

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