Figure 1
Ratings of Current Financial Condition of Cities/Villages by Population Size
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Figure 2
Rating of Financial Prospects for Cities/Villages for the **Next Five Years** by Population Size

- **16.6%** - Adequate revenues/able to reduce taxes
- **59.2%** - Adequate revenues/not able to expand services
- **18.6%** - Inadequate revenues/not reducing services
- **5.7%** - Inadequate revenues/reducing services

Legend:
- □ Less than 1,000
- □ 1,000 - 4,999
- □ 5,000 or greater
**Figure 3**
*Public Works*
Municipal Solid Waste

- **Municipal Employees**
- **Private for Profit**
- **Other Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Municipal Employees</th>
<th>Private for Profit</th>
<th>Other Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yard waste collection</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. solid waste coll.</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. solid waste coll.</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste disposal</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of respondents =**

- Yard waste collection: 350
- Res. solid waste coll.: 409
- Recycling: 421
- Comm. solid waste coll.: 365
- Solid waste disposal: 391

**Figure 4**
*Public Works*
Streets

- **Municipal Employees**
- **Private for Profit**
- **Other Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Municipal Employees</th>
<th>Private for Profit</th>
<th>Other Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meter maintenance/collection</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking lot cleaning</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowplowing/sanding</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street sweeping</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street repair/maintenance</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signal installation/maintenance</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of respondents =**

- Meter maintenance/collection: 158
- Street parking lot cleaning: 364
- Snowplowing/sanding: 433
- Street sweeping: 395
- Street repair/maintenance: 413
- Traffic signal installation/maintenance: 258
Number of respondents = 302

**Figure 5**
*Public Works*
Other Functions

- Municipal Employees
- Private for Profit
- Other Methods

Number of respondents = 65

**Figure 6**
*Public Works*
Transportation

- Municipal Employees
- Private for Profit
- Other Methods
Figure 7
Public Utilities
Electricity, Gas, Water & Sewer

- Municipal
- Private for Profit
- Other

Number of respondents = 273 226 367 357 392 452

Figure 8
Public Utilities
Other

- Municipal Employees
- Private for Profit
- Other Methods

Number of respondents = 452 382 297 360 175
### Figure 9. Intergovernmental Cooperation in Public Works: Percent of Wisconsin Municipalities Responding that Other Units of Government Produce Service

[Number of respondents with service produced by another unit of government and total number of respondents shown in parentheses after service category]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Respondents with Service Produced by Another Unit of Government</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential solid waste collection</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0/409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree trimming/planting</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4/345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard waste collection</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7/350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter maintenance/collection</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4/158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking lot cleaning</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11/364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection/code enforcement</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9/302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street repair/maintenance</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25/413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial solid waste collection</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12/365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot garage operation</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2/65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking lot cleaning</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11/364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage collection</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23/392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signal installation/maintenance</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>61/258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45/421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste disposal</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52/391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery admin./maintenance</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18/205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowplowing sanding</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28/433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street sweeping</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30/395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection/code enforcement</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9/302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 10. Intergovernmental Cooperation in Public Utilities -- Percent of Wisconsin Municipalities Responding that Other Units of Government Produce Service

[Number of respondents with service produced by another unit of government and total number of respondents shown in parentheses after service category]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Respondents with Service Produced by Another Unit of Government</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential solid waste collection</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0/409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree trimming/planting</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4/345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard waste collection</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7/350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter maintenance/collection</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4/158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street parking lot cleaning</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11/364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection/code enforcement</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9/302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street light operation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25/360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage collection</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23/392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>29/226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24/273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewage treatment</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>55/452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric power</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24/273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sludge disposal</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>43/297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility meter reading</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11/382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water distribution</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10/367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility billing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8/452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 11**
*Public Safety*
Police and Fire

Number of Respondents = 314 361 330 315 308 319 333

- Municipal Employees
- Private for Profit
- Other Methods

Traffic control/parking enforcement
Crime prevention/suppression
Police communication
Police training
Fire communication
Fire training

**Figure 12**
*Public Safety*
Emergency/Ambulance and Other Services

Number of Respondents = 184 360 370 245

- Municipal Employees
- Private for Profit
- Other Methods

Building services
Emergency medical services
Ambulance service
Vehicle towing/storage
Figure 13
Health and Human Services
Sanitation and Animal Control

Figure 14
Health and Human Services
Public Services Program
Figure 15. Intergovernmental Cooperation in Public Safety:
Percent of Municipalities Responding that Other Units of Government Produce Service
(Number of respondents with service produced by another unit of government and total number of respondents shown in parentheses after service category)

Figure 16. Intergovernmental Cooperation in Health and Human Services:
Percent of Municipalities Responding that Other Units of Government Produce Service
(Number of respondents with service produced by another unit of government and total number of respondents shown in parentheses after service category)
Number of Respondents =

397 380 326 43

Figure 17
Parks and Recreation

Municipal Employees
Private for Profit
Other Methods

Number of Respondents =

278 102 64

Figure 18
Cultural and Arts Program

Municipal Employees
Private for Profit
Other Methods
Number of Respondents = 374 198 332

Figure 19
Support Functions
Building Services

Number of Respondents = 254 242 291 257

Figure 20
Support Functions
Vehicle Operations
Figure 21
Support Functions
Financial Services

Number of Respondents =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>403</th>
<th>278</th>
<th>273</th>
<th>381</th>
<th>402</th>
<th>365</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax billing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax assessing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent tax collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22
Support Functions
Other

Number of Respondents =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>307</th>
<th>276</th>
<th>224</th>
<th>239</th>
<th>276</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>358</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretarial services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations/information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 23. Intergovernmental Cooperation in Support Functions: Percent of Municipalities Responding that Other Units of Government Produce Service
[Number of respondents with service produced by another unit of government and total number of respondents shown in parentheses after service category]
Fig. 24  Comparison of Number of Municipal Contracts for Service Production with Private Firms, 1996 vs 1991

Figure 25. Future Privatization Plans (1998-2003)
Fig. 26. Have Contracts for Municipal Services Been for New Services or Existing Services?

- Both existing and new 46%
- New services only 5%
- Existing services 49%

Figure 27. Factors Causing Cities/Villages to Consider Privatization During the Past Five Years
Figure 28. Methods for Implementing/Promoting Privatization

- Analyzed feasibility
- Identified successful use in other jurisdictions
- Promoted general features of privatization
- Used privatization only for new or growing services
- Implemented privatization on a trial basis
- Kept service complaint mechanism in house
- Minimized effect of displaced public workers
- Recommended changes in state and local laws
- Established citizen advisory committee
- Allowed gov't depts to compete with private sector in bidding
- Other

Figure 29. Factors Contributing to Success in Privatizing Services

- Quality of work
- Financial considerations
- Responsiveness
- Timeliness
- Flexibility
- Past experience
- Monitoring of contract
- Sensitivity to political situation
- Other

Legend:
- Third Most Important
- Second Most Important
- Most Important
Figure 30. Reasons Why Municipalities Have Not Privatized Services
Figure 31. If Municipal Employees Have Bid on Contracts, Have They Been Successful?

Figure 32. If a Contract Monitoring System Is in Place, Who Is Responsible For Monitoring Contractor Compliance?

Figure 33. Has Privatization or Contracting Resulted in Cost Savings?
Figure 34. In Municipalities Where Employees Are Unionized, Does Contractor for Private Services Recognize Union?

Figure 35. Impact on Employees Displaced Due to Privatization or Contracting
Figure 36. If City/Village Has Contracted for Services, How Do Private Firm Employee Wages Compare to City/Village Wages?

Don't know 68%
Higher than city/village 11%
Lower 10%
About the same 11%

Figure 37. If City/Village Has Contracted for Services, How Do Private Firm Employee Benefits Compare to City/Village Benefits?

Don't know 77%
More 6%
About same 6%
Less than city/village provided 11%
Figure 38. Source of Most Useful Privatization Information

- Other Municipalities: 5.1%
- League of Wisconsin Municipalities: 17.5%
- Private Contractors: 25.7%
- ICMA: 33.1%

Figure 39. More Privatization Information Needed --What Topics?

- Cost comparison between in-house and contracted services: 78.2%
- Performance review for municipal services: 61.4%
- Effective bidding system for competitive contracting: 60.7%
- Designing an effective monitoring systems for competitive contracting: 46.2%
- Evaluating performance and experience of private contractors: 42.8%
- Transition strategies for public employees: 30.3%