



ST. TAMMANY PARISH

MICHAEL B. COOPER
PARISH PRESIDENT

May 14, 2026

Please find the following addendum to the below-mentioned RFP.

Addendum No.: 1

RFP#: 26-3-3

Project Name: Consulting Services for Emergency Disaster Claims

RFP Due Date: Thursday, May 28, 2026

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS:

Question 1. Has the Parish previously contracted with any other consulting firms to complete similar disaster consulting work? If so, which firm(s)?

Answer 1. No, this has not been previously contracted.

Question 2. What is the estimated contract value for the desired emergency disaster claim consulting services?

Answer 2. The estimated contract value is \$100,000.00, with billing based on actual hours worked. The actual value will depend on the size and scope of the disaster.

Question 3. Will there be in-person work requirements, or is the client okay with remote work?

Answer 3. Working remotely is acceptable.

Question 4. Has St. Tammany Parish procured these services before?

Answer 4. Please refer to Answer No. 1.

Question 5. Is this a re-compete of an existing contract?

Answer 5. Please refer to Answer No. 1.

Question 6. Is there an incumbent vendor for this contract opportunity which is currently providing these services?

Answer 6. Please refer to Answer No. 1.



ST. TAMMANY PARISH

MICHAEL B. COOPER
PARISH PRESIDENT

Question 7. Given that responses to proposer inquiries are due May 22, 2026, and proposals are due May 28, 2026, would the Parish consider extending the proposal due date to allow adequate time to incorporate final addenda responses and complete proposal printing and shipping activities, particularly given the Memorial Day holiday weekend?

Answer 7. No time extension will be granted at this time.

Question 8. Section 1.5.I and 1.5.J reference customer service personnel, including an account manager and designated customer service representative(s). Can the Parish clarify the anticipated roles and responsibilities for these positions under this contract

Answer 8. Proposers should submit a plan outlining potential roles and responsibilities that may be utilized to complete the project.

Question 9. PART I OVERVIEW, Section 1.5.J (Resumes) allows Offerors to submit resumes for “any other key personnel to be assigned to this Project,” while Attachment A-2 (Pricing Sheet) provides a set of standard roles and allows for additional positions to be proposed. Can the Parish clarify which roles it considers to be ‘key personnel’ for evaluation purposes, and whether this designation is limited to specific positions listed in Attachment A-2 or determined by the Offeror’s proposed staffing approach?

Answer 9. The Parish considers “key personnel” to be those individuals the Provider identifies as essential to the successful performance of the project. Section 1.5.J intentionally allows Provider to propose resumes for any roles they deem critical, rather than limiting key personnel to a predefined list. Attachment A-2 is provided for pricing purposes and does not, by itself, designate which positions are considered key. Therefore, the determination of key personnel is based on the Provider’s proposed staffing approach and the roles they identify as central to delivering their solution, whether or not those roles appear in Attachment A-2.

Question 10. PART I: OVERVIEW, Section 1.4 (Proposal Submittal) requires Offerors to submit a W-9 with their response if they have not done business with the Parish. Can the Parish advise on where in their response Offerors should include their W-9?

Answer 10. The W-9 should be submitted with Attachment A-2 - Proposal Pricing Sheet.

Question 11. PART I: OVERVIEW, Section 1.4 (Proposal Submittal) references submission by ‘certified mail with return receipt requested,’ while a subsequent provision states that proposals may be sent via ‘certified mail, hand-delivery, or courier service.’ Can the Parish confirm that delivery via commercial courier services (e.g., FedEx, UPS) is acceptable and does not require certified mail with return receipt?

Answer 11. Commercial courier services are acceptable. Proposer is solely responsible for ensuring that its courier service provider makes inside deliveries to our physical location. The Parish is not responsible for any delays caused by the proposer’s chosen means of proposal



ST. TAMMANY PARISH

MICHAEL B. COOPER
PARISH PRESIDENT

delivery. Proposer is solely responsible for the timely delivery of its proposal. Failure to meet the proposal opening date and time shall result in rejection of the proposal.

Question 12. PART V: GENERAL PROVISIONS, Section 5.46 (Veteran Initiative and Hudson Initiative Programs) requires proposers to identify certified small entrepreneurship subProviders, including the work to be performed and the dollar value of each subcontract. Can the Parish confirm whether proposers may include descriptions of subProviders and their scope of work within Section 1.5.I (Customer Service) or another technical section, and provide the associated hourly rates for those subProviders within Attachment A-2 (Pricing Sheet)?

Answer 12. Providers may submit the anticipated usage of a subProvider who is certified under the Veteran and Hudson program, as long as the percentage of work displayed is for potential activation.

Question 13. Can the Parish confirm that the required forms to be submitted with the proposal include Attachment A-2 (Pricing Sheet), Attachment C (Acknowledgment and Waiver), evidence of insurance in accordance with Attachments D and H, and Attachments F-1 and F-2 (Scoring Matrices)? If so, can the Parish clarify where within the proposal these forms should be included (e.g., appendices or a separate forms section)?

Answer 13. The referenced documents are required for submission. As well as any other documents deemed pertinent by the Proposer, which the Proposer wishes the Parish to consider.

Question 14. PART I OVERVIEW, Section 1.5.I (Customer Service) requests information including personnel assigned, toll-free number, and ‘account inquiry.’ Can the Parish clarify the specific information it would like to see in this section (e.g., staffing structure, roles and responsibilities, service approach, communication protocols, response times, tools/technology, and performance metrics)? Additionally, can the Parish clarify what is meant by ‘account inquiry’ in the context of this engagement?

Answer 14. The Parish requests that Section 1.5.I (Customer Service) include a description of how the Provider will support the Parish throughout the engagement. This generally includes, but is not limited to, the following types of information: the staffing structure and personnel assigned to customer service; roles and responsibilities of those personnel; the Provider’s overall service and support approach; communication protocols; expected response and resolution times; tools or technology used to manage and track customer issues; and any performance metrics used to measure customer service quality. While the Parish does not prescribe a specific format, Providers should provide enough detail to demonstrate a clear and effective customer service model. The term “account inquiry” is used to refer to the processes by which the Parish may request information, clarification, status updates, or issue resolution related to its account, contract activity, project tasks, billing, or other service-related matters. Providers should describe how such inquiries will be handled within their proposed customer service structure.



ST. TAMMANY PARISH

MICHAEL B. COOPER
PARISH PRESIDENT

Question 15. PART I OVERVIEW, Section 1.5.G (Financial Proposal) indicates that we should include any and all costs, while Attachment A-2 requests hourly rates and a total proposal amount. Given that this is an as needed contract, can the Parish confirm whether a detailed pricing build up including level of effort assumptions and ODCs such as travel and expenses is required as part of the proposal? If such a build up is required, can the Parish provide an estimated level of effort or assumptions so that all Offerors may develop their pricing on a consistent basis? Alternatively, can Offerors just provide hourly rates?

Answer 15. The proposer shall provide any and all costs, including hourly rates by position/job title, rates for potential incidental costs such as travel, costs/rates for any software service, or third-party charges, or they should note that those costs are included in their hourly rate schedule.

Question 16. PART I OVERVIEW, Section 1.5.C requests descriptions of all relevant consulting assignments completed within the last three (3) years. Given the breadth of our experience, can the Parish confirm whether proposers may limit submissions to the most relevant projects that best demonstrate qualifications for this engagement, rather than providing an exhaustive list of all projects?

Answer 16. The Parish confirms that proposers may focus on the most relevant consulting assignments completed within the past three years. An exhaustive list is not required. Proposers should prioritize projects that best demonstrate their qualifications and alignment with the scope of this engagement

Question 17. PART III EVALUATION indicates that cost is allocated 10 points in the evaluation criteria. Can the Parish clarify how cost will be evaluated, including whether the lowest cost proposal will receive the full 10 points and other proposals scored on a proportional basis, or if an alternative method (e.g., cost realism or best value) will be used?

Answer 17. The number of points awarded to each Proposer for Overall Cost and Fees will be determined by applying the cost scoring formula.

$$\text{Cost Score} = \left(\frac{\text{Lowest Proposed Price}}{\text{Proposer's Price}} \right) * \text{Max Points}$$

The Proposer with the lowest price will receive the full maximum points available for cost. All other Proposers will receive a proportionate share of the points, based on how much higher their proposed price is compared to the lowest price.

End of Addendum # 1