

# COUNTY OF BARNSTABLE

## PURCHASING

### DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

SUPERIOR COURT HOUSE

P.O. BOX 427

BARNSTABLE, MASSACHUSETTS 02630

Phone: (508) 375-6637

Fax: (508) 362-4136

Email:

edavis@barnstablecounty.org

**Elaine Davis**  
Chief Procurement Officer

## ADDENDUM NO. 1

Barnstable County Purchasing Department  
PO Box 427  
Barnstable, MA 02630

DATE ISSUED: January 21, 2014  
TO: All Bidders of Record  
SUBJ: Barnstable County Request for Proposals from experienced firms to prepare a comprehensive classification and compensation study for Barnstable County.

### ADDENDUM NO. 1

The following are questions submitted by a potential respondent. The responses to the questions are in blue.

1. The RFP notes approximately 195 employees; is a roster of job titles or at least a count of distinct jobs (and incumbents within each job) available for preview?  
**The existing job titles and position descriptions will be provided to the selected vendor.**
2. Is there already a market survey available for the service provider to draw from, or is the service provider expected to conduct a survey? Within the RFP, there appears to be language that can be interpreted both ways. Could you clarify your expectation?  
**Selected vendor is expected to conduct the market salary survey.**
3. If a survey exists to be drawn from, can you provide some further detail on that existing survey – e.g., who conducted the survey; who participates, roles covered; reward data available within it? **N/A**
4. If a survey is to be conducted in order to supply you with market information, are you open to use of general market data for the New England region to which Hay Group has access and can use to establish the market pay rate for relevant jobs, as a means of managing your project costs?  
**The vendor is expected to develop a salary survey based on municipal entities comparable to Barnstable County. The vendor is expected to propose comparable entities to Barnstable County before starting the survey.**
5. Are you open to revisions to the work approach you outline in the RFP, to make the process more efficient? For example, relative to Task Two:
  - For Position Questionnaires (PQs), could a group of incumbents in a common job collaborate to create one representative document for that job?

- In general, each individual employee is to be afforded the opportunity to complete a PQ; however, certain union positions within the Facilities Department and the Registry of Deeds will consolidate PQ's. to no more than 5 PQs for each of these departments.
    - Will incumbents have access to computers whereby the PQs can be completed via Word, collected and edited electronically?
      - Yes, employees will be able to complete PQ's electronically
    - Hay Group has experience whereby the PQs created have been able to stand as Position Descriptions. Might this be acceptable, as opposed to a rewriting process from PQs to draft JDs?
      - No, position descriptions are required for each position within Barnstable County. The majority of County positions have existing position descriptions and not all position description will need to be revised.
    - Further, if the questionnaires are to be approved by the Department Heads, can the Department Head interviews be used to also review the completed questionnaires for each Head's organization and subordinates, rather than the service provider interviewing each employee?
      - No, interviews are required. There are opportunities for consolidating interviews for union staff within the Facilities Department and Registry of Deeds
    - Could the county HR department be engaged to support collection of revisions?
      - Existing County staff will facilitate communications and deliverables between County departments and the selected vendor, but revising position descriptions, as needed, will be done by the selected vendor.
6. Can a sample (three to five) of your currently existing JDs be provided? Do position incumbents currently have access to same or could they be provided as part of the project? And, in your view, would they constitute a logical starting point to creating new JDs?

See attached sample position descriptions (Attachment C). Employees will be provided a copy of their existing position description as part of this process. It is the responsibility of the selected vendor to ensure that existing position descriptions accurately reflect employee's current responsibilities. In the instances where a position description does not exist, approximately 10 percent of existing positions, a new position description shall be developed by the selected vendor.

7. For Task Two D "Rate the relative value of the final job descriptions by utilizing the previously developed position-rating manual" – is there a position-rating manual already in existence (and if so can this be shared)? Or, will the service provider be expected to develop a new manual, per the fourth stated objective of the project? Given that Hay Group maintains a world-renowned, defensible system for job content measurement and comparison -- is the county open to its application as part of this engagement?

The service provider will be expected to develop a new manual; however, attached for reference is the rating for County's Supervisory, Professional and Technical positions.

8. For Task Three A “Determine the best methodology of compensating County employees (i.e. one salary schedule vs multi schedules)” – is this the one specific question to be addressed, or is it an example of a question to be answered within a broader set of methodology recommendations?

This should be addressed within the selected vendors proposed compensation methodology. The County anticipates that a proposed salary schedule would consist of a base, medium, and high range.

9. For Tasks Three A & B, it appears likely that the methodology for Task Three B will follow certain aspects for how Task Three A is defined, but there is a short requested timeline for Task Three B. If these tasks are indeed interdependent, would making Task Three A & B an iterative dialogue be acceptable in order to create an effective result?

Yes, that is an acceptable proposal.

10. Has a Project Manager been identified for this work, and is the choice an internal staff member or an external service provider? If internal, can you indicate the person’s current role?

The Project Manager will be the Assistant County Administrator, Margaret Downey.

11. Are you willing to share the identity, or at least the number, of service providers who have been provided with this RFP and who are expected to participate in bidding for the work?

Three other vendors have downloaded the RFP documents from the County website; however, there is no indication that they will be submitting a proposal.

---

Elaine Davis  
Chief Procurement Officer