

**OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE AUDITS  
OF THE  
CITY OF ROSEVILLE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
AND PARKS, RECREATION, AND LIBRARIES DEPARTMENT**

**ADDENDUM #1 – RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS**

Responses are provided below to questions received in writing on or before December 16, 2013.

1. Does the City have any expectations concerning the Programmatic areas to be included in the benchmarking/comparator evaluations contemplated under the second bullet at the top of Page 6. In particular which of the following areas are to be benchmarked against external comparators at a minimum:

- a. Public Works
  - i. Administration
  - ii. Engineering
  - iii. Street Maintenance
  - iv. Alternative Transportation
- b. Parks, Recreation, and Libraries
  - i. Administration
  - ii. Park Planning
  - iii. Recreation
  - iv. Adventure Club
  - v. Park Operations/Open Space
  - vi. Golf Operations
  - vii. Library & Museum

***Response: It is the City's desire to benchmark all programmatic areas (PA) described above; however, cost may be a driving factor. Proposal cost structures should account for benchmarking of all PAs, but provide alternative pricing strategies that would allow the City to narrow the scope of work if necessary for cost containment.***

2. Which Department(s) are to be evaluated concerning their Asset Management Program (refer to the fourth from last bullet at the top of page 6)?

***This project parameter was erroneously included in the scope of work. Please disregard. Both departments are included in the current citywide Enterprise Asset Management rollout.***

3. Is the City Childcare program referred to in the second to last bullet at the top of page 6 the Adventure Club? Are there other City Childcare programs to be reviewed?

***Response: The Adventure Club program is the only City-run childcare operation and the only childcare operation to be reviewed with this OPA.***

4. Is the City requiring these performance audits to be conducted under Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS) (also known as the “Yellow Book” published by the U.S. Government Accountability Office)?

***Response: No.***

5. Please provide a copy of the attribute-based framework and any supporting documentation currently being utilized for Operational Performance Audits (OPAs) of the City’s utilities.

***Response: The requested audit report is attached.***

6. Please provide a copy of (or a link to) the Materials Management for All Asset Groups – Findings and Best Practices Recommendations (April 2012).

***Response: The requested report is attached.***

7. A Council Communication dated September 20, 2010 titled Recommend Award of Contract for the Organizational Efficiency and Effectiveness Study contained a Scope of Work submitted by the winning bidder. Task 8 of the Scope of Work included “A set of implementation plans covering all recommendations consisting of implementation work steps; suggested responsibility; timing and sequencing for each work step; as well as cost and/ or savings.” Did the City receive these implementation plans and, if so, can the City provide a copy?

***Response: The final work product did not include a detailed implementation plan. City responses to the study’s recommendations were incorporated into the executive summary, which is attached.***

8. The RFP’s schedule does not indicate a completion date for the audits. Are these needed a) simply sometime within the calendar year, b) by some budget dictated date, or c) is the consultant free to propose whatever schedule they feel is most appropriate?

***Response: For this audit, completion by the end of the fiscal year (July) is desired, but flexibility can be provided. The City’s ultimate intent is to align the completion of future audits with the beginning of the annual budget planning process in February.***

9. The City has indicated that it prefers to hire one firm to do both studies, but will entertain proposals for a single area from the proposers. Assuming we propose on both projects, does this mean that we need to propose costs and schedules for both a joint award and two

potential single study awards? (Normally the combined costs of two separate studies would exceed the cost of two combined studies due to some reporting and coordination costs being shared between the two.)

**Response: One joint cost proposal is acceptable; however, pro-rata cost should be allocated to each department as appropriate for City budgeting purposes.**

10. Could you e-mail all proposing firms the Matrix study that led to these RFP's?

**Response: The Matrix Study and other supporting documents are attached.**

11. Can we assume that these 2 studies will focus exclusively on the functions within each OPA and that considerations such as a) transfers of portions of their operations to/from another department and/or b) the rethinking of centralized vs. departmental support services were covered in the Matrix work? This could include vehicle maintenance programs.

**Response: The primary focus of the OPAs should be on the functions within each identified programmatic area. However, the City will accept recommendations based on observations made during the course of the OPAs that may lead to greater efficiencies or effectiveness.**

12. No mention is made in the list of tasks of revenue optimization activities. Is this being done elsewhere or has it already been done? If not, should we include some analysis of revenue improvement opportunities? If we should be looking into this, is there a citywide A-87 study annually along with automatic fee adjustments? If so, could forward an electronic copy to all prospective proposers?

**Response: Revenue enhancement is not a primary focus of this effort; however, the City will accept recommendations based on observations made during the course of the OPAs. Development and other fees are evaluated through separate nexus studies.**

6. Negotiations with the highest ranked proposer are mentioned in the RFP. Is it the City's practice to attempt to negotiate price aspects of the proposal as part of those negotiations? Also, are items of concern in the proposed contract open to negotiation at that time as well?

**Response: Yes. The City reserves the right to negotiate price aspects and other contract items to address City budget constraints.**

7. Will you send out a list of those attending the bidders conference?

**Response: This list was emailed to attendees on December 13, 2013.**

Dated: December 21, 2013