusetts Department of Revenue (DOR) to determine what properties can be properly labeled as “social service agencies.” The DOR classifies all properties that are nonprofit “charitable organizations” or “private hospitals” within the same property class code of 905. The Task Force extracted all parcels having a state property class code as 905 from the city’s assessing records and then plotted those parcels, with a few exceptions and a few additions, on the attached map.

The locations identified in the map are defined as any facility owned and occupied by a tax-exempt social service agency or by a state-run human services department. This definition includes facilities in which clients reside and receive support services, and/or facilities in which the agency is located and clients reside and receive services. The size of the program, the type of clients served, the nature of the services, or other characteristics within any of these services are not designated.

Locations where agencies rent their facilities from taxable entities (landlords) are not identified on the map. The effect of these omissions is not clear. While the map thus does not include every possible social service agency program site or location, it is reasonably representative of a “picture in time” for the location of the current social service system within the City of Worcester. In addition, the use of the DOR definition accompanied by this map can be used going forward for future trend analysis.

The location, size, concentration, and type of program were the subject of much debate in the public hearings and within the Task Force. Currently, both sides of the debate only have anecdotal evidence to support their point of view. Based upon these discussions, **the Task Force recommends that an in-depth independent study of the social and economic impact of these programs on the city’s neighborhoods be completed.** Perhaps the UniverCity Partnership can take on this task as one of its contributions to the City.

III D. Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT)

The purpose of this section is to identify reasonable Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) or PILOT-like options for generating compensating revenue to the City for properties that have been or will be removed from the local tax rolls.

This report balances desired outcomes with probabilities of adoption in an effort to develop a reality-based menu of options. Rather than a "one size fits all" approach, this report offers several recommended discussion points for the City administration, our local legislative delegation, and tax-exempt social service agencies.

The Task Force considered recommending changes in federal and state laws that would eliminate or reduce local tax exemptions for nonprofit corporations. This discussion resulted in a consensus opinion that this was not a viable strategy and was beyond the scope of the Task Force.

The recommendations focus on three achievable categories: state PILOT options, state incentive options, and local PILOT options.

Background

It is recognized that any participation by social service agencies in a PILOT program is **voluntary**, since by federal and state statutes, nonprofit (501(c) (3)) organizations are exempt from payment of local taxes.

However, all municipalities are required to provide basic public services, including public safety, to individuals and businesses residing within their boundaries. Local taxes are a significant means through which these services are funded.

Due to the costs to provide these services and the impact of lost revenues related to property removed from the tax rolls, the City seeks relief from passing the increasing costs of providing basic services to the taxpayers. The recommendations made in this report are directed to (1) the Commonwealth that contracts for many of these social services based on a community-care model and (2) the tax-exempt social service agencies themselves.

This report recommends four options for social service agencies to participate directly in helping to fund the cost of providing basic services in the City.

Recommendations for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

- 1. Seek legislative changes to establish a *State PILOT program* to provide state reimbursement directly to municipalities.**

The state makes an annual PILOT directly to municipalities for all state-funded "continuum of care" services that are provided in tax-exempt properties (sheltering, treatment, transitional, supportive, counseling, etc.).

This would be accomplished by creating a line item on the local Cherry Sheet for direct payment to each municipality. The amount would be calculated using the current state reimbursement rate used for state-owned land PILOT payments to municipalities.

The current reimbursement rate is \$14.06 per thousand dollars of assessment. Thus, the state would have a line item for nonprofit social services agencies, tax-exempt reimbursement that is calculated at \$14.06 per \$1,000 of the assessed value of all nonprofit social service agencies, tax-exempt properties where state-funded services are funded. The State of Connecticut currently has a PILOT similar to this recommendation.

2. Seek legislative changes to establish a *State Incentive Program* similar to the affordable housing incentive program in Chapter 40B, subsection R.

In recognizing the difficulties in siting social service programs, it is important that the Commonwealth provide incentives to all municipalities to host social service programs by providing fixed dollar amounts directly to municipalities at the time of contract award.

The amount of the incentive award should reflect the Commonwealth's priorities and the potential local impacts.

Recommendations for the City of Worcester

- 1. Seek negotiated agreements with social service providers for a *City of Worcester Social Services PILOT*.** These written agreements would be negotiated directly, agency by agency, through the City administration and each nonprofit organization. Suggested options are:
 - a. Social service agencies acquiring new properties do not seek exemption for properties, but rather keep them on the tax rolls by not making annual application for exemption (through form 3ABC). This option would not necessarily require a written agreement with the City.
 - b. Similar to item 1a, social service agencies do not make annual application for tax exemption on currently owned properties.
 - c. For social service agencies choosing to make application for exemption, they enter a written agreement with the City to participate in a voluntary PILOT by funding a position or a project cost within a City-developed strategic initiative. This funding should be a fixed dollar amount for a

specific number of years. Under this option there would be no effect on the tax exempt status of the social service agency's properties.

- d. Social service agencies enter a written agreement with the City to participate in a voluntary PILOT by contributing to the City's General Fund. The PILOT is calculated as 18% of the property tax rate on the assessed property value calculated annually.

Other successful PILOT programs have used the annual budget percent of local tax levy funded costs for providing police, fire, communications, code, and public works as the basis for a PILOT payment. In Worcester, for fiscal year 2006, the tax levy cost to the city for these basic services is 18.28% of the total tax levy budget. It is expected that this percentage will not vary much from year to year.

If the property removed from the tax roles is residential, the residential tax rate would be used in the calculation; if the property is commercial/industrial, then the commercial tax rate would be used in the calculation.

IV A. Public Testimony Addendum A

In addition to the two June hearings set up specifically to hear the public's concerns about or support of social service agencies, the Task Force received a number of written testimonies by email or on paper. The written testimony was copied and distributed to members of the Task Force. Each submission has been saved and is available for viewing in the Mayor's office.

The first hearing was held June 15, 2005, in the City Council Chambers, from 6-9:30 p.m. Fifty-three people signed up to speak; 43 testified.

Name	Organization	Worcester resid?
1. Robert Edward Fetterman	CHL consumer - DMH	Y
2. Elizabeth Taylor	NAMI advocate	Y
3. Roger Trahan, Jr.	Chelsea House advocate	N – Grafton
4. Catharine Darensbourg	CHL advocate	Y
5. Kelly Brassard	CHL	Y
6. Jennifer Lee Ives	CHL consumer – Share Program	Y
7. Bernadette Kerns	CHL consumer	Y
8. Phil George	CHL advocate	Y
9. Larry Gottlieb	CHL VP, Homeless Services	N – Newton
10. Charlie Campbell	CHL consumer – Oasis House	Y
11. James Clark	CHL consumer – Oasis House	Y
12. Chris Noonan	CHL consumer – Oasis House & PIP	Y
13. Lynne Simmarano	CHL consumer – Maranda House	Y
14. Patricia Santos	CHL consumer – Maranda House	Y
15. Bonita Richardson	CHL consumer – Maranda House	Y
16. Kim Sullivan	CHL consumer	Y
17. Elsie Yanski	CHL consumer – Faith House	Y
18. Sylvia Thompson	CHL consumer – Faith House	Y
19. Heidi Mason	CHL consumer – Faith House	Y
20. Michael Mason	Henry Lee Will Ctr consumer	Y
21. Jim Convery	Pleasant St. resident – siting issues	Y
22. Sen. Harriette Chandler	Siting issues	Y
23. Christina Hall	CHL consumer – Faith House	Y
24. Joan Dunn	Highland-St. res; KNIT rep – siting	Y
25. James Cote	Doherty HS parent – siting	Y
26. Michael Stewart	NAMI advocate	Y
27. Jim Eber	Midland St. resident – siting issues	Y
28. Linda Wambach	Topsfield Rd. resident – siting issues	Y
29. Cait McCormack	Copley Rd resident – siting issues	Y
30. Robert Norwood	pro independent living houses	Y
31. Katrina DeJoseph	Did not testify	
32. Mike Winsor	Haviland resident – siting issues	Y

33. Lauren Dubeau	Haviland resident – siting issues	Y
34. John O’Neil	Genesis House advocate	Y
35. Neal Rosenblum	Did not testify	
36. Christopher Comeau	Highland St. resident – siting issues	Y
37. Marjorie Cohen	Did not testify	
38. Martin Bouthiller	CDC concerns	Y
39. Calvin Bradshaw	Did not testify	
40. Joseph Parson	Did not testify	
41. Peter Panerelli	CHL consumer	Y
42. Nicole LeBlanc	Did not testify	
43. John Larson	Did not testify	
44. Jaydev Chandra	Did not testify	
45 Bill Bernhard	Morningside Rd resident – siting	Y
46. Peter Stefan	PIP advocate	Y
47. Dr. Rao	Did not testify	
48. Liz Tomaszewski	Did not testify	
49. Nicole Cormier	Maplewood Rd resident – siting	Y
50. Sandra Katz	Lee St. resident – siting/PILOT	Y
51. Jacqueline Diaz	CHL consumer – Maranda House	Y
52. Tara Schutz	CHL consumer – Faith House	Y
53. Tom Hicks	Lenox St. resident – siting issues	Y

**Mayor's Social Service Task Force
Public Hearing June 23, 2005**

The second hearing was also held in the City Council Chambers from 6-11 p.m. Forty-nine people signed up to speak; 41 testified

Name	Organization	Worcester resid?
1. Roberta Schaefer	Worc Regional Research Bur	Y
2. Ray Kosinski	Dept Mental Health – BEAS Reg II	N
3. Janice Yost .	Health Foundation of Cent Mass	Y
4. Christian Baehrecke	CHL board member - did not testify	N
5. Katrina DeJoseph	Independent Living advocate	Y
6. Katherine McGovern	KNIT Worcester	Y
7. Geraldine McGovern	KNIT Worcester	Y
8. Portland Relf	CHL consumer Patricia Mays House	Y
9. Wendy Silverstein	CHL consumer Patricia Mays House	Y
10. Chastity Bonilla	CHL consumer Patricia Mays House	Y
11. Anthony Searcy	CHL advocate	Y
12. Arthur Crowell	CHL consumer	Y
13. Barbara Quandt	CHL consumer	Y
14. Patsy Lewis	spoke on siting recommendations	Y
15. Nancy Minto	CHL consumer	Y
16. Linda Duggan	RN, voter, taxpayer, pro programs	Y
17. Sheila Monfette	Barclay St resident siting concerns	Y
18. Sandy Hubbard	Fiske St resident siting concerns	Y
19. Carolyn Curtis	Haviland St resident siting concerns	Y
20. Gloria St. Denis	June St. resident siting concerns	Y
21. Michelle Hartigan	Shephard Hill	Y
22. William Breault	Main South Alliance for Pub Safety	Y
23. Carolyn Packard	Beacon St resident siting concerns	Y
24. Lynne Simonds	Illinois St resident siting and PILOT	Y
25. Joseph Curtis	Haviland St resident siting concerns	Y
26. David Schaefer	Cricket Ln resident – siting concerns	Y
27. John Fresolo	State Rep – siting concerns	Y
28. Marie Sanchirico	Highland St resident – siting issues	Y
29. Erika Nicolson	did not testify	N
30. Diane Bruce	did not testify	Y
31. Anthony Colon	Illinois St resident siting & PILOT	Y
32. Stephen Williams	Westland St resident – siting	Y
33. Sarah Guidi	Did not testify	N
34. Doreen Samuels	Did not testify	Y
35. Ellen Laverdure	Taxpayer and Willis Center advoc	Y

36. Larry Laverdure	Willis Community Center employee	Y
37. Stacey Avril	Amherst St resident siting concerns	Y
38. Rick Miller	Friends of Newton Hill siting/PILOT	Y
39. Johanna Evans	Highland St resident siting concerns	Y
40. Karen King	Did not testify left written testimony	N
41. Deborah Ferriabough	CHL employee	N
42. Rita Panarelli	CHL advocate	Y
43. Frank Zitomersky	Castle St resident siting concerns	Y
44. Jacqueline Diaz	Did not testify – spoke last week	Y
45. Pat Santos	Did not testify – spoke last week	Y
46 Jennifer Lee Ives	Spoke last week CHL consumer	Y
47. Bernadette Kerns	Spoke last week - Program advocate	Y
48. Sandra Katz	Spoke last week – siting concerns	Y
49. Bill Bernhard	Spoke last week – siting concerns	

IV B. Worcester Social Service PILOT Calculation Addendum B

An example of the PILOT payment calculation follows: A social service agency purchases a residential property with an assessed valuation of \$300,000. The agency would pay the city a PILOT equal to 18% of the current \$13.18 residential tax rate. A \$300,000 home that is fully taxed would generate \$3,954 in taxes. Under this PILOT option the social service agency would pay 18% -- or roughly \$711 -- to the city for that year.