REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)
MARKET ANALYSIS OF THE COMMISSION’S COMPENSATION SYSTEM

INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONS

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 The Delaware River Basin Commission ("DRBC" or "Commission") is a federal-interstate commission with regulatory authority to oversee a unified approach to managing the water resources of the Delaware River Basin without regard to political boundaries.

1.2 The Commission is seeking a qualified firm to provide an analysis of the market competitiveness of its current job classifications, salary grade system (the “General Schedule”), and total compensation (i.e., an employee’s salary in addition to available benefits).

1.3 Any changes to this RFP will be in the form of an addendum, which will be posted on the Commission’s website, www.drbc.gov.

1.4 The DRBC reserves the right to reject any or all submittals and to be the sole judge of the merits of each submittal.

1.5 The selected firm will be chosen based upon proposals received in response to this RFP and any amendments to this RFP, as described in Section 1.2, above.

1.6 Questions regarding this RFP should be directed to Elba Deck, the Commissioner’s Director of Finance and Administration, at 609-883-9500, ext. 201 or elba.deck@drbc.gov.

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

2.1 The project objective is to obtain an updated analysis of the market competitiveness of the Commission’s current compensation system.
2.2 In 2002, the Commission hired a professional services firm to perform a Position Classification and Compensation Program Review (the “2002 Review”). The job classifications and “General Schedule” (schedule of salary ranges by grade) in use today closely resemble those adopted as a result of the 2002 Review. Together with a revised performance evaluation system, these elements replaced the Commission’s historical “step” system of advancement based on tenure. The 2002 Review also evaluated the competitiveness of the Commission’s total compensation package (i.e., salary and benefits) relative to the market. The Commission would benefit from an updated analysis of market competitiveness.

2.3 The resulting analysis should determine the competitiveness of the Commission’s total compensation system as compared to local private sector, local public sector, and peer public agency employers.

2.4 The Commission anticipates that tasks to complete the analysis will include, but may not be limited to:

2.4.1 Identifying local private sector, local public sector, and peer public agency employers that are appropriate to include in the evaluation.

2.4.2 Developing and conducting a “market” survey of such employers’ total compensation.

2.4.3 Comparing salary and wage ranges and mid points for each Commission job classification to those for similar positions in the public sector, including up to ten federal/state/local public/government sector organizations (including DRBC member state and federal environmental and water resource agencies) and up to six peer public agencies (including other interstate water commissions in the mid-Atlantic, Midwest and New England area).

2.4.4 Comparing Commission salary and wage ranges by job classification to existing salary survey information for comparable positions in the private sector in the Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington metropolitan statistical area. For some positions, data developed by professional associations may be used.

2.4.5 Preparing a summary of similarities and differences in total compensation between the Commission and the selected comparison organizations. In addition to base salary or wages, total compensation will include paid leave, the value of health benefits relative to cost borne by employees, and other benefits that may not be readily quantifiable in terms of cost, such as flexible work schedules and remote or hybrid work options.
2.4.6 Preparing a summary of all salary grade adjustments annually and cumulatively over the preceding six years for the selected comparison organizations.

2.4.7 Providing recommendations, as appropriate, for adjustments to the Commission’s job classifications, General Schedule, and for changes to the Commission’s employee benefits offerings.

2.4.8 Presenting findings to senior Commission staff.

3. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS / PROPOSAL CONTENT

3.1 Proposals must adhere to the format and content prescribed by this RFP. Interested firms must include the following within the proposal:

3.1.1 General Description of the Proposed Approach. Provide a narrative of the proposed process and approach.

3.1.2 Work Plan. Provide information about proposed activities. Provide a timetable for completing the process within the timeframe outlined in Section 4, Calendar of Activities.

3.1.3 Staffing Plan, Including Resumes. Identify and provide a resume for each person who will work on the project and identify their role.

3.1.4 Point of Contact. The proposal must include the name and contact information for the bidding firm’s point of contact.

3.1.5 References. Please supply names and current contact information for three references for similar projects staffed by the individuals identified in Section 3.1.3.

3.2 Failure to adhere to these requirements, or the inclusion of conditions, limitations, or misrepresentations in the submittal, may be cause for rejection.

4. ANTIQUEATED SCHEDULE

The Commission and the selected firm should expect to adhere to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of RFP to potential Bidders</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>08/28/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of questions to the Commission</td>
<td>Bidders</td>
<td>09/11/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers to questions distributed to potential Bidders</td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>09/15/2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Commission reserves the right to modify the above schedule.

5. SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

Proposal

Interested bidders should send an electronic (PDF) file of their proposal (excluding the cost proposal) that includes the requirements outlined in Section 3, Submittal Requirements / Proposal Content, via email to: DRBCProposals@drbc.gov.

Cost Proposal

Bidders shall propose a total cost for this project as a “not to exceed” total dollar amount. The agreed upon total project budget may not be exceeded without prior authorization by the Commission. The cost proposal shall include the expected hours for each staff member proposed in Section 3.1.3.

Interested bidders should send or hand deliver one hard copy cost proposal in a sealed envelope clearly marked “Cost Estimate” to:

Elba L. Deck, Director of Finance and Administration
Delaware River Basin Commission
25 Cosey Road
P.O. Box 7360
West Trenton, NJ 08628-0360

Proposals (digital files) and sealed Cost Estimates (in hard copy only) must be received no later than 4:00 p.m., Eastern Time, on Friday, October 13, 2023. Proposals received after this time will not be considered. The Commission reserves the right to reject any submittals for any reason.

The Commission’s standard contract is available for review at: http://www.nj.gov/drbc/library/documents/DRBC_StandardContract.pdf. If the bidder cannot
execute the standard contract in its current form, the bidder must describe the exceptions in the proposal.

The Commission shall not be liable for any costs associated with the development, preparation, transmittal, or presentation of any proposal or material submitted in response to this RFP.

6. PROPOSAL SELECTION AND AWARD PROCESS

Proposals will be evaluated by a committee comprised of Commission staff members knowledgeable about the service(s) and/or product(s) that are the subjects of this RFP. Evaluation committee members may not speak with bidder representatives regarding pending proposals submitted in response to this RFP between the time of submission and the Commission’s selection of a bidder.

Accepted proposals will be reviewed by the evaluation committee and scored against the criteria outlined below. The committee may review references, request interviews/presentations (on-site or virtual) or additional details. The resulting information will be used to score the proposals. The evaluation committee’s scoring will be tabulated, and proposals ranked based on the numerical scores received. The proposals will be scored using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Description of the Proposed Approach</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Plan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Plan</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Proposal</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oral presentations may be used to clarify the contents of proposals. Scores may be adjusted based on oral presentations.