

ADDENDUM NO. ONE
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
ORGANIZATIONAL REVIEW
PROJECT NO. 458-24
CITY OF THORNTON, CO

TO: Prospective Proposing Firms and all others concerned

DATE: January 14, 2025

PURPOSE: To provide additional information and clarification to the solicitation documents for the above-referenced Project.

1. The following questions and answers are provided for additional clarification to the Request for Proposal (RFP). All answers from Thornton in response to Vendor submitted questions have been provided in **bold** text.

Question #1: The scope of work is fairly extensive; can you provide the city's budget for this project?

Answer #1: The City has identified funding but does not have a set budget for the Project. Proposals will be evaluated based on both responsiveness to the Scope and overall cost.

Question #2: When does the City of Thornton envision the vendor completing all project deliverables and scope (e.g., December 31, 2026)? Side note: the RFP states, "The initial award from this solicitation will be from the date of the final signature of the agreement until December 31, 2030."

Answer #2: The Project deliverables and Scope of Work outlined in the RFP shall be completed by June 2025. If additional work is needed beyond June 2025, that work will be mutually agreed upon via Change Order, without having to complete a new contract.

Question #3: Is there a budget range for this project?

Answer #3: Please see answer #1.

Question #4: Can you provide the total number of employees in the City?

Answer #4: The 2025 Budget includes funding for 1,171.5 full-time equivalent positions and 137.5 part-time equivalent positions.

Question #5: Should community feedback or external stakeholder perspectives (e.g., residents, businesses) be included, or is the focus strictly internal?

Answer #5: No external community feedback will be included in the study. However, interviews with relevant external stakeholders may be part of the study and those stakeholders will be identified by the City.

Question #6: Do you have any workload data available?

Answer #6: Yes, depending on the “areas of evaluation emphasis”, relevant workload data will be made available.

Question #7: Is there a budget for this project?

Answer #7: Please see answer #1.

Question #8: Can you clarify the intent of the award for the five year contract? Is this a Master RFP to for a consultant to complete organizational reviews of all city departments across the city over the next five years?

Answer #8: Please see answer #2.

Question #9: Are you looking for a cost proposal to complete organizational assessments for each and every city department across the city within this RFP?

Answer #9: The proposal should include an assessment of the “areas of evaluation emphasis” identified in the Project scope.

Question #10: Are there specific departments you would like to complete first? Or an order of priority for reviewing departments?

Answer #10: There is not a priority for the review and some of the “areas of evaluation emphasis” are likely interrelated. However, the City would be interested in receiving work that is completed in advance of the June deadline.

Question #11: The scope of work identifies areas of evaluation emphasis and activities. Can you please clarify what you mean by “potential department scope of Review”? Is the expectation that you are asking that we evaluate specific line items (1-7) across the city organization, that may exist in multiple departments?

Answer #11: The “areas of evaluation emphasis” are in most cases cross-departmental in nature. The “potential department scope of review” is intended to identify which of the current departments should be included in the review of each “areas of evaluation emphasis”.

Question #12: Do you have a budget identified for this project effort? The scope is relatively large and will require significant engagement across the city.

Answer #12: Please see answer #1.

Question #13: Are you open to a variation on approach that allows for phased review of departments to address the evaluation areas? If so, what priorities would you have?

Answer #13: The consultant can phase the work as they see appropriate. However, the entire study shall be completed by the June deadline.

Question #14: What is the anticipated budget or budget range for this project?

Answer #14: Please see answer #1.

Question #15: The solicitation states that “initial award from this solicitation will be from the date of the final signature of the agreement, until December 31, 2030.” What is the anticipated timeline for this project, for instance when would you anticipate receiving the final report and presentation?

Answer #15: See answer #2.

Question #16: What are the expectations regarding time on-site? Are there specific meetings, presentations, or activities for which you would like the project team to be on-site, versus opportunities to work and meet remotely (e.g. via Microsoft Teams)?

Answer #16: There are no set expectations regarding time on-site. It is anticipated that much of the work could be done remotely or virtually, however, there may be engagement opportunities or feedback sessions that would benefit from in-person meetings.

Question #17: Are there any requirements or preference given for:

- a) Local or regional Contractors or Contractors with an office in Colorado?
- b) Local or regional subcontractors?

- c) Contractors or subcontractors with certification as Minority, Women, or Disadvantaged Business Enterprise?

Answer #17: No. There are no preferences given.

Question #18: The solicitation states that “The engagement process will create opportunities for City Manager’s Office Staff, key personnel in Departments identified in the “Potential Departments of Review”, broad representation of City Employees, and Elected Officials to provide feedback about challenges and opportunities that may be addressed by structural changes or other engagement opportunities as identified by the engagement plan.” Do you have an estimate for the number of individuals across agencies who will be involved in this project so that we can develop an estimated number of individual interviews or small group meetings that will be required?

Answer #18: It is estimated that the number of individuals involved in the process could be between fifty (50) and one hundred (100), though feedback could be collected through a variety of methods including surveys, group meetings, and other alternatives to individual interviews.

Question #19: Which cities have been identified as potential comparable peer cities for the purposes of benchmarking?

Answer #19: A list of potential peer cities will be provided, along with an opportunity to discuss additional or alternative peer cities.

Question #20: Does the city prefer a concurrent or phased approach to complete the Areas of Evaluation Emphasis? If phased, are the Areas of Evaluation Emphasis in priority order?

Answer #20: Please see answer #10 and #13.

Question #21: Does the city have an anticipated completion date, and can the city share any timeline goals related to budget development or any other upcoming major planning effort?

Answer #21: Please see answer #10 and #13.

Question #22: Does the city have an estimated budgeted amount for this project?

Answer #22: Please see answer #1.

Question #23: Does the City of Thornton have a Community Engagement Framework that would guide the engagement process? If not, how would you rank your expectations on community engagement in

terms of low (surveys), medium (surveys and online interviews), high (surveys, online interviews, focus groups, and on-site engagement).

Answer #23: The City is looking for proposing firms to recommend an engagement framework that best meets the desired scope of the review.

Question #24: "Community Connections" is listed as one of the proposed departments for review, but it is not listed in the 2024 organization chart. Is there a "Community Connections" department or did the city mean to identify another department?

Answer #24: Community Connections is an office within the Parks and Recreation Department.

Question #25: Section C.2, 3e requests the Proposed Not to Exceed Cost: not to exceed pricing and the estimated hours and hourly rate schedule. Section D.1 Pricing Information states that "This section shall include a description of the proposed costs and prices. All pricing information shall be limited solely to this section of your proposal." Section D.6 contains a cost table. Does the City want the pricing information in Section C.2, 3e in the proposal, Section D.1, or Section D.6?

Answer #25: Proposing vendors must use section D.6 to submit pricing information.

Question #26: Does the City want that page included in the proposal with the table in Section D.6, or would the City accept a recreation of the table within the proposal document containing the same information?

Answer #26: As long as the same information is included, proposing vendors may recreate the table within their proposal document.

Question #27: Are in-person meetings, interviews, or presentations required, and if so, how frequently are these anticipated?

Answer #27: Please see answer #23.

Question #28: Does the City have a preference for on-site stakeholder engagement versus virtual meetings?

Answer #28: Please see answer #16.

Question #29: For final presentations or deliverables, is there a requirement for these to be conducted in person?

Answer #29: Not a requirement, but there may be a feedback meeting that would benefit from being conducted in-person.

Question #30: Who would serve as our individual or team of project sponsors to work with on this project? Also, do you have a steering committee or similar for this project already formed?

Answer #30: The Project will be led by a steering committee of staff in the City Manager's Office, including the City Manager, Deputy City Managers, and prior Interim City Manager.

Question #31: Do you have relevant employee engagement and perception feedback at a departmental level that could be used as input for the project?

Answer #31: No.

Question #32: Do you have customer feedback by interaction type for various departments that could help indicate points of contact and which areas are doing well and/or need improvement in design?

Answer #32: The City will provide resident surveys that evaluate satisfaction with City services.

Question #33: When would you like the project to start? Do you have an ideal duration for the project?

Answer #33: The Project should kickoff in February and be completed in June.

Question #34: What is the budget for this project?

Answer #34: Please see answer #1.

Question #35: Do you anticipate this being an MSA with one consultant or multiple consultants?

Answer #35: No preference.

Question #36: In addition to the City of Thornton ETC Institute Community Survey Resident Findings Report 2023, does the City have a recent customer satisfaction-specific survey for both in-person and on-line services?

Answer #36: The 2023 survey is the most recent survey.

Question #37: Does the City have a recent employee engagement survey?

Answer #37: No.

Question #38: What are the Peer cities that Thornton has already identified and how many per cities would the city want in the evaluation?

Answer #38: Please see answer #19.

Question #39: What list of firms have already demonstrated interest?

Answer #39: There is no requirement for firms to submit an interest to propose.

Question #40: Did the City of Thornton participate in any US Conference of Mayors or ICMA surveys in the last 5 years? If so which surveys?

Answer #40: No.

Question #41: What are the names of the information system used for CMMS, Financial Budget and Accounting, HR and Payroll, and Permitting?

Answer #41: The City uses City View, VUEWORKS, JD EDWARDS, and NEOGOV and is in the process of upgrading the payroll and financial ERP system

Question #42: What systems do the following departments use for equipment tracking, staffing and scheduling for fire, police, parks and public works?

Answer #42: The core systems for Fire and Police are not germane to the study. Parks and Recreation and Infrastructure use VUEWORKS.

Question #43: What performance management or KPIs are used and tracked by department or division? (sometimes share in monthly reports, city manger budget discussions and or budget books.)

Answer #43: The City tracks a variety of performance measures and relevant workload data will be made available.

Question #44: Has the city already used some firm for PR, organizational reviews, budget making, HR recruitment in the last 5 years? If so, which firms were used? (Example – placement of the City Manager, etc).

Answer #44: The City has contracted with a number of executive recruiting firms for various positions.

Question #45: Are City staff aware of the upcoming organizational review and its purpose? Or, should the selected consulting firm expect to conduct initial communication and readiness activities?

Answer #45: The organizational review has been communicated to the organization but it is expected that the selected consultant will continue to advise on organizational change and communication throughout the review.

Question #46: Has the City conducted any previous organization reviews/ assessments or performance audits, and if so, what were the findings and outcomes?

Answer #46: No.

Question #47: Are there recent customer satisfaction or employee engagement surveys that can be shared?

Answer #47: Please see answer #32.

Question #48: Does the City want the consultant to develop descriptions for any new or realigned positions recommended as part of organizational restructuring?

Answer #48: The selected consultant should provide broad responsibilities for any new or realigned positions, but does not need to develop formal job descriptions.

Question #49: Does the City have a preferred project timeline and completion date?

Answer #49: Please see answer #33.

Question #50: Has the City established a budget or budget range for this project? If so, can the City share that information?

Answer #50: Please see answer #1.

2. All other terms and conditions shall remain unchanged except as provided by this Addendum. Proposing firms must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum in their Proposal.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. ONE

Megan deGrood, CPPB
Purchasing Manager

Date