

| CITY OF STOUGHTON, WI | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| TEAM 4 - WELL RUN GOVERNMENT | | | | | | | | | | |
| FY 2011 - 2012 | | | | | | | | | | |
| DEDICATED REVENUE | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offer # | Offer | Department | Required by Mandate (Y/N) | General Fund | Other Funds | Revenue | Total Program Cost | Funding Needed | Running Total of Funded Programs | |
| 04-12 | Mayor | MAYOR'S OFFICE | Y | - | - | - | 94,098 | 94,098 | 94,098 | |
| 04-16 | Treasury Management | FINANCE/TREASURER | Y | 25,000 | - | 25,000 | 127,651 | 102,651 | 196,749 | |
| 04-15 | Financial and Accounting Services | FINANCE/TREASURER | Y | - | - | - | 179,323 | 179,323 | 376,072 | |
| 04-17 | Debt Service | FINANCE/TREASURER | Y | - | 721,229 | 721,229 | 2,623,270 | 1,902,041 | 2,278,113 | |
| 04-11 | Insurance / Risk Mgmt | CITY CLERK / PERSONNEL | N | - | - | - | 175,641 | 175,641 | 2,453,754 | |
| 04-07 | Elections | CITY CLERK / PERSONNEL | Y | - | - | - | 78,344 | 78,344 | 2,532,098 | |
| 04-10 | Council / Committees | CITY COUNCIL | Y | - | - | - | 102,650 | 102,650 | 2,634,748 | |
| 04-08 | Clerk Admin | CITY CLERK / PERSONNEL | Y | - | - | - | 60,628 | 60,628 | 2,695,376 | |
| 04-14 | City Attorney Services | FINANCE/TREASURER | N | - | 65,000 | 65,000 | 170,000 | 105,000 | 2,800,376 | |
| 04-20 | INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY & SERVICES | PLANNING AND DEVELOPME | N | - | - | - | 48,086 | 48,086 | 2,848,462 | |
| 04-06 | Contracted Services Refuse & Recycling Collection | STREETS AND PARKS | N | 654,869 | - | 654,869 | 657,333 | 2,464 | 2,850,927 | |
| 04-13 | Assessor | CITY CLERK / PERSONNEL | Y | - | - | - | 49,487 | 49,487 | 2,900,414 | |
| 04-19 | CITY FACILITY OPERATION, MAINTENANCE & REPA | PLANNING AND DEVELOPME | N | 14,400 | 31,000 | 45,400 | 490,968 | 445,568 | 3,345,981 | |
| 04-04 | Government Media Production | MEDIA SERVICES | N | - | - | - | 33,391 | 33,391 | 3,379,372 | |
| 04-09 | Personnel | CITY CLERK / PERSONNEL | N | - | - | - | 42,190 | 42,190 | 3,421,563 | |
| 04-18 | We Deliver! | PUBLIC LIBRARY | N | - | 35,000 | 35,000 | 39,112 | 4,112 | 3,425,674 | |
| 04-21 | Contracted Services Cemeteries | STREETS AND PARKS | Y | 12,000 | - | 12,000 | 33,482 | 21,482 | 3,447,157 | Funding = \$3,455,000 |
| 04-05 | SENIOR CENTER ADMINISTRATION & ADVOCACY | SENIOR CENTER | N | 18,400 | - | 18,400 | 81,743 | 63,343 | 3,510,500 | |
| 04-03 | City Webpage Design, Admin, and Support | MEDIA SERVICES | N | - | - | - | 19,533 | 19,533 | 3,530,033 | |
| 04-01 | Interdepartmental Media Tech Services | MEDIA SERVICES | N | - | - | - | 12,973 | 12,973 | 3,543,006 | |
| 04-02 | Interdepartmental Communications Admin & Support | MEDIA SERVICES | N | - | - | - | 11,168 | 11,168 | 3,554,174 | |

TOTALS

\$ 724,669 \$ 852,229 \$1,576,898 \$ 5,131,072 \$3,554,174

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Funding Needed | \$ 3,554,174 |
| Funding Allocated | \$ 3,455,000 |
| Gap-Unfunded Programs | \$ (99,174) |

Date: August 12, 2011
To: Leadership Team
From: Team #4 – Citizen Focused, Well-Run Government
Subject: Final Round Decision Explanation

The priority for our team was a Citizen Focused, Well-Run Government. Through training and other activities we deduced that there were six primary factors that are essential to meeting our priority. These six factors in order of importance are leadership, financial stability, communication, participation, strong management, and knowledgeable and experienced staff. We ranked these factors based on how they build upon each other. For example, you can't have participation if there is a lack of communication.

There is a strong correlation on how the offers were ranked and how they fit within the ranked primary factors. If you look at our final purchasing plan, you will see that we have the mayor (leadership primary factor) offer ranked at the top along with offers that influence financial stability. Many of the offers that ranked low with our team met a lower ranked primary factor and/or we felt that they weren't good value for what they provided.

Throughout the whole process our team had few disagreements, so it was no surprise that we ranked many of the offers similarly in our initial ranking. The only disagreement that our team had with our final ranking were the offers that fell just above or below the line. There was some reshuffling done in our final ranking compared to our first round ranking. This was due to the questions that were given to the leadership team about their offers after the first round ranking and their answers to these questions.

Looking at the offers that we received it became clear that there's not much flexibility or more efficient measures that can happen to free up monies to fund another program. Some of the following areas that can be looked at and explored further are listed in this paragraph. A new building use policy to take advantage of new large meeting spaces at the EMS and Fire Department with the hope that it would create more revenue. Looking at installing efficient equipment in city buildings to save on utilities cost. Exploring different city attorney options next year as the contract will run out in 2012. Studying what the reduction in polling locations would do to voter turnout.

As stated earlier, we have found that there's not much flexibility or cost saving measures that will act as a silver bullet and save all of the programs that fell below the line. Moving forward it will be up to the Mayor and the leadership team to create the final purchasing plan; this is just a recommendation from what information we had to work with.