

From: Kelly Altschul kelly.altschul@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: MHJFD agreement discussion
Date: September 21, 2025 at 23:31

KA

To: Greg Hyer TCPChair@townofcrossplains.wi.gov, Jennifer Broberg TCPCLERK@townofcrossplains.wi.gov, Bonnie Krattiger tcptreas@townofcrossplains.wi.gov, Patty Mullins TCPSup1@townofcrossplains.wi.gov, Tom Rhude TPCPC4@townofcrossplains.wi.gov, Greg Haack TCPSup3@townofcrossplains.wi.gov, Paul Correll TCPSup4@townofcrossplains.wi.gov
Cc: Kelly Altschul kelly.altschul@springdalewi.gov

You don't often get email from kelly.altschul@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello Town of Cross Plains Officials,
I am Kelly Altschul, a Town Board Supervisor in neighboring Springdale.
I am writing to inform you that at this week's FDMH Board meeting (wednesday the 24th) Springdale is going to request that the Board open up the shared service agreements that all the member municipalities have with FDMH so that the allocation of levy funding can be re-calculated in a more equitable manner.
We will not oppose Jenny's prepared 2026 budget, as it seems too late to get approved contracts in place without an interruption in service.
But we will be requesting that the shared services agreements be renegotiated this upcoming year, to apply to next year's 2027 budget and FDMH levy.

A quick summary of why Springdale will be asking for this:

1. The levy allocation is currently calculated based solely on the Equalized Value of each of the participating municipalities. This is not a typical, or even recommended, way of allocating shared service costs.
 - a. The UW model shared services agreement recommends that shared services be levied to municipalities based on the proportion of a 3 year rolling average of the location of service calls.
 - b. Some nearby shared service districts use a calculation method using a 3 prong calculation which averages the 1)equalized values 2)population and 3) 3 year rolling average of location of service calls.

In 2024 the Village of Mount Horeb accounted for 68% of FDMH's service calls. And yet the Village of Mount Horeb is only paying for 47% of the FDMH budget.

Springdale made up 12% of FDMH's calls, but pays 23% of the budget.

The Town of Cross Plains' rolling 3 year average of calls to FDMH is 2.01%, but you're paying 3.97% of the FDMH levy.

This may sound like small potatoes, but in 2026 your levy is \$81,663 based on the equalized value calculation, but if we recalculated the levy based on the 3 year rolling average of number of calls, your levy would only be \$33,338.

I know that with our levy limits that amount matters.

Why is the current equalized value calculation so disproportionate?

First of all, in 2023 the state exempted personal property from taxation, reducing the equalized value of municipalities with personal property on their rolls (found in commercial and manufacturing property assessments). And while municipalities were reimbursed for most of this new exemption by the state, the exemption did reduce equalized value totals for municipalities. I don't have the FDMH levies for 2023 or 2024 to compare the distribution of levies after this new exemption, but it was that year that Springdale's FDMH levy increased by more than \$80k; increasing from \$280k to \$353k. I am assuming that all other municipalities in the agreement were affected similarly, as MOHO is likely the only participating municipality with a significant amount of commercial and manufacturing property in it. So, even though the Village of Moho was reimbursed by the state for their loss in personal property tax revenue, their share of the FDMH levy decreased significantly due to the new exemption.

Second, MOHO has two active TID districts, the improvements within each (likely well over \$100 Million in equalized value, total) are not included in its equalized value calculation. This nuance of TIF law keeps the Village of MOHO's Equalized Value deceptively low and requires the other municipalities to pick up and pay for far more FDMH levy than they should be responsible for, even applying the current equalized value calculation that is required by the agreement in place.

Furthermore, the Village is building more and more multi-unit and senior housing, which creates denser populations that are more likely to use FDMH services. In fact, the new low-income senior housing that was just approved in the Village will likely never increase the Villages' equalized value at all, but will surely increase demand on the FDMH. The Villages' move toward allowing denser populations in the future will only make Equalized Value a more and more disproportionate way to divy up the FDMH levy.

I have attached a spreadsheet of data and estimated levy amounts (and pasted the summary of levy amounts below) that I hope will convince you that our shared services agreements need to be renegotiated this year to apply to our 2027 budgets. I will be sending a similar email to all municipalities in the FDMH district in the hopes that we can discuss this on Wednesday evening at the Board meeting.

I look forward to meeting you on Wednesday.

Let me know if you have any questions in the meantime.

Kelly Altschul

Springdale Supervisor #1

Muni	estimated 2026 Levy EQ Value	estimated 2026 levy on calls	estimated 2026 levy population	Average EQ value + calls	Average EQ value + calls + pop
Vil of Moho	790,450.47	1,102,358.62	957,297.56	1,029,828.09	950,035.55
Vil of Blue Mounds	81,637.89	84,748.88	112,623.24	98,686.06	93,003.34
Twp of Blue Mounds	153,454.37	122,138.09	110,292.26	116,215.18	128,628.24
Twp of Cross Plains	81,663.06	33,338.71	57,376.51	45,357.61	57,459.43
Twp of Perry	60,822.04	28,976.64	60,579.77	44,778.21	50,126.15
Twp of Primrose	47,619.37	21,187.22	42,068.09	31,627.66	36,958.23

Twp of Springdale	366,581.00	197,228.10	268,921.73	233,074.91	277,576.94
Twp of Vermont	75,671.81	67,923.74	48,740.84	58,332.29	64,112.13
	1,657,900	1,657,900.00	1,657,900.00	1,657,900.00	1,657,900.00
	Springdale's difference	(169,352.90)	(97,659.27)	(133,506.08)	(89,004.06)

EMS & Fire expense funding.xlsx

