



**REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
(RFP)**

For Professional Services

**Title: Classification and Compensation Study
ADDENDUM I – Response to Questions**



Addendum I – Response to Questions

RFP Submittal Deadline:

4:00 p.m.

October 7, 2016

RFP Contact:

Jennifer Callaway, Administrative
Services Director

JCallaway@sonoraca.com

City of Sonora
94 North Washington St
Sonora, CA 95370
(209) 532-4541

ADDENDUM I – Response to Questions

We thank you for your interest in the City of Sonora’s Request For Proposals (RFP) for professional services to conduct a citywide classification and compensation study. As per the instructions provided in the RFP, questions or concerns regarding the RFP were to be received by 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 21, 2016. Thirteen questions were received and are provided below with clarification.

1. I understand there are 32 classifications BUT we are wondering if we can get **a list of all classifications with the number of employees in each classification**. There was a salary range table included with the RFP but much of it prints out in black and is unreadable (it must have been a document with a lot of color that was printed in black and white and then the colored areas turned black, but was included with the RFP despite it being unreadable).

City Response: An excel file has been attached with the electronic version of the salary schedule that was provided in the RFP. In addition, below is a Summary of Positions by Department.

	2012/13 Funded	2013/14 Funded	2014/15 Funded	2015/16 Funded	2016/17 Funded	Comments
City Administration						
City Administrator	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
City Attorney	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	Prior Years Contracted Services
Admin Serv Dir/Finance Dir	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Administrative Analyst	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	
Admin/Finance Assistant	1.0	1.5	1.0	2.0	1.0	
Total Department FTEs	3.0	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.2	
Community Development						
Community Development Director	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Community Development Specialist	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Special Programs Coordinator	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Building Inspector	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Department FTEs	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	
Police Department						
Chief of Police	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Police Lieutenant	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	CY add 1.0 FTE
Police Sergeant	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	
Police Officer	9.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	
Communications Dispatcher	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	
Police Records Technician	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Total Department FTEs	18.0	19.0	19.0	19.0	20.0	
Fire Department						
Fire Chief	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Fire Captain	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
Fire Engineer	1.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	
Total Department FTEs	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	7.0	
Public Works						
Public Works Supervisor	1.0*	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Public Works Specialist	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	
Public Works Assistant	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Supervising Mechanic	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Equipment Mechanic	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Public Works/Building Inspector	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Total Department FTEs	8.3	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	
Total City FTEs	38.3	41.5	41.0	41.0	42.2	

* Reflects the promotion of a Public Works Specialist to Public Works Supervisor that occurred in July 2012.

- Page 5 of the RFP, “Compensation Plan” the first bullet refers to “Total Compensation” which means salary **and** benefits. Second bullet says “complete an internal **base salary** analysis”, and that of course means NO benefits included. Therefore, we are wondering if this is to be a **TOTAL COMP Study or a BASE SALARY study**. Can you clarify (this will affect the timeline as well as the cost estimate), please?

City Response: As part of the labor negotiations that took place in 2015, the City agreed to conduct a compensation and classification study to analyze market position and classification for each position. The City would like to review BOTH base salary and total compensation to obtain a fair comparable.

3. How long ago was the last study conducted? No year is given.

City Response: We currently have no compensation or classification study on file. It has been at least six years since such a study has been completed and possibly quite longer.

4. Page 3 of the RFP: As far as the “10 comparable cities/agencies” referenced in Introduction on page 3 do you have a predetermined list from the earlier study that you wish to use, either all or in part, OR do you want the Consultant to work with the City to select a list of 10 all new appropriate comparators for the study?

City Response: The City has asked each of the affected associations to identify agencies that they felt would be comparable, while the associations have done so the City has not finalized this list or agreed to any comparables at this time. While the City will determine the final list of comparable agencies, we are asking that the selected Consultant work with the City and Associations to identify and agree upon final comparable agencies.

5. I may have overlooked it but I read thru the RFP a couple times and am just not seeing this: how many hard copies of the proposal do you want OR is the proposal to be submitted electronically?

City Response: Proposal submittal requirements are outlined on page 10 of the RFP in section g. The City is requesting one (1) original and seven (7) copies of the proposal. The City’s preference is for hard copies. Thank you.

6. Should the hard copies (if hard copies are desired) be bound or may they be stapled? We are trying to be much more environmentally sensitive wherever possible and not bind with plastic or 3 ring binders, etc.?

City Response: The City will accept either stapled, bound or clipped proposals for convenience.

7. Can the example of a previous study be included on a thumb drive OR if emailed, sent electronically? Our final reports can run to 130-150 pages, or even more.

City Response: The sample report can be provided via thumb drive. Please include the thumb drive with the hard copies at time of submittal.

8. Has the City set aside a budget range for this project? If so, what is the total budget?

City Response: The City has not allocated a budget for this project at this time. As indicated above and in the RFP this project was agreed to during negotiations and approved by the City Council at that time. The Council is aware that a compensation and classification study will be completed by an outside consultant. It

is anticipated that the City will award contract on or around November 7, 2016. Contract approval and award will be presented to the City Council with authorization for a budget adjustment to accommodate costs.

9. How many single position classifications do you have?

City Response: The City does not have any classifications that are so unique that it is anticipated there would be difficulty in finding comparable agencies. The City currently has 15 classifications that have only one employee in them. Please see the table provided in response to question 1 above for more detail.

10. What is your management to staffing ratio?

City Response: The City has 46 FTE's, including the following six management positions – City Administrator, Chief of Police, Police Lieutenant, Fire Chief, Community Development Director and Administrative Services Director.

11. How many new classifications/job families do you anticipate?

City Response: The City has not determined an expected number of new classifications/job families. This would depend on the results of the study and how or what the City is able to implement.

12. Of the 32 classifications, how many are vacant or unfunded?

City Response: We currently have the following vacancies or have recently received resignation letters from the employee (recruitments and/or testing is currently underway for most if not all of them at this time):

Police Officer – 1*

***An additional Officer is currently in the background process for another agency**

Police Sergeant - 1

Fire Captain – 1

Public Works Specialist – 1

Office Assistant – Fire Department (PT) – 1

Office Assistant/Accounting Technician (PT) – 1

Police Dispatch (PT) – 1

In addition, the Chief of Police has announced a retirement date effective December 30, 2016.

All of the above vacancies above are funded at this time. We have one unfunded part-time Community Service Officer position. This position has previously been funded, however when the vacancy occurred in the position the City elected to keep the position unfunded for the balance of 2016/17 fiscal year.

13. By “internal relationship” development, do you envision an internal equity analysis of each position/incumbent or do you want a targeted analysis of positions that may be misplaced in the classification plan?

City Response: The City would like a targeted analysis of positions that may be misplaced in the classification plan and would seek guidance or recommendations from the consultant in selecting those positions.