

PITTSBURGH REGIONAL TRANSIT

TRANSMITTAL MEMORANDUM #4

SUBJECT: Workforce Analysis Services
Request for Proposal No. 26-23

DATE: May 28, 2026

Please find enclosed the following:

- RFP 26-23 – Answers to Questions

The following signature acknowledges the receipt of this Transmittal Memorandum #4. Please include this sheet with your Proposal.

Signature

Name of Company

Date

Sign above and return signature page only in Appendices Section of RFP Response:

Pittsburgh Regional Transit
Procurement Department
345 Sixth Avenue, Third Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222-2527

Attention: Deb Norkevicius

TO: All Holders of Request for Proposal No. 26-23
Workforce Analysis Services

DATE: May 28, 2026

SUBJECT: Answers to Questions Posed by Interested Parties

The information provided herein below is for informational purposes only. Any changes to the RFP will be by written addendum only and nothing stated in the following material shall be construed as a change or qualification, in any way, to the provisions of the RFP.

QUESTION #1: Can PRT provide additional detail regarding which divisions, departments, and position classifications are included within the approximately 283 administrative roles and 352 staff members identified in the scope.

RESPONSE #1:

All divisions, departments and positions within the agency that are not represented.

QUESTION #2: Will PRT provide current organizational charts, reporting structures, position descriptions, and workforce/headcount data at project initiation? If so, what systems or formats will be used?

RESPONSE #2:

Yes, in PDF format.

QUESTION #3: Has PRT conducted any prior organizational, workforce, classification, or compensation studies that will be made available to the selected consultant?

RESPONSE #3:

PRT recently conducted a Compensation Desk Audit, with the most recent review concluding in May 2026.

QUESTION #4: What level of stakeholder engagement does PRT anticipate during the project (e.g., number of interviews, focus groups, workshops, or leadership working sessions)?

RESPONSE #4:

We expect all eight members of the senior leadership team, including the CEO, to participate in individual interviews. The number and structure of focus groups and workshops will be left to the discretion of the selected firm. At a minimum, we would anticipate focus groups that include both new hires and tenured employees, as well as any additional employee groupings the vendor deems appropriate.

QUESTION #5: Does PRT anticipate any constraints related to labor agreements, civil service requirements, or organizational governance that should be considered when developing recommendations?

RESPONSE #5:

Since the Workforce Analysis Services are primarily focused on non-represented employees, we do not anticipate any constraints imposed by the represented employee groups. However, we would expect that any recommendations take into consideration whether the non-represented employee has responsibility for managing represented employees.

QUESTION #6: Can PRT clarify the expected depth of the peer benchmarking analysis, including whether the review is expected to include organizational structure comparisons, management/reporting layers, staffing ratios, role classifications, and compensation comparisons in addition to overall headcount comparisons?

RESPONSE #6:

We expect the recommendations to include an assessment of the organizational structure aimed at improving workflow efficiency, evaluating management reporting layers (whether excessive or insufficient), analyzing staffing ratios, and reviewing role classifications to identify redundancies or opportunities to consolidate duties into a single position, as well as evaluating overall headcount.

QUESTION #7: Is the estimated twelve (12) week schedule for completion of Tasks 1–10 a fixed requirement, or may proposers recommend alternative or phased schedules based on the proposed methodology?

RESPONSE #7:

At this time, we prefer to complete the project within the estimated twelve (12)-week schedule for completion of Tasks 1–10.

QUESTION #8: Does PRT have an anticipated budget range, target spend, or not-to-exceed amount established for this engagement?

RESPONSE #8: PRT does have budget constraints, however, we cannot release this information. We would like to have the vendor provide what they feel is reasonable and fair given the marketplace.

QUESTION #9: Which Strategic Plan priorities are most important to reflect in recommendations?

RESPONSE #9:

The strategic items pertaining to efficiency, quality of service, funding, cost savings, and overall operational effectiveness.

QUESTION #10: What artifacts will PRT provide for the org/role review (org charts, position descriptions, title lists, headcount by function, reporting relationships, span-of-control data)?

RESPONSE #10:

Organizational charts will be provided in addition to job descriptions.

QUESTION #11: Will PRT provide any internal performance/operational metrics to inform “client needs,” or should the team rely on interviews and publicly available benchmarks?

RESPONSE #11:

PRT can provide KPI for any of the items we track.

QUESTION #12 What benchmark outputs are expected—role mapping, spans/layers, headcount ratios, job architecture comparisons, or a smaller set of “best practice” illustrations?

RESPONSE #12:

We expect to receive a proposed organizational chart reflecting any recommended changes, along with identification of positions considered redundant, proposed adjustments to span of control and organizational layers, headcount ratios, and job architecture comparisons, as well as a concise set of “best practice” illustrative models for reference.

QUESTION #13 For the final deliverables: what level of detail is expected in the comprehensive report (e.g., role-by-role findings vs thematic recommendations)?

RESPONSE #13:

We expect the main body of the report to include thematic recommendations—broad, pattern-based conclusions that cut across multiple roles or departments. Rather than focusing on individual positions, these recommendations should identify systemic issues or opportunities, such as excess layers of management, inconsistent job leveling, duplication of administrative duties, or inefficient spans of control, and propose organization-wide improvements. Based on our experience, strong reports typically present role-by-role findings in the appendix or supporting sections, while reserving thematic recommendations for the main body so that executives can readily focus on actionable insights without being drawn into excessive detail.

QUESTION #14 Will the proposer interviews on June 17 and 18 be conducted virtually, or onsite?

RESPONSE #14:

The interviews are slotted for in-person or Teams Link .

QUESTION #15 Does PRT prefer (or require) that the employee and stakeholder focus groups/interviews/working sessions be conducted onsite or virtually?

RESPONSE #15:

The employee and senior team meetings can be conducted onsite or virtually (Teams).

QUESTION #16 Has PRT established a budget for this project that you are able to share with proposers?

RESPONSE #16:

PRT does have a budget established for this project, we are not able to provide that information. PRT is asking that the Proposer provide reasonable fees on the Fee Sheet or/and acceptable alternative fee structure.

QUESTION #17 What prompted this workforce analysis initiative at this time?

RESPONSE #17:

The workforce analysis initiative was prompted by the organization's need to conduct its first comprehensive review of its workforce structure. As this type of analysis has not previously been undertaken, it represents an opportunity to establish a baseline understanding of organizational efficiency, staffing alignment, and structural effectiveness.

In addition, given that the organization receives federal, state, and local funding, the initiative is also intended to demonstrate responsible stewardship of public resources by assessing whether staffing and organizational design support efficient and effective use of funding.

QUESTION #18 Has PRT conducted any prior workforce, organizational, classification, or compensation studies within the past 3–5 years? If so, will those materials be made available to the selected consultant?

RESPONSE #18:

As stated in item 3, since 2019 we have scheduled a Compensation Desk Audit every three years. The first Pay Equity Analysis was conducted in 2025. We will be able to share some of the information.

QUESTION #19 Is PRT seeking recommendations only, or does it anticipate implementation support in a future phase?

RESPONSE #19:

Based on the recommendations, we may solicit implementation support.

QUESTION #20 Are there specific departments, divisions, or functions that PRT considers higher priority or higher concern within the administrative structure review?

RESPONSE #20

At this time, I believe all of the departments, division, require a review. However, Operations would be of higher concern.

QUESTION #21 Will PRT assist with scheduling interviews/focus groups and coordinating internal communications?

RESPONSE #21:

Yes.

QUESTION #22 Are there any restrictions on access to employees or departments due to labor relations, confidentiality, or operational considerations?

RESPONSE #22:

Since the focus is non represented employees there are no restrictions.

QUESTION #23 Does PRT have preferred peer transit agencies for benchmarking purposes, or should the consultant independently determine peer comparators?

RESPONSE #23:

Since we have recently completed a Compensation Desk Audit, the peer transit agencies for benchmarking purposes are:

Dallas Area Rapid Transit	Regional Transportation District
Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority	San Diego Metropolitan Transit System
Maryland Transit Administration	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Metropolitan Council	Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority
Metropolitan Transit Authority of Houston	TriMet (formerly known as Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon)

QUESTION #24 Should benchmarking focus solely on transit agencies, or may comparable public-sector or quasi-governmental organizations also be included?

RESPONSE #24:

The primary focus should be on transit agencies; however, many non-represented positions also exist in private, public, and quasi-governmental organizations. In those cases, please use your professional judgment. For example, core IT roles such as systems administration, cybersecurity, network engineering, software development, data analytics, and help desk support rely on similar foundational skills, tools, and certifications whether performed in a transit agency or in private industry.

QUESTION #25 Should benchmarking focus solely on transit agencies, or may comparable public-sector or quasi-governmental organizations also be included?

RESPONSE #25:

Please refer to item 24 Response.

QUESTION #26 Is the anticipated 12-week timeline fixed, or is PRT open to alternative schedules based on the consultant's proposed methodology?

RESPONSE #26:

Please refer to item 7 Response.

Deborah Norkevicius

Deborah Norkevicius
Professional Services Contract Specialist

cc: Project File

RFP 26-26 TM 4 Q&A

Final Audit Report

2026-05-28

Created:	2026-05-28
By:	Deborah Norkevicus (DNorkevicus@rideprt.org)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAA__ugo8tuYfivN47SWxPCiKo0DVgNQ5iN

"RFP 26-26 TM 4 Q&A" History

-  Document created by Deborah Norkevicus (DNorkevicus@rideprt.org)
2026-05-28 - 2:17:07 PM GMT- IP address: 199.102.91.189
-  Document emailed to Deborah Norkevicus (DNorkevicus@rideprt.org) for signature
2026-05-28 - 2:17:54 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Deborah Norkevicus (DNorkevicus@rideprt.org)
2026-05-28 - 2:18:05 PM GMT- IP address: 72.153.231.12
-  Document e-signed by Deborah Norkevicus (DNorkevicus@rideprt.org)
Signature Date: 2026-05-28 - 2:18:14 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 199.102.91.189 - Signature Appearance Selected: IMAGE
-  Agreement completed.
2026-05-28 - 2:18:14 PM GMT