


Figure 1
Ratings of Current
Financial Condition of
Cities/Villages by
Population Size







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




Number of respondents =

350 409 421 365 391

Figure 3
Public Works
Municipal Solid Waste

▨ Municipal Employees
■ Private for Profit
□ Other Methods




Number of respondents =


158 364 433 395 413 258

Figure 4
Public Works
Streets


▨ Municipal Employees
■ Private for Profit
□ Other Methods



Number of respondents =




Number of respondents =



Number of respondents =

Figure 7
Public Utilities
Electricity, Gas,
Water & Sewer



Number of respondents =

Figure 8
Public Utilities
Other




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]







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]



Number of Respondents =





Number of Respondents =



Number of Respondents =

281 196 175 215

Figure 13
Health and Human Services
Sanitation and Animal Control



Number of Respondents =

185 179 145 132 108 128 88 117 99

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



Number of Respondents =



278 102 64

Figure 18
Cultural and Arts Program





Number of Respondents =

Figure 19
Support Functions
Building Services





Number of Respondents =

Figure 20
Support Functions
Vehicle Operations





Number of Respondents = 403 278 273 381 402 365

Figure 21
Support Functions
Financial Services



Number of Respondents = 307 276 224 239 276 36 358

Figure 22
Support Functions
Other



**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?




Figure 27. Factors Causing Cities/Villages to Consider Privatization During the Past Five Years




Figure 28. Methods for Implementing/Promoting Privatization




Figure 29. Factors Contributing to Success in Privatizing Services




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?**



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




Figure 38. Source of Most Useful Privatization Information




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

