



REVISED ****SPECIAL**** ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

June 24, 2025 at 5:30 PM

Kronenwetter Municipal Center - 1582 Kronenwetter Drive Room A121

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

President David Baker called the June 24, 2025 Special Administrative Policy Committee Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Those in attendance were invited to recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Roll Call

PRESENT: *President David Baker, Trustee Sandi Sorensen, Mary Solheim, Sean Dumais, Guy Fredel (joined at 5:32 p.m.)*

STAFF: *Interim Finance Director John Jacobs, Clerk Jennifer Poyer*

GUESTS: *Trustee Ken Charneski*

2. ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLOSED SESSION

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Bernie Kramer, 2150 E. State Hwy 153, Peplin, WI, 54455 – *Kramer commented on the budget process. He said the board should be more involved and it should be completed earlier than in years past.*

Ken Charneski, 2604 16th Road, Kronenwetter, WI, 54455 – *Comment read by clerk and attached to minutes.*

4. REPORTS AND DISCUSSIONS

C. Finance Director Report

Interim Finance Director John Jacobs presented his budget. He answered questions from committee members.

5. NEW BUSINESS- DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION (Items were discussed in numbered order designated below.)

3) D.Funding for Kronenwetter Storage Driveway

No action taken. Discussed elevated bike path on either side of road and emergency purchases process.

2) E. Reassessment Services for Village Properties

No action taken. Discussed RFP for each type of reassessment, state compliance, reassessment values and types of reassessments. Staff directed to move forward with an RFP for reassessment service.

1) F. Budget Timeline

Motion by Fredel/Sorensen to forward proposed Budget Timeline to the Village Board. Motion carried by voice vote. 5:0.

Interim Finance Director John Jacobs reviewed the Budget Timeline detailing actions for staff, board and committees. Committee discussed adding a special Utility Committee meeting to the timeline.

4) G.Meeting Room Control Upgrade

No action taken. Discussed the current state of equipment, time constraints involved, past fixes/upgrades, costs and FIN-04.

6) H.APC Workplan

No action taken. Discussed items on workplan and added long term financial analysis of TID 1 as well as a joint meeting with RDA.

7) I. Badke Open Meeting Notice Requirements

Item will be brought back to APC. Discussed final authority, committee's power to act, past actions and authority.

5) J. Date of Meeting

Committee members agreed to change the meeting date to the Tuesday before the fourth Monday of the month. The meeting time will remain at 5:30 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

Motion by Dumais/Solheim to convene into closed session pursuant to Wis. Stat. 19.85 (1)(c) for consideration of employment, promotion, compensation or performance evaluation data of any public employee over which the governmental body has jurisdiction or exercises responsibility – to wit Review of Administrator candidates; to wit- administrator interview. Motion carried by roll call vote. 5:0.

PRESENT: President Baker, Trustee Sorensen, Trustee Charneski, Mary Solheim, Guy Fredel, Sean Dumais

Closed session convened at 7:55 p.m.

RECONVENE OPEN SESSION

Motion by Dumais/Fredel to reconvene into open session. Motion carried by voice vote. 5:0.

Open session convened at 9:37 p.m.

ACTION AFTER CLOSED SESSION

No action taken.

6. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA

- *Minutes from previous meetings*
- *Possible special meeting*

7. NEXT MEETING: July 22, 2025 at 5:30 p.m.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Fredel/Dumais to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried by voice vote. 5:0.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Jennifer Poyer

From: Ken Charneski
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Jennifer Poyer
Cc: Sean Dumais; David M. Baker; Sandi Sorensen; Guy Fredel; maryeve05@gmail.com
Subject: public input

Ken Charneski 2604 16th Road Kronenwetter

My Input for the June 24 APC special meeting.

Agenda item 5E Reassessment services for the Village.

No doubt we need a reassessment according to State regulations, that part is obvious.

It appears from the packet that staff will likely be promoting one of the full-blown \$220-260,000 options, and that would be based on Associated Appraisal's documents promoting those more costly options.

I would view the Associated Appraisal documents cautiously, as they appear to have a conflict of interest in that they are obviously going to promote their most lucrative products. I have seen things like this with other contracted consultants in the past 8 years.

The last time we discussed assessments was about 2 years ago, and the cost of the interim market update revaluation was at that time around \$90,000. This is much more cost effective than what they are steering us toward this time. It would be entirely sufficient to bring us in compliance with State regulations.

However, this time around Associated Appraisals says in the chart on page 28 that the revaluation is "**not an option**". Is this what the law says, or is this only their opinion? They cite no statute to back up that statement.

If it is a matter of clear-cut law, then there is not much choice for the village, but if it is only Associated's opinion or their policy, then why are they stating it in a dogmatic fashion as if we have no choice in the matter? We are not subject to their mere policy or opinions.

I'd like to point out that the more expensive options have no real return for the added cost, as none of the assessment options will bring any more, or any less revenue to the Village. They bring only added cost.

Given the way Associated present the options, my first inclination would be to consider issuing RFP's for other assessor services like this, to compare the costs and assessment philosophies.

Other than that, I think the committee should request a quote for a **basic revaluation** at the lower cost regardless of Associated's opinion, and go with that option. It makes the most sense.

The second item is 5F Budget Timetable.

I see this schedule as completely unacceptable.

First, the Sept 19 deadline for department budgets is much too late. I would have thought this would have been ready in July.

Second, no elected or committee official even gets to see or discuss these proposed budgets **until October**. Again much too late for a first review.

For 3 years, we have repeatedly ended up with bad budgets due to pushing these things off until there is a time crunch at the end, and the Village Board ends up with "no time left" to make prudent adjustments.

In the past, for examples 2018 to 2021, we had budget numbers presented to **each standing committee** by **late July or early August** for feedback and suggested changes. These committees represent the taxpayers and should have a seat at the table in creating the budget.

This process went around to all 3 committees a second time.

Each committee had **two shots** at approving or suggesting changes to refine the budget, with the Board getting an early look at it as well in between the committee reviews, before it finally went to the Board for final review.

I think that system worked out well to have the citizen committee members and elected officials participate in the process **early on** before too much of the budget got basically set in place and difficult to change.

And don't say "it's not difficult to change". I've been through this budget process 7 times so far, and I know the psychology of how this works and I've seen how both systems work. The early start budgets worked well, and the last-minute type of budgets have been disasters.

This budget in particular will need close watching from beginning to end due to the deficit in the debt levy last year, that will need to be included in this budget but without raising taxes this year.

Thanks for your consideration.