

Questions and Answers regarding the RFP - Operational and Organizational Assessment of the City of Ingleside

The questions and answers below concern the Request for Proposal sent out on May 12, 2017. The RFP included the possibility to send in questions until June 1, 2017. The responses were all published by June 5, 2017 on <http://inglesidetx.gov/Finance/bids-and-proposals/> and emailed to those asking the questions.

Is your website request for a different study? If so, can you tell us the status of the April RFP request from the city and if you need any further information on our April proposal? If this is a different study request, can you send us a request for proposal?

Yes, our website has the current RFP information. The City Council made a decision following the first RFP to subdivide the project, therefore a revised RFP was posted and we will forward to you.

This RFP was initially issued in March – why has it been reissued?

The City divided the project into two separate projects.

What budget amount has been set aside for this project?

That has not been finalized; however \$50k has been projected.

Will you be publishing a formal response to all questions received from bidders? If so, when will that be available?

As per the RFQ, question can be asked through June 1, 2017 and will be responded to as promptly as possible. A list of the questions and answers will be published by June 5, 2017 on our city website at <http://inglesidetx.gov/Finance/bids-and-proposals/>

For the previous RFP, you indicated that the 90-day completion timeframe was driven by the budget process.

a. **Is that still the case?**

We will entertain up to 120-days.

b. **When does the City's 2017/2018 fiscal year begin?**

Oct. 1, 2017

In the section titled Organizational Review on page 2, one of the tasks listed is: "Evaluate staff scheduling and process for managing overtime." While this is an important topic, and links directly to cost efficiencies, the nature of staff scheduling necessarily varies based on each City department's operational goals and service commitments, and a task of this sort suggests a detailed unit-level problem-solving process rather than an big picture goals-focused strategic assessment of either a department or the City.

This is a statement. There is no question being asked.

In the section titled Operational Review on page 2, one of the tasks listed is: “Produce an updated description of each job and produce a classification system based on job content analysis.” The scale and type of work required for this task also varies significantly from an overall assessment. I note that this is a revised RFP—perhaps this task is no longer part of the assessment project?

The classification schedule and rate structure has been moved to the second stage of this process and a separate RFP will be submitted upon the completion of the first project.

In the section titled Recommendations on page 2, one of the tasks listed is: “Provide training recommendations to improve operations and support succession planning.” While an assessment of the sort described often does result in a set of recommendations around training needs, goals or management systems, the inclusion of succession planning expands and reshapes the concept of training from an organizational system level to an individual development plan approach. The idea of succession planning does not appear elsewhere in the RFP; and we believe that this represents a separate body of work if indeed that is what is intended.

This is a method to identify basic training.

A second clarification is requested with regard to timeline for completion. In our experience with assessments of this nature, 120-180 days to completion are typical; and the number of City departments to be assessed does not suggest that a shorter time frame would yield best results for the City. Is the City willing to extend the timeframe subject to a reasonable project schedule included in a proposal?

We will entertain up to 120-days.

Item (4) of the “Deliverables” requires the vendor to supply the City with “updated job descriptions” and the “Timeline” as stated on page-3 of the solicitation specifies a project execution period of “90 days.” We are concerned that given the City’s staff consists of 101 people, complying with the 90-day project execution schedule will be very expensive to the City. So, we would like to understand if the City will consider extending the project period to 180 days to allow ample time to execute the assessments and careful development of the job descriptions?

We will entertain up to 120-days.