



ADDENDUM NO. 1

Date: March 30, 2026

From: City of Grand Junction Purchasing Division

To: All Proposers

RE: Classification and Compensation Study, RFP-5883-26-KF

Proposers responding to the above-referenced solicitation are hereby advised that certain requirements have been **clarified, modified, or supplemented** as of the date of this Addendum, as outlined below.

Please take note of the following:

1. **Question:** Do you expect every employee to be involved in the job analysis interview process, or a represented subset?

Answer: The City does not expect interviews/desk audits with every employee. The selected Consultant shall propose a right-sized, tiered approach (e.g., broad coverage via questionnaires and targeted interviews/desk audits and job analysis sessions for higher-impact, higher-change, or disputed classifications).

2. **Question:** What are your expectations for in-person meetings, and how many do you think will need to be conducted?

Answer: The City is open to virtual, on-site, or hybrid delivery methods. Proposers shall recommend an approach based on best practices and clearly identify which components are proposed to be in person versus virtual and the assumptions reflected in the fee.

3. **Question:** Since you have represented positions, would we be expected to engage with the unions as part of this project?

Answer: The City does not have bargaining units/union-represented employee groups for this project. Union engagement is not anticipated.

4. **Question:** Can you provide a high-level estimation for how many different job families you have?

Answer: The City currently organizes classifications into 29 job families. The job family structure may be refined as part of this study based on the Consultant's recommendations and City review/approval.

5. **Question:** Do you use the term job classifications and job descriptions interchangeably? If not, how many job descriptions are included in the study?

Answer: The City generally maintains one job description/class specification for each job classification. Therefore, the number of job descriptions included in the study is expected

to align closely with the number of classifications (approximately 250). The City has established compensation practices and guiding principles. The City is open to either refining the existing approach or developing a new compensation philosophy and is seeking the consultant's assistance to document the philosophy and translate it into operational guidance that can be applied consistently.

- 6. Question:** Do you have an existing compensation philosophy? If so, are you looking for updates to the current approach or the development of a new philosophy?

Answer: The City has established compensation practices and guiding principles. The City is open to either refining the existing approach or developing a new compensation philosophy and is seeking the consultant's assistance to document the philosophy and translate it into operational guidance that can be applied consistently.

- 7. Question:** Do you anticipate comparable research as part of market study? If so, how many organizations do you expect to be included in the study? (We typically recommend 8 -10 comparable orgs.)

Answer: Yes. The consultant shall recommend a defensible comparator/peer group and market approach as part of the market strategy. The City anticipates a reasonable peer set consistent with best practices; the final list will be confirmed during the project.

- 8. Question:** Do you have existing market survey data that you would like to include as part of the study?

Answer: The City may have existing market-related information that can be provided to the selected consultant for consideration. The consultant remains responsible for recommending and applying a defensible market approach.

- 9. Question:** Do you expect us to facilitate virtual communications for all staff, or will that be managed by Grand Junction's project team?

Answer: The consultant is expected to develop/support key communication content related to the study (e.g., presentations, talking points, FAQs). The City will generally manage distribution using internal communication channels.

- 10. Question:** What is your proposed timeline for completing the Classification and Compensation Study?

Answer: Proposers shall recommend a realistic timeline and workplan. The City does not anticipate completion in time for the July 2026 budget cycle and expects proposers to account for sequencing and decision points.

- 11. Question:** Can you please provide the current classification plan with job families and career levels?

Answer: The City can provide its current classification list and current job family structure. Career levels/ladders may be developed or refined as part of the study.

12. Question: When was the last time the compensation plans were updated?

Answer: The City last completed a comprehensive classification and compensation study in 2008 (including updates to job descriptions, job families, and related structure). Since then, the City has conducted periodic market studies to inform pay range updates.

13. Question: When was the last market assessment completed?

Answer: The City has conducted market studies approximately every two years since 2008. The most recent market study was completed in 2023. Available market study materials will be provided to the selected consultant for consideration as part of this engagement.

14. Question: How many job descriptions will need to be updated?

Answer: The number of job descriptions requiring updates will depend on the consultant's findings and recommendations (including any approved consolidation, re-leveling, or restructuring). The City does not anticipate full rewrites for all classifications. The consultant shall propose a tiered approach, with more substantial updates targeted to classifications requiring change and validation/minor updates for stable classifications.

15. Question: What are the expectations for consolidating job titles? How many job titles are anticipated after the consolidation?

Answer: Consolidation is not a predetermined outcome. The consultant shall evaluate opportunities for simplification/streamlining and provide recommendations with rationale. The City has not established a target number of classifications/titles after consolidation.

16. Question: What compensation survey sources do you currently use?

Answer: The City has used a combination of market sources, including the Colorado Municipal League (CML), Employers Council resources, and pay plan/salary schedule information from comparable individual organizations/jurisdictions. These are examples and are not intended to be an exhaustive list. The selected consultant will be provided available City market study materials (including the most recent study) and shall recommend a defensible market strategy and sources consistent with the RFP.

17. Question: What is the current HRIS system?

Answer: Oracle HCM.

18. Question: What is meant by "tiered strategy for classification review intensity" in the Scope of Services section?

Answer: It means the consultant should scale effort based on need (e.g., questionnaires for broad coverage and targeted interviews/desk audits and job analysis sessions for higher-impact, higher-change, or disputed classifications), rather than applying the same level of review to every classification.

- 19. Question:** Can the City provide a roster of all classifications and incumbents by department, including vacancy rates and FTE vs. part-time/seasonal status?

Answer: Yes. The City anticipates providing a roster and related workforce data to the selected consultant early in the project, subject to standard data handling and confidentiality practices.

- 20. Question:** Are there known problem areas driving the need for this study (e.g., compression, outdated classification series, recruitment/retention challenges, grievances)?

Answer: Yes. Key drivers include modernization since the last comprehensive study, ensuring internal alignment, addressing compression/compaction concerns, improving classification structure sustainability, and reviewing market competitiveness and pay plan design. The City has also received employee feedback expressing dissatisfaction with the current step plan and progression approach, and the City is seeking evaluation of pay structure alternatives consistent with the RFP scope.

- 21. Question:** Is all work to be completed virtually? If on-site presence is required, for which portions is it needed (e.g., kickoff, workshops, presentations)?

Answer: The Proposer shall recommend an approach based on its expertise and the industry's best practices. The City is open to virtual, on-site, or hybrid delivery methods. Proposers should clearly describe its proposed strategy and implementation plan, including which project components (e.g., kickoff, stakeholder engagement, workshops, presentations) are recommended to be conducted in person versus virtually, and the rationale for that approach.

Proposers shall ensure that its Price Proposal clearly reflects the level of effort, tasks, and delivery methods proposed, including any assumptions related to travel or on-site engagement. This level of detail is required to allow the City to evaluate proposals effectively and to support potential adjustments during negotiations with the preferred Proposer.

- 22. Question:** Does the City have a target completion date for the study?

Answer: See response to Question 10. The City requests that proposers recommend a realistic schedule and does not anticipate completion in time for the July 2026 budget cycle.

- 23. Question:** Are there any periods (e.g., budget cycles, labor negotiations) that may impact project scheduling or limit City staff availability?

Answer: Yes. The City's annual budget cycle and other operational peak periods may affect availability. Proposers shall recommend a schedule with practical sequencing and decision points.

- 24. Question:** How many presentations to City leadership and/or the governing body are anticipated, and what level of support materials (e.g., manager talking points, FAQs, communication tools) is expected?

Answer: The consultant should assume multiple touchpoints, including leadership briefings and governing body support as needed. Communication tools such as FAQs and manager talking points are included in the deliverables; proposers should describe the recommended approach and level of effort.

- 25. Question:** When was the last classification and compensation study conducted for the City, and which firm performed that study?

Answer: The City last completed a comprehensive classification and compensation study in 2008. The study was performed by Fox Lawson and Associates.

- 26. Question:** When were the last classification study and compensation study conducted?

Answer: Please refer to the response to Question 25.

- 27. Question:** What is the City's budget or maximum contract amount for this study?

Answer: Proposers shall refer to **Section 4.5.2 – Budget** of the solicitation.

- 28. Question:** Of the approximately 900 employees and 250+ classifications, how many are Police (sworn vs. civilian) and Fire (suppression vs. support)?

Answer: Based on the City's current class/comp schedule (effective March 1, 2026), Police includes approximately 132 sworn and 111 civilian employees. Fire includes approximately 156 suppression employees and 27 support/administrative employees. These figures are estimates for proposal purposes; final counts will be confirmed in the roster provided after award.

- 29. Question:** Are Police and Fire classifications expected to be included in both classification and compensation analysis, or compensation only?

Answer: Police and Fire classifications are included in both the classification and compensation components of the study.

- 30. Question:** How many classifications are single-incumbent positions?

Answer: Based on the City's current class/comp schedule (effective March 1, 2026), approximately 131 classifications have a single incumbent/position. This is an estimate for proposal purposes; final roster details will be provided after award.

- 31. Question:** How many supervisors and managers are included in the approximately 900 employees covered by this study?

Answer: The City estimates approximately 201 employees in supervisory, management, and executive roles. This figure is provided for proposal purposes; final counts will be confirmed in the roster provided to the selected consultant after award.

- 32. Question:** What proportion of classifications does the City anticipate needing substantial updates versus minor revisions? How many new classifications are anticipated from the analysis?

Answer: The City has not set a predetermined proportion or number. The consultant shall assess and propose a tiered approach and provide recommendations based on findings.

- 33. Question:** Are the current class specifications up to date and standardized, and are full rewrites expected for all 250+ classifications or only those impacted by changes?

Answer: The City does not anticipate full rewrites for all classifications. The consultant shall recommend and apply a tiered approach; substantial updates should be targeted to classifications requiring change, with validation/minor updates where appropriate.

- 34. Question:** Does the City have an existing classification specification template that must be used, or is it open to the vendor proposing a standardized format?

Answer: The City is open to the consultant proposing a standardized format.

- 35. Question:** Please confirm whether the classification study is expected to include allocation recommendations at the individual position level, physical requirements analysis, and/or appeals support. If appeals are included, please indicate the anticipated volume and whether the City has an established process.

Answer: The study is focused on classification-level review, job documentation, and program recommendations. Individual position allocation determinations and formal appeals support are not specifically required unless proposed as an optional service and accepted by the City through contract negotiations. Physical requirements should be addressed only to the extent necessary within job documentation updates.

- 36. Question:** Approximately how many classifications are anticipated to require FLSA exemption review? Is the review expected for all classifications or only those impacted by job documentation changes?

Answer: FLSA exemption review is expected for classifications impacted by job documentation changes and any classifications where exemption status is unclear. The City has not set a fixed number; proposers should describe their recommended approach.

- 37. Question:** Does the City have an existing classification philosophy or policy document it can share?

Answer: The City may have existing policies/guidance related to classification and compensation administration. Any available documents will be shared with the selected consultant; part of this engagement includes clarifying and documenting governance and maintenance practices.

- 38. Question:** What level of employee participation and response rate is expected for position questionnaires?

Answer: The City expects broad participation and will support communications encouraging completion. Proposers should describe their approach to maximizing participation and managing follow-up in a practical manner.

- 39. Question:** The scope references listening sessions and job analysis sessions. How many listening sessions are anticipated? Does the City have a standard script or set of questions, or should the vendor develop them? What is the expected duration for each session, and how does the City envision listening sessions differing from job analysis sessions and/or job evaluation interviews?

Answer: Proposers shall recommend an engagement plan, including the number and format of sessions, consistent with best practices and the City's size/complexity. The consultant should propose scripts/questions and session structure for City review. Listening sessions focus on employee experience and program feedback; job analysis sessions focus on documenting work performed for classification validation (including consolidation/leveling considerations).

- 40. Question:** What level of labor union participation is expected in engagement activities?

Answer: Not applicable. The City does not anticipate labor union participation as part of this project.

- 41. Question:** How many bargaining units exist, and which employee groups do they represent?

Answer: The City does not have bargaining units applicable to this project.

- 42. Question:** Are there active MOUs that define pay structures or limit classification and compensation changes?

Answer: The City does not have MOUs associated with bargaining units for this project.

- 43. Question:** Will separate presentations or communications be required for labor groups?

Answer: Not applicable. The City does not anticipate separate labor-group communications as part of this project.

- 44. Question:** Are there any ongoing negotiations, grievances, or disputes relevant to this study?

Answer: The City does not have union negotiations/bargaining associated with this project. The City is not identifying any active issues that would prevent completing the work as scoped. The consultant should anticipate standard employee engagement considerations and will coordinate through the City's project governance process.

- 45. Question:** Will this study include base salary analysis only or total compensation (salary and benefits)? If total compensation, which benefit elements does the City wish to include?

Answer: The primary focus is base salary and pay structure. Proposers may describe if and how they would incorporate high-level total compensation context (e.g., core benefits) for competitiveness understanding; however, the City is not seeking a full benefits redesign as part of this scope unless proposed as an optional service.

- 46. Question:** Does the City have a preferred list of labor market comparator agencies? If not, how many comparable agencies does it wish to include in the study?

Answer: The City requests that the consultant recommend a defensible comparator list/market definition as part of the proposed market strategy. The final comparator list will be confirmed during the project.

- 47. Question:** How many benchmark classifications does the City anticipate including in the market pricing analysis?

Answer: The benchmark list will be developed early in the project as part of the market strategy and job matching rules. Proposers should describe their recommended approach for a City of this size and complexity.

- 48. Question:** How many pay grades are in the City's current salary structure?

Answer: The City's salary schedules include approximately 221 separate pay grades/ranges across its pay plans. Most pay grades/ranges are administered using a ten (10) step structure with 3% step progression. The full salary schedule will be provided to the selected consultant after award.

- 49. Question:** Does the City have an existing compensation philosophy or policy document it can share?

Answer: Please refer to the response to Question 6.

- 50. Question:** Is the City open to moving away from the current step-based pay plan, or should the alternatives remain within a step framework?

Answer: The City is open to evaluating alternatives, including modernized step-plan options as well as range-based or hybrid approaches, consistent with the RFP scope.

- 51. Question:** Are there constraints (legal, MOU, or system-related) on modifying steps or range structures?

Answer: The City is not identifying bargaining-unit MOUs that would constrain this project. Proposers should assume compliance with applicable laws and practical system administration considerations. Any system-related constraints will be addressed during the project as part of implementation planning.

- 52. Question:** Please clarify what is intended by “certification or skill recognition assessment and recommendations” and whether this analysis should be based on self-reported information from employees and supervisors or if there are existing City policies, programs, or data sources to be incorporated?

Answer: The intent is to evaluate whether and where certifications/skills should be recognized (including distinguishing job-required versus job-enhancing certifications) and to recommend options and governance controls. The consultant should use job documentation and available City records/data sources where available; any self-reported information should be validated through job analysis and City review.

- 53. Question:** Is an individual-level pay equity analysis (e.g., examining pay gaps by demographic characteristics) part of the scope of this study, or is the internal equity analysis limited to the classification level?

Answer: The study’s internal equity analysis is focused on classification structure/internal alignment and compensation program design. An individual-level demographic pay equity study is not specifically included unless proposed as an optional service.

- 54. Question:** Is the development of a wage progression tool (beyond the pay structure alternatives and step plan analysis) part of this study?

Answer: The study includes evaluation of pay structure alternatives and pay administration guidance (including recommended progression rules). A separate standalone wage progression calculator/tool (e.g., a pay progression matrix or automated worksheet) is not specifically required unless proposed as an optional service and accepted by the City.

- 55. Question:** Is the City requesting classification and compensation maintenance training sessions at the conclusion of the study, or is the knowledge transfer expectation satisfied by the governance documentation and editable deliverables described in the scope?

Answer: Knowledge transfer is expected through governance documentation and editable deliverables. Proposers may include optional training sessions if recommended.

- 56. Question:** Could you please share what factors are driving the decision to conduct this study at this time?

Answer: See response to Question 20.

- 57. Question:** Are there specific issues or challenges the City seeks to address through this study?

Answer: See response to Question 20.

- 58. Question:** Could the City please share the City’s current compensation philosophy, if there is an established philosophy?

Answer: See response to Question 6.

- 59. Question:** Does the City wish for the consultant to review, refine, or validate the existing philosophy as part of this engagement or develop a new philosophy?

Answer: The City is open to either refining the existing approach or developing a new compensation philosophy, and is seeking the consultant's assistance to document the philosophy and translate it into operational guidance that can be applied consistently.

- 60. Question:** Has the City established an internal budget for this project? If so, will that information be shared with proposers?

Answer: Proposers shall refer to **Section 4.5.2 – Budget** of the solicitation.

- 61. Question:** How soon after the expected contract execution does the City anticipated beginning the study?

Answer: The City anticipates beginning promptly after contract execution. The kickoff meeting is expected within ten (10) business days of Notice to Proceed.

- 62. Question:** Approximately how many job descriptions does the City anticipate need updating?

Answer: Please refer to the response to Question 14.

- 63. Question:** Does the City currently utilize a job evaluation system (e.g., point-factor method) to maintain internal equity? If not, is the City interested in implementing one?

Answer: The City is not requiring any single proprietary job evaluation system. Proposers should recommend a transparent, scalable, and explainable approach appropriate for the City. The City is not seeking a one-size-fits-all mandatory point-factor approach.

- 64. Question:** Does the City anticipate the use of a custom compensation survey, or should the consultant rely on existing published and publicly available sources (e.g., Mountain States Compensation Survey)?

Answer: Proposers should recommend an appropriate approach. The City is open to use of reputable published sources and peer jurisdiction data; any custom survey approach should be clearly described, justified, and reflected in the proposed fee and schedule.

- 65. Question:** Should the market analysis include both public and private sector organizations? If private sector data is needed, would the City be comfortable with using reputable published survey sources, given that private employers rarely participate in custom surveys?

Answer: Proposers should recommend the appropriate market approach by job family. The City anticipates a primarily public-sector comparison for most roles but is open to reputable published survey sources (including private sector data) where appropriate for specialized job families, provided the approach is documented and defensible.

66. Question: Would the City like the consultant to focus solely on base salary, or should the analysis also include total compensation elements such as benefits, paid leave, health insurance, and retirement programs? If benefits are included, should the consultant provide recommendations for potential adjustments based on the findings?

Answer: See response to Question 45.

67. Question: Does the City want the consultant to recommend adjustments to the current pay structure as a result of the study?

Answer: Yes. The scope includes evaluation of the current pay structure and development of alternatives and recommendations.

68. Question: Would the City like the consultant to provide recommendations related to compensation and pay administration policies?

Answer: Yes. The scope includes development/refinement of compensation philosophy and operational pay administration guidance.

No further questions will be accepted.

This addendum amends the original solicitation for the referenced project as outlined above. All other terms and conditions of the solicitation remain unchanged.

Proposers must acknowledge receipt of this addendum by completing the acknowledgment section on the **Solicitation Response Form** (Section 7.0).

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,



Kassy Nelson
Buyer
On behalf of Kathleen Franklin
Purchasing Agent
City of Grand Junction