

**OSSIPEE BUDGET COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
February 2, 2022**

Meeting recorded for Minutes summarized by Laura Nash, Budget Committee Recording Secretary, amendments are noted by ***bold/italic*** type.

Call to Order: Chairman Joe Goss called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

Pledge of Allegiance – was recited by all attendees.

Attendance by Roll Call: – Joe Goss, Donna Gridley, Lynne Parker, Roland Millette, Donna Sargent, Dallas Emery, and Connie Billings,

Absent: WOFP Representative, Cameron Quigley, Matt Sawyer, Jr, Jonathan Smith (Selectmen's Rep.), Andrea Picard, and TJ Eldridge.

Attendees: Krystal Eldridge, Angela Eldridge and Marie McConarty

Meeting Minutes: Review of minutes from November 17, 2021,

A **Motion** by Billings to approve the meeting minutes of November 17, 2021. Millette seconded.

- Parker noted an error on page 2 under - **Ossipee Corner Light & Power Precinct** - The 2022 proposed budget request is \$21,995.00, should read ***The 2022 proposed budget request is \$381,040.00***

No further discussion. Goss called for a vote as amended. A unanimous vote was taken by a show of hands.
Motion passed. 7-0-0

Selectmen's Report: N/A

2022 YTD - Budget Report: N/A

2022 Revenue Report: N/A

2022 Town Budget Proposals:

- **Petition Warrant Articles:** Verified by Town Clerk
 - **School's Out Program!!!** - \$45,000.00

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$45,000 for the purpose of funding the Schools Out Program!"

Discussion: Goss called on Krystal Eldridge as the first signee of the petition for any comments. Krystal Eldridge commented that the committee has already discussed the program. The petition was submitted for the committee to either recommend or not recommend and for the voters to decide at the Annual Town Meeting on March 9th, 2022.

Emery questioned why is the petition for the full amount of \$45,000.00, when they had a surplus left over from last year. The committee members explained even though it was reported to have a surplus, no one can change the wording of the petition after it been submitted. Discussion ensued over the total budget for the School's Out program.

A **Motion** by Millette to **Not** Recommend the Petition Warrant Article in the amount of \$45,000.00 for the purpose of funding the Schools Out Program! to come from general taxation. Emery seconded. No discussion. All others voted to **Not** Recommend. **Motion Passed 6-0-1.** (Billings abstained)

○ **Children Unlimited - \$3,000.00**

To see if the Town will vote to raise and appropriate the sum of \$3,000 for the purpose of funding the Children Unlimited.

Discussion: The committee reviewed their previous paperwork to better understand why they zero balanced the funding.

Parker reported that Children Unlimited serviced 32 clients at \$273.00 per unit of services and are contracted by the state.

Gridley's understanding is that the committee viewed this service as part of DCYF and should be state funded, and not town funded. Sargent agreed.

Marie McConarty explained how she utilizes the services of Children Unlimited through her foster care home. McConarty stated that Children Unlimited is not part of DCYF. They do receive state funding, but they are not part of DCYF. Through the foster care program, Children Unlimited will work with children on any developmental behaviors, social skills or learning disabilities a child may have. Children Unlimited will work with the parents through their unification program to get families re-united through supervised visitation and education to see if unification will be possible.

Gridley commented if DCYF also does these same services then why should the town support Children Unlimited. McConarty explained because DCYF is so understaffed for the amount of children in the system that they have to contract with another agency, in this case Children Unlimited, who licensed to assist with helping the children and families. Gridley commented that DCYF is paying Children Unlimited for these services, so why do the taxpayers have to fund it as well. McConarty clarified that DCYF is not paying Children Unlimited, but both organizations receive some funding from the state because it offers a lot of services that helps the community, but it is not part of DCYF.

Millette inquired if Children Unlimited provides services regionally or are they a statewide organization. McConarty noted Children Unlimited is based out of Conway and they are a source for services that a child and/or parent may need. Children Unlimited is not just a source for DCYF, they are a source for the whole Mount Washington Valley. McConarty believes that Children Unlimited service fees are on a sliding scale income based or they get Title XX through the state. Millette inquired if McConarty dove tails with CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocate). McConarty stated that CASA will come to her house along with other children services. Discussion continued over Children Unlimited connection with DCYF, how funding and referrals are exchanged, and Children Unlimited services provided to the community separate from DCYF.

Parker reviewed the application of Children Unlimited, who reported serving 32 clients at a cost of \$273.00 per unit of service. But it does not clarify if this was for only the 32 clients or the 32 clients multiple times. So based on 32 clients times \$273.00, calculates to \$8,736.00 that the Town benefits monetarily from services if the town is funding \$3,000.00. Discussion ensued.

Sargent commented that if we believed that money was the issue, this budget would be ten times it's current rate. We throw money, after money, after money, at all these problems with no results. And it's not getting any better! McConarty stated she does see the benefits when a child is unified with it's parent/s.

A **Motion** by Millette to recommend the Petition Warrant Article in the amount of \$3,000.00 for the purpose of funding Children Unlimited to come from general taxation.

Discussion: Emery commented that he has been told straight to his face that he does not like kids. Emery emphatically denies this accusation. Emery believes the cost is based on the worth of services provided. Emery believes these situations are pushed on the towns from the courts and judges and believes they should be paying for it and not the tax payers.

Goss raise the question of adding it back into the budget. But McConarty stated if the committee did so, they would be funding \$6,000.00 because the petition warrant article still has to be on the ballot.

A **Motion** by Millette to recommend the Petition Warrant Article in the amount of \$3,000.00 for the purpose of funding Children Unlimited to come from general taxation. Gridley seconded. No further discussion. All others voted to Recommend. **Motion Passed 5-1-1.** (Sargent opposed) (Billings abstained)

General discussion ensued on voter education of what a service actually provides and does for the community. Millette would like to see some sort of demographic illustrating how some of these organizations overlap in services. Discussion ensued.

- Updated 2022 Proposed Operating Budget – was reviewed and discussed by the committee.

Goss noted the amount to be raised by taxation is \$4,320,794.00 and with the overlay's the overall amount is \$4,551,794.00, which is a decrease of -0.19%. The 2021 overlay was calculated at \$58,615.00 with an increase to \$60,000.00 for 2022, which is an increase of 2.36%. The Overlays include abatements, which are not reflected on the MS-737. The War Service Credits were \$171,000.00 and are level funded for the 2022 proposed budget, which are not reflected on the MS-737.

- Updated 2022 Proposed Revenues – was reviewed and discussed by the committee.

Goss reported the projected revenues for 2022 is \$2,981,030.00 with a decrease of \$47,030.00.

Billings and Emery believe this will increase because a new house cannot be taxed until after April 1st, 2022 and the sale of homes cannot be charged until after April 1st, 2022. Goss noted this is a revenue but the type of revenue that gets recorded on the projected revenue report. Discussion ensued over which municipal properties would be up for sale for a projected revenue increase of \$60,000.00. Discussion ensued over how to verify or dispute this amount and how the amount for boats and trailers is down. Because in 2021, they took in \$1,040,000.00 and a projected revenue of \$1,000,000.00 for 2022. If the town brings in more that's good for the town. But when the town is projecting estimated revenue, you want it to be under the actual revenues brought into town.

- Updated 2022 Proposed Monetary Warrant Article — was reviewed and discussed by the committee.

Goss noted the recommended amount for Warrant Article will increase from \$805,000.00 to \$808,000.00 once the \$3,000.00 from Children Unlimited is added into the total.

- Updated Draft MS-737

The secretary is to inform the Town Administrator, Matt Sawyer, Jr., that the Budget Committee would like to have the actual expenditures filled in on MS-737 for the next meeting.

Next Meeting:

- **BC Meeting: February 10, 2022 – 6:30 PM at the Town Hall Bud Avery Gymnasium**

- **Public Hearing: February 10, 2022 – 7:00 PM at the Town Hall Bud Avery Gymnasium - Public Hearing on Petition Articles**
- **Town Election: March 8th, 2022 –at the Town Hall Bud Avery Gymnasium**
- **Annual Town Meeting: March 9th, 2022 –at the Town Hall Bud Avery Gymnasium**

Any Other Business that May Come Before the Committee:

Sargent requested to have all the minutes ready for the next meeting.

Parker inquired about not receiving the paperwork for Main Street as an Outside Agency. Gridley stated that Main Street did not submit an application and they were not funded last year. Sargent and Parker both said that Masin Street did submit an application to the Selectmen and questioned why the Budget Committee did not receive a copy. Parker was told because the Selectmen denied the application is why it did not come to the Budget Committee. Several member disagreed noting the application still should have come to the Budget Committee. Goss stated any budget application that is submitted to the Selectmen is supposed to come before the Budget Committee because the Selectmen and the Budget Committee are only voting to Recommend or Not Recommend and then it's up to the voters.

Discussion ensued over what got submitted this year verses last year. What was approved and not approved and there was time to submit a petition warrant article but that was not done either. So, the Budget Committee cannot render a vote on something that was not brought before them.

Adjournment:

A **Motion** by Gridley to adjourn the meeting. Emery seconded. No further discussion. A unanimous vote was taken. **Motion passed.** The meeting adjourned at 7:24 PM.

Minutes approved by majority vote of the Board on

Date

Joe Goss, Chairman
Budget Committee

Donna Gridley, Vice-Chair
(In the absence of the Chairman)