NOLA Public School

Procurement Department

2401 Westbend Parkway, Suite 5076,

New Orleans, LA 70114

Paul A. Lucius, Executive Director of Procurement

November 2, 2026

Addendum No. 2

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL NO. 27-0062

PROJECT AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES

The following are the responses of the Orleans Parish School Board (NOLA-PS) to written questions received for RFP No. 27-0062, Project and Construction Management Services. These responses are issued by addendum and become part of the RFP. Except as expressly stated below, all terms of the RFP remain unchanged. Where a response refers to another question, the referenced response applies.

This Addendum consists of 19 Page(s).

1. **Section 2.1 – Anticipated Workload:**

Can OPSB provide the anticipated annual number, approximate construction value, and types of capital projects expected to be assigned under this contract?

Response to Question 1: OPSB anticipates assigning multiple capital projects annually under this contract. The number of assignments and aggregate construction value will depend on available funding, approved capital priorities, and project readiness. OPSB does not guarantee a minimum number of projects or construction value. Assignments may include roof replacements, HVAC replacements, building system upgrades, interior renovations, accessibility improvements, site improvements, and other capital repairs or improvements. Individual assignments may vary in size, complexity, and phase of development. For reference, the current project management contract is averaging approximately 200 hours per month. This historical average is provided for planning purposes and does not represent a guaranteed level of effort under the new contract.

2. **Sections 2.1 and 4.0 – Staffing Requirements:**

Does OPSB anticipate requiring dedicated full-time personnel, or may the consultant adjust staffing levels based on assigned projects and workload? Are there specific positions or minimum staffing levels required?

Response to Question 2: OPSB anticipates that the consultant will adjust staffing levels based on assigned projects, project schedules, and workload. Dedicated full-time personnel are not anticipated unless required for a specific assignment.

The consultant should propose a staffing plan identifying key personnel, roles, availability, and the ability to increase capacity as needed. Staffing must satisfy the requirements of the solicitation and provide sufficient resources to perform the assigned services.

3. **Section 2.4 – Field Inspections:**

What is the anticipated frequency of field inspections, and will any projects require full-time, on-site inspection personnel? Additionally, are daily inspection reports required for every active project or only on days when inspections are performed?

Response to Question 3: Field inspection frequency will depend on each project's scope, construction activities, schedule, and specific needs. Full-time, on-site inspection personnel are not anticipated as a standard requirement but may be required for specific assignments.

Inspection reports are expected for each day an inspection is performed. Any requirement for daily reporting or continuous on-site coverage will be established for the individual assignment, consistent with the solicitation.

4. **Section 2.1(l) – Emergency Services:**

Are there established response-time requirements or expectations for after-hours, weekend, or emergency capital repair assignments?

Response to Question 4: Response expectations will depend on the urgency and nature of the assignment. The consultant is expected to maintain reliable contact procedures and the ability to coordinate after-hours, weekend, or emergency assignments when needed.

Specific response times and coverage requirements will be established for individual assignments, consistent with the solicitation.

5. **Sections 2.2–2.4 – Consultant Responsibilities:**

Can OPSB clarify the extent of the PM/CM consultant's responsibility for design compliance, construction quality, and site safety, particularly where licensed design professionals and construction contractors retain responsibility for their respective services and means and methods?

Response to Question 5: The PM/CM consultant will perform the oversight, coordination, review, verification, documentation and reporting services required by the solicitation. These include reviewing design documents at all phases for completeness, coordination, constructability and alignment with project requirements; verifying compliance with applicable codes, standards and OPSB requirements; providing construction quality assurance and field inspections; and monitoring safety compliance in coordination with the responsible parties.

Licensed design professionals and construction contractors retain their respective responsibilities under their contracts. The consultant's services do not replace the design professionals' responsibility for their designs or the contractors' responsibility for construction quality, contract compliance, construction means and methods, and site safety.

The consultant must identify and document deficiencies, coordinate corrective actions, promptly report observed unsafe conditions to OPSB and the responsible parties, and track resolution. The retention of responsibilities by other project participants does not reduce the consultant's obligations under the solicitation and resulting agreement.

6. **Incumbent Consultant:**

Is there an incumbent Project and Construction Management consultant currently providing these services to OPSB? If so, can OPSB identify the incumbent firm and clarify whether this solicitation is intended to replace, supplement, or expand the existing services?

Response to Question 6: OPSB currently has an incumbent consultant providing project and construction management services. This solicitation is intended to replace the existing services upon expiration or conclusion of the current contract.

7. **Section 5.3 – Annual Budget:**

Does the stated annual budget of $1,680,000 represent the total funding available across all contracts awarded under this solicitation, or is that amount available for each selected consultant?

Response to Question 7: The stated annual budget of $1,680,000 represents the total anticipated funding across all contracts awarded under this solicitation, not an allocation for each selected consultant. Actual assignments and expenditures will depend on OPSB's needs and available funding.

8. **Sections 3.9 and 3.11 – Multiple Contract Awards:**

The RFP states that OPSB reserves the right to award contracts to multiple firms. If multiple firms are selected, how will project assignments be distributed among awardees (e.g., geographic assignment, project type, rotational basis, qualifications-based selection, or at OPSB's discretion)? Additionally, will each awarded firm receive a defined scope of services or anticipated level of effort?

Response to Question 8: If multiple firms are selected, OPSB will distribute assignments at its discretion based on project needs, relevant experience, qualifications, staff availability, capacity, and performance. Assignments will not necessarily be distributed equally or on a rotational basis.

Each firm will receive a defined scope of services and authorized level of effort for its assigned work. No paid work may begin until a Purchase Order has been issued by the Procurement Department, as required by Section 3.25. Award of a contract does not guarantee a minimum number of assignments, hours, or compensation (see Section 3.14).

9. **Section 9.0 – Annual Fee:**

Is the proposed annual fee intended to cover all assigned projects regardless of volume, or will OPSB establish a defined level of effort or workload?

If assignments exceed the anticipated level of effort, is additional compensation available through an approved amendment or other written authorization?

Response to Question 9: The proposed annual fee should reflect a defined staffing plan and anticipated level of effort. It is not intended to cover an unlimited volume of assignments. OPSB will establish the scope and authorized level of effort for assigned services.

If additional assignments require services beyond the authorized scope or level of effort, additional compensation may be considered, subject to available funding and an approved contract amendment or other applicable written authorization. Additional services must be authorized before the work begins.

10. **Sections 2.0 and 4.0 – Project Administration:**

Will OPSB provide access to its existing project management systems, reporting templates, and project records, or is the consultant expected to furnish these resources?

Response to Question 10: OPSB will provide access to available project records, existing systems, and reporting templates as needed for assigned services. The consultant is expected to furnish the personnel, equipment, software, and other resources necessary to perform its work, except where expressly provided by OPSB. The consultant must follow OPSB's reporting, document management, and information security requirements. Any proposed alternative systems or templates must receive OPSB approval before use.

11. **Section 1.2 – Contract Commencement:**

What is the anticipated commencement date, and will a transition or mobilization period be provided before the consultant assumes responsibility for assigned projects?

Response to Question 11: The commencement date will be established upon contract execution and issuance of written authorization to proceed. OPSB anticipates coordinating a transition and mobilization period to transfer available project records, review active assignments, and establish communication and reporting procedures. The duration and expectations will be confirmed with the selected consultant based on project needs.

12**. Section 9.0 – Invoicing and Payment:**

Will the annual fee be invoiced in equal monthly installments, or will payments be based on assigned projects, deliverables, or other established milestones?

Response to Question 12: The annual fee will not automatically be paid in equal monthly installments. The invoicing method and payment schedule will be established in the executed contract based on the approved scope, staffing plan, and level of effort. Invoices must document services performed and are subject to OPSB review and approval.

Qualifications and References

13. **Section 4.0 – Professional Qualifications:**

The RFP references a "Louisiana licensed General PM/CM Consultant" or an individual holding a recognized project management certification. Can OPSB confirm whether an active Louisiana General Contractor license satisfies the licensing requirement? If not, please identify the specific license or certification required and whether equivalent construction management experience and formal project management training are acceptable.

Response to Question 13 (see also Question 33): Section 4.0 requires that the proposer's team include one or more members who hold either (i) a Project Management Professional (PMP) certification from the Project Management Institute, or a comparable certification from another recognized PM/CM professional society (for example, the Certified Construction Manager (CCM) credential of the Construction Management Association of America), or (ii) a Louisiana professional license relevant to PM/CM services.

Louisiana does not issue a license titled "General PM/CM Consultant." For purposes of Section 4.0, the Louisiana-license alternative is satisfied by a team member who holds an active Louisiana architect registration, an active Louisiana professional engineer license, or an active Louisiana general contractor (building construction) license issued by the Louisiana State Licensing Board for Contractors.

A PMP certification held by a team member independently satisfies the credential element of Section 4.0. Equivalent construction management experience or formal project management training, without one of the credentials described above, does not satisfy the credential element, but such experience and training will be considered under the evaluation criteria in Section 6.0.

The credential element is one of several elements listed in Section 4.0; all other experience, staffing, and qualification requirements of the RFP continue to apply.

14. **Section 7.1 – References:**

Will OPSB accept references from public agencies, municipalities, or institutional clients demonstrating comparable project and construction management experience in lieu of exclusively school district references?

Response to Question 14 (see also Questions 49–51 and 54): Section 7.1 requires three (3) to five (5) client references from school districts, and that requirement remains in effect. Section 7.2, Tab 9 asks that references reflect services of similar scope; school district references meeting Section 7.1 satisfy Tab 9 when they reflect

comparable project and construction management services. Proposers may also include, in addition to the required school district references, references from public agencies, municipalities, universities, community colleges, or other institutional clients for comparable project and construction management services. Such additional references will be considered under the evaluation criteria in Section 6.0 but do not substitute for the school district references required by Section 7.1.

DBE Participation

15. **Appendix B – DBE Participation Requirements:** Genesis 360, LLC maintains active DBE certification through the Louisiana Unified Certification Program (LAUCP). Can OPSB confirm whether services self-performed by a certified DBE serving as the prime consultant count toward satisfying the 35% DBE participation goal, without requiring additional DBE subconsultant participation? Additionally, please clarify how a DBE-certified prime consultant should complete the required DBE responsiveness and verification forms when the proposed services will be self-performed.

Response to Question 15 (see also Questions 33 and 59): Yes. Under the DBE Provisions (Appendix B, Section F, Calculations), the total dollar value of a direct contract awarded to a certified DBE is counted toward the goal, provided the DBE performs a commercially useful function, meaning it is responsible for a distinct element of the work and performs, manages, and supervises that work itself. Accordingly, services self-performed by a certified DBE prime consultant count toward the 35% goal without additional DBE subconsultant participation, to the extent of the value of the work the DBE prime actually performs with its own forces. Work the DBE prime subcontracts to non-DBE firms does not count. A DBE prime consultant should (a) complete DBE Responsiveness Form 1 identifying itself as the DBE firm and stating the self-performed scope, estimated dollar value, and percentage; (b) complete DBE Responsiveness Form 2 identifying the self-performed scope and any DBE subconsultants; (c) submit the Verification of DBE Certification Form for itself, completed and signed as the DBE firm; and (d) submit the notarized DBE Professional Services Compliance Certification Checklist. All DBE forms must be submitted with the proposal.

Contractual Responsibilities

16. **Section 11.0 – Indemnification:**

Can OPSB clarify whether the consultant's indemnification obligations are limited to losses, damages, or liabilities attributable to the consultant's negligent acts, errors, omissions, or willful misconduct?

Response to Question 16: No change will be made to Section 11.0. The indemnity in Section 11.0(A) applies to losses, damages, and liabilities for injury to or death of persons, or loss of or damage to property, caused by or arising out of the performance of the work or services by the consultant or its officers, employees, or agents. It does not by its terms require the consultant to indemnify NOLA-PS for losses caused solely by the negligence of NOLA-PS. The Additional Insurance Requirements in Section 11.0 further provide that the consultant is responsible for damages or liabilities to the extent they result from the consultant's actual errors, omissions, or negligence. Any proposer that takes exception to Section 11.0 must state the deviation or exception in its proposal as required by Section 5.2.0; exceptions may affect the evaluation of the proposal.

17**. Project workload and the scope to be used for pricing**

We reviewed the capital schedules in RFQ 26-0108, Addendum No. 4 dated May 1, 2026: 23 FY26 projects totaling $22,323,231 and 34 FY27 scopes totaling $18,782,500 across Phases 1 and 2, plus earlier-year and Other Current Capital Projects. Examples include James Skelly Wright windows, Gentilly Terrace mechanical improvements and Eisenhower modular classrooms. To confirm how these historical schedules relate to this assignment, would NOLA-PS please clarify:

(a) whether those lists remain current, which projects have since been completed, deferred or revised, and what additional projects or scopes should be included; an updated FY27 list and anticipated FY28-FY29 work, distinguishing approved projects from forecasts, would be helpful;

(b) for each expected assignment, the school, scope, current phase, remaining budget, funding status, target dates and services to be performed by the selected consultant, including unfinished work from earlier fiscal years and expected concurrent construction sites;

(c) which projects OPSB personnel or other consultants will retain, which will transfer to the selected team, and whether transition begins at Notice to Proceed, including the expected overlap period and records handover;

(d) whether the confirmed project list, remaining work and program-wide duties will establish the common scope and workload assumptions all proposers should use for staffing and the annual fee;

(e) whether projects outside that confirmed baseline, or material additions to its scope or duration, would be addressed as additional services through prior written agreement on scope, staffing, schedule and compensation, or whether an allowance for such work should be included in the annual fee; and

(f) what allowance for emergency or unplanned work should be included, given Sections 1.2 and 2.1(l), and what authorization and fee-adjustment procedure applies when that allowance is exceeded.

Response to Question 17(a): The schedules in RFQ 26-0108, Addendum No. 4, provide historical planning information. Project status, scope, budgets, and schedules may have changed. Future projects remain subject to funding and approval. These schedules should not be treated as a confirmed assignment list for this contract.

Response to Question 17(b): OPSB will establish assignment details as work is authorized, including the location, scope, current phase, applicable budget and funding, target dates, and required consultant services. Assignments may include unfinished work from earlier fiscal years and multiple concurrent construction sites.

Response to Question 17(c): OPSB will determine which projects remain with internal personnel or other consultants and which transfer to the selected consultant. Transition timing, any overlap, and records handover will be coordinated through written authorization and the agreed transition plan.

Response to Question 17(d): Proposers should base staffing and annual fees on the solicitation and its addenda and clearly identify their proposed staffing, hours, capacity, and workload assumptions. Historical capital schedules do not establish a guaranteed workload. For reference, the current PM contract averages approximately 200 hours per month; this does not represent a guaranteed or maximum level of effort.

Response to Question 17(e): The annual fee is not intended to cover unlimited assignments. Services materially exceeding the agreed scope or authorized level of effort will require prior written authorization and, where applicable, an approved amendment addressing staffing, schedule, and compensation. Additional compensation is subject to OPSB approval and available funding.

Response to Question 17(f): Proposers should describe their capacity for emergency and unplanned assignments and identify any allowance included in the annual fee. OPSB will establish the authorized scope and response expectations for these assignments. Services exceeding the agreed allowance or level of effort must receive prior written authorization through the applicable contract amendment or authorization process.

18**. Current staffing and reporting expectations**

Would NOLA-PS please provide or confirm:

(a) the current staffing by role, typical and peak weekly hours, site coverage and division of responsibilities between OPSB and its consultants, to help plan continuity of service;

(b) any service priorities, lessons learned or desired improvements that NOLA-PS would like the selected team to address; and

(c) whether the April 2025 Capital Improvement Program Monthly Progress Report remains the preferred reporting format; please provide a current example, required reporting frequency and any changes expected from the selected consultant.

Response to Question 18(a): Staffing and site coverage vary with active assignments and project needs. For reference only, the current project management contract has averaged approximately 200 hours per month. This historical average does not establish required staffing, typical or peak weekly hours, or future workload. NOLA-PS retains program direction, project prioritization, and approval authority. The consultant will perform the program and project management services required by the RFP, coordinated with NOLA-PS staff to support continuity of service.

Response to Question 18(b): Priorities include timely project delivery, reliable budget and schedule reporting, proactive identification of issues, complete change order documentation, effective coordination with schools and project teams, and timely closeout. OPSB also seeks consistent records and clear tracking of decisions, responsibilities and outstanding actions.

Response to Question 18(c): The RFP requires program and project reporting (Sections 2.1(a), (k), and (m)) but does not prescribe a particular template. Proposers should assume monthly program-level reporting to NOLA-PS leadership, supplemented by project-level updates and prompt reporting of urgent issues. The specific format will be established with the selected consultant. Proposers may describe their proposed reporting approach in their proposals.

19**. Software platform and responsibility for its cost**

The April 2025 program report, printed pages 3-4, refers to a TEAMS program-management database, an FMX database conversion and OPSB SharePoint. Question 27 of RFQ 26-0108 Addendum No. 4 described a centralized project-tracking system under consideration, with District-provided training and maintenance of that system and FCA software. To help us build on the District's current systems and price the appropriate support, would NOLA-PS please clarify:

(a) what project-management, cost-control, scheduling, document-management, asset and facility-condition systems does OPSB currently use, and which must the selected consultant use or integrate with; please identify the product/vendor behind TEAMS and whether it remains in service;

(b) will OPSB provide the platform, licenses, user access, training and support, or must the owner-representative team furnish and pay for some or all of them;

(c) if consultant-provided software is required, what functions, user counts, integrations, implementation, data migration and support must be included in the annual fee, and may any identified software costs be priced separately; and

(d) who owns and administers the systems and data, and what export, retention, turnover and continuing OPSB access requirements apply at transition and contract completion?

Response to Question 19(a): OPSB is reviewing its project tracking and facility data needs. References to TEAMS, FMX, SharePoint, or a proposed centralized system in earlier documents should not be treated as

confirmation of current platforms or required integrations. The applicable systems and required consultant use will be identified for assigned services.

Response to Question 19(b): OPSB will provide access to District systems and available training needed for assigned work. Proposers should identify any additional software, licenses, training, or support included in their proposed fee and clearly state their assumptions.

Response to Question 19(c): Proposers should not assume an undefined software implementation, integration, or data migration obligation. Any proposed consultant platform should identify its functions, included users, licensing costs, implementation, migration, and support. Separately priced software or optional services should be clearly identified, subject to the solicitation's pricing requirements and OPSB approval.

Response to Question 19(d): NOLA-PS will own all project records and District data. Consultant systems must permit timely NOLA-PS access to, and export of, those records in usable formats, and all project records must be turned over to NOLA-PS at transition and contract completion, consistent with Sections 2.5(c), (h), and (i). Where federal funds are used, the record retention requirements of the EDGAR Contract Addendum (2 C.F.R. Part 200) also apply. Proposed subscription dependencies or restrictions on access or export must be disclosed in the proposal.

20**. Site coverage and responsibilities of other professionals**

Section 2.4 calls for routine and periodic inspections and daily inspection reports. Would NOLA-PS please clarify:

(a) whether every active project must be visited every working day, or whether a dated inspection report is required for each actual visit; please specify any minimum frequency by phase or requirement for full-time site coverage;

(b) whether reports should document observed deficiencies, corrective actions and work appearing to conform to the contract documents; and

(c) whether independent testing, special/code inspections, testing and balancing, and commissioning are separately contracted, with the PM/CM team coordinating or observing them, and whether design professionals retain their customary construction-administration and site-observation duties. Please identify any such services the PM/CM team must itself perform and price.

Response to Question 20(a): Daily visits to every active project are not anticipated as a standard requirement. A dated inspection report with photographic documentation is required for each day a site inspection is performed. Visit frequency will depend on construction activities, project phase and site needs. Any minimum frequency or full-time coverage requirement will be established for the individual assignment.

Response to Question 20(b): Reports should document work observed, progress, conformity with the contract documents, observed deficiencies, corrective actions required or taken, and follow-up on previously identified issues. The consultant must coordinate corrective actions with the responsible parties and track their resolution. Reports should clearly identify the extent and limitations of the observations performed.

Response to Question 20(c): The advertised services include observation of testing performed by others and coordination of startup, commissioning and training. These responsibilities must be included in the proposed fee. The parties responsible for performing independent testing, special or code inspections, testing and balancing, and commissioning will be confirmed for each project. Design professionals and contractors retain their respective contractual responsibilities without reducing the PM/CM consultant's obligations under the RFP.

Any requirement for the PM/CM consultant to directly perform specialized services beyond the advertised scope must be expressly identified and authorized in writing before work begins, with any associated compensation established through the applicable approval process.

21**. Annual fee and billing method**

The Cost Form requests an annual fee, and Section 5.3 states an annual budget of $1,680,000. Would NOLA-PS please confirm:

(a) whether the annual fee is a fixed fee for defined services or an annual not-to-exceed amount billed against actual authorized hours at the proposed rates; please identify the required invoice detail and treatment of administrative/support personnel;

(b) whether the stated budget is a firm annual ceiling, and whether an amendment may increase the authorized amount when assigned workload requires more hours than the agreed baseline; and

(c) whether unused annual authorization expires or may carry forward into a subsequent contract year, subject to appropriation and written approval.

Response to Question 21(a): Proposers should submit the annual fee requested by the Cost Form and identify the staffing, hours, rates, and services supporting that fee. The payment basis, whether fixed fee or an annual not-to-exceed amount billed against authorized hours, will be established in the executed contract. Invoices must identify the billing period, assigned projects, services performed, and applicable supporting detail. Administrative and support costs must be clearly identified, including whether they are included in proposed rates or separately charged, without duplication.

Response to Question 21(b): The $1,680,000 represents the total anticipated annual budget across all contracts awarded under this solicitation. It does not authorize expenditures or guarantee compensation. Any increase in a consultant's authorized amount requires available funding and prior written approval through the applicable amendment process.

Response to Question 21(c): Proposers should not assume unused annual authorization carries forward. Any continued availability must be expressly approved in writing, subject to appropriation, available funding, and the contract terms. Unused authorization does not constitute compensation earned or payable.

22**. Cost scoring and comparable staffing assumptions**

The Computed Cost Score provision on RFP page 7 refers to standard cost rates, while the Cost Form on page 30 requests an annual fee evaluated over three years. Would NOLA-PS please clarify:

(a) whether the formula uses annual fees, three-year total fees or blended hourly rates, and which costs are included; a simple calculation example would be helpful;

(b) whether OPSB will establish common hours, role mix or workload assumptions for cost comparison; if each firm proposes different hours, how will OPSB compare those offers on a consistent basis; and

(c) how proposed staffing and hours will be considered alongside price to confirm capacity to deliver the required services, and how differing scope assumptions will be addressed consistently in the evaluation and resulting agreement.

Response to Question 22(a): The "standard cost rates" referenced in the Computed Cost Score provision are the annual fee submitted on the Cost Form (Section 9.0). Proposers must submit an annual fee; blended hourly rates will not be used for scoring. The annual fee will be evaluated over the initial three-year term (annual fee × 3). The cost score is calculated as CSF = (LPC ÷ PC) × 15, where LPC is the lowest three-year proposed cost and PC is the proposer's three-year proposed cost. Example: if the lowest annual fee is $1,500,000 (three-year cost $4,500,000) and a proposer's annual fee is $1,800,000 (three-year cost $5,400,000), that proposer's cost score is ($4,500,000 ÷ $5,400,000) × 15 = 12.5 points. The lowest-cost proposer receives the full 15 points. Renewal-year pricing indicated on the Cost Form is not included in the score.

Response to Question 22(b): NOLA-PS will not establish common hours, role mix, or workload assumptions for cost scoring. Cost is scored on the proposed annual fee as described in Question 23(a). Proposers should clearly identify the staffing, hours, services, and assumptions supporting their fee.

Response to Question 22(c): Proposed staffing, hours, qualifications, and availability will be evaluated under the technical criteria in Section 6.0 (including Organizational Capacity & Key Personnel and Project Management & Operational Approach) to assess each proposer's capacity to perform the required services. A low fee supported by staffing insufficient to perform the scope may score lower under those criteria. The resulting agreement will define the authorized scope, staffing, level of effort, and compensation.

23. Changes in workload and labor costs

Would NOLA-PS please clarify:

(a) the process for adjusting authorized hours and fees when assignments increase, decrease or extend beyond the agreed schedule, including material additional effort arising from unforeseen project complexity, and how changes in workload and construction cost are considered; and

(b) whether hourly rates and annual fees must remain fixed during the initial three-year term, or whether stated annual labor-cost increases may be proposed; please identify permitted escalation or renegotiation during the two optional renewal years.

Response to Question 23(a): Changes to authorized hours or fees will be evaluated based on documented changes in scope, workload, staffing needs, and duration. The consultant must submit the reason for the adjustment, supporting hours and rates, schedule impacts, and proposed fee revision for OPSB review and written approval before performing additional services. A change in construction cost alone does not automatically justify a fee adjustment. Reduced assignments may also warrant adjustments consistent with the contract's compensation terms.

Response to Question 23(b): The annual fee stated on the Cost Form applies to each year of the initial three-year term and will not escalate during that term. As the Cost Form provides, proposers should indicate whether the annual fee will remain the same during the optional renewal periods; a proposer that intends a different renewal-year fee should state it on the Cost Form. Under the Contract Term and Renewal provision, any renewal terms will be in writing, are negotiable, and are subject to NOLA-PS approval.

24. Shortlisting and oral-interview schedule

RFP page 11 anticipates presentation notices on Friday, October 30; page 4 schedules oral presentations and the Evaluation Committee meeting for November 2-3. Page 10 provides for initial reviews to identify the top two to four firms. To help teams plan, would NOLA-PS please clarify:

(a) the anticipated timing and process for the initial proposal review and selection of the top two to four firms before the October 30 notices, including who conducts that review and how the published criteria will be applied;

(b) whether the November 2-3 committee meeting follows the interviews for final scoring and recommendation, and the intended sequence from initial review through final scoring;

(c) whether interviews are anticipated for shortlisted firms and, if feasible, whether approximately one week's notice could be provided to coordinate the proposed team's attendance;

(d) whether the anticipated sequence follows Procurement Handbook Appendix J, Steps 11-14 and its flowchart (PDF pages 53-54), which include notification, proposal evaluation, "Host oral presentations," and committee score-

sharing and recording. We understand that handbook printed page 18 says "if applicable" and that interviews are optional under this RFP; clarification of the intended approach would help our planning; and

(e) how interview clarifications will be considered within the existing published evaluation criteria, whether preliminary scores may be updated without adding interview points or changing weights, and when individual scores and the final ranking will be completed.

Response to Question 24(a): The Evaluation Committee will conduct the initial review of responsive proposals using the published evaluation criteria in Section 6.0. If oral presentations are held, the Committee may invite the top two to four (2–4) proposers based on that initial review. Proposers selected to present will be notified of their presentation time on Friday, October 30, 2026.

Response to Question 24(b): Yes. The sequence is: initial review; notification of firms selected for oral presentations (if presentations are held); oral presentations via Zoom on November 2–3, 2026; and completion of final scoring and the Committee's recommendation. The Evaluation Committee meeting on November 2–3, 2026 may include both presentations and final scoring.

Response to Question 24(c): Oral presentations are optional and at the discretion of NOLA-PS. If held, they will be conducted via Zoom, and selected firms will be notified on October 30, 2026. NOLA-PS cannot commit to one week's notice; proposers should plan around the published schedule. The presentation format is set out in the RFP (10 minutes set-up and introductions, 20 minutes presentation, 15 minutes questions and answers, and 5 minutes closing).

Response to Question 24(d): The evaluation will be conducted as described in the RFP, including notification of selected firms, oral presentations if held, individual scoring by Committee members, and each member's signing and dating of his or her individual score sheet, with scores tabulated and recorded by the Procurement Department coordinator.

Response to Question 24(e): As stated in the RFP, oral presentations are for informational and clarification purposes only. No additional points will be awarded or weighted based on oral presentations, and the scoring rubric in Section 6.0 will not be modified. Committee members may consider clarifications provided at presentations in applying the existing Section 6.0 criteria to the written proposals before finalizing their individual score sheets. Commitments made at presentations are binding. Individual scores and the final ranking will be completed following the presentations.

25. Evaluation committee composition

RFP page 9 anticipates a committee of three to five members, and Section 17.0(g) restricts scoring by individuals who supervise or manage an incumbent's work. Would NOLA-PS please confirm:

(a) the expected number of voting evaluators and their functional backgrounds, including construction/facilities, finance and DBE expertise; and

(b) how facilities staff may contribute relevant expertise in light of Section 17.0(g), including whether staff may serve in an advisory capacity without scoring?

Response to Question 25: (a) As stated in the RFP, the Evaluation Committee will consist of three to five (3–5) members, which may include administrators, department staff, non-public personnel, subject matter experts, and other qualified experts as determined by NOLA-PS. NOLA-PS does not identify evaluators before evaluation is complete. Each member must execute a conflict-of-interest disclosure.

Response to Question 25: (b) Consistent with Section 17.0(g), no individual who supervises or manages the incumbent's work will serve as a scorer or participate in the Committee's deliberations or scoring.

26. Resumes and the required submission format

Would NOLA-PS please confirm:

(a) whether supporting project lists may accompany resumes under Tab 11, outside the 20-page narrative limit, and whether any length or content limits apply;

(b) the tab numbering and order to follow, with reference to Section 7.2 and the October 9 pre-proposal presentation, and whether the cover page, cover letter, table of contents and tab-divider pages count toward the 20-page limit; and

(c) our understanding from the October 9 meeting that sample work should not be included unless requested, consistent with Tab 11(d), and whether supporting project lists attached to resumes are treated separately from sample work.

Response to Question 26 (see also Question 45): (a) Yes. Under Section 7.2, the 20-page limit applies to the narrative proposal only and does not include required forms, appendices, resumes, or sample work submitted under Tab 11. Project lists that are part of an individual's resume may be included with that resume under Tab 11(c). No specific length limit applies to resumes, but they should be concise.

Response to Question 26 (b) Proposals should follow the order of Tabs 1 through 11 in Section 7.2. The cover sheet, table of contents, and tab divider pages do not count toward the 20-page limit. (c) Correct. Sample work should not be submitted unless requested (Tab 11(d)). Project lists included in resumes are treated as part of the resumes, not as sample work.

27. Electronic delivery and receipt

To help ensure timely and complete electronic delivery following the October 9 guidance, would NOLA-PS please confirm:

(a) the maximum accepted attachment and total email size, whether SharePoint or OneDrive download links are permitted, and the required submission method if a single PDF exceeds the limit; and

(b) any required link-access settings and how Procurement will acknowledge successful receipt and the official receipt time?

Response to Question 27: (a) Proposals must be submitted electronically to procurement@nolapublicschools.com as stated in the RFP. **Microsoft 365 / Exchange Online (Business):** The default maximum receive limit is **35 MB to 36 MB.** If a proposal submission exceeds this limit, the proposer may submit the proposal in multiple PDF files via consecutively numbered emails, each of which must be received before the deadline. Vendors should be advised that SharePoint or OneDrive download links are not permitted.

Response to Question 27: (b) The official receipt time is the time the email is received in the procurement@nolapublicschools.com mailbox. The Procurement Department will acknowledge receipt by reply email. NOLA-PS is not responsible for delays in delivery; proposers should submit sufficiently in advance of the deadline.

28. Eligibility of a prequalified engineering subconsultant

Would NOLA-PS please clarify:

(a) whether an engineering firm prequalified under RFQ 27-0014, with no active OPSB project assignment, may participate as a subconsultant on this PM/CM team if it declines assignments that would create a conflict, including review of its own work; and

(b) the disclosures, independent-review arrangements and determinations needed under Section 17.0 before proposal submission, award or a specific assignment, including any separate Louisiana Board of Ethics determination.

Response to Question 28: (a) The RFP does not prohibit a firm prequalified under another NOLA-PS solicitation from participating as a subconsultant, provided the relationship is disclosed in the proposal. However, the PM/CM team may not review, oversee, inspect, or recommend payment for work designed or performed by any member of the team, and NOLA-PS will structure assignments accordingly. A firm on the PM/CM team that later seeks or receives a design assignment may be excluded from PM/CM services on that project. (b) The proposal must disclose the relationship and describe the firm's proposed role and the measures to prevent review of its own work. Any subcontracting requires prior written permission of NOLA-PS (Section 18.0(C)). Compliance with the Louisiana Code of Governmental Ethics is the responsibility of each proposer; NOLA-PS does not issue ethics determinations, and any proposer seeking one should contact the Louisiana Board of Ethics directly.

STAFFING AND PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

29. Minimum Staffing Requirements

Does OPSB require a minimum number of dedicated personnel or full-time equivalents (FTEs) to perform the services under this contract? If so, please identify the required positions and minimum staffing levels.

Response to Question 29: OPSB does not anticipate a fixed minimum number of dedicated personnel or FTEs. Proposers should identify the positions, staffing levels, hours, and availability necessary to perform the solicitation's required services and adjust capacity to meet assigned workloads. Any dedicated staffing requirements will be established for specific assignments.

30. Dedicated vs. Shared Personnel

Must personnel assigned to this contract work exclusively on OPSB projects, or may they support other projects provided that all OPSB contractual obligations are met?

Response to Question 30: Personnel may support other projects, provided they maintain sufficient availability to meet all OPSB contractual obligations, schedules, and response requirements. Any exclusive or dedicated staffing requirement will be expressly established for the applicable assignment.

31. Subcontractors and Independent Consultants

May the proposed project and construction management team include qualified subcontractors, or must key personnel be direct employees of the prime contractor?

Response to Question 31: The proposed team may include qualified subconsultants. Section 18.0(C) requires prior written permission of NOLA-PS before the consultant delegates or subcontracts its responsibilities. Proposers must identify each subconsultant and its personnel, roles, qualifications, and availability in the proposal. Subconsultants identified in the proposal and approved in the executed contract will be deemed approved for purposes of Section 18.0(C); any later addition or substitution requires separate prior written approval.

The RFP contemplates personnel employed by subcontractors or partners and does not generally require all key personnel to be direct employees of the prime consultant. The prime consultant remains responsible for the performance and coordination of all services and compliance with the solicitation's requirements.

32. Professional Licensing and Certification

Section 4.0 references a Louisiana-licensed General PM/CM Consultant or a Project Management Professional (PMP) certification. Could OPSB clarify the specific licensing or certification requirements? Would a PMP certification independently satisfy this requirement?

Response to Question 32: See Question 13.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) REQUIREMENTS

33. DBE Participation Calculation

How is the 35% DBE participation goal calculated? Is it based on the total contract value, actual expenditures, or another method? Additionally, does participation by a certified DBE prime contractor count toward the participation goal?

Response to Question 33: DBE participation is measured as a percentage of the total dollar value of the contract. Proposers state their committed participation on DBE Responsiveness Forms 1 and 2, and compliance is then determined by actual participation (payments made to DBEs), documented through the required monthly DBE compliance reports. Participation by a certified DBE prime consultant counts toward the goal to the extent of work it performs with its own forces; see Question 15.

PROJECT WORKLOAD AND CONTRACT STRUCTURE

34. Anticipated Project Workload

Approximately how many active capital improvement projects and school facilities does OPSB anticipate requiring project and construction management services simultaneously?

Response to Question 34: See Questions 1 and 17.

35. Multiple Contract Awards

The RFP indicates that OPSB may award contracts to one or multiple firms. If multiple firms are selected, how does OPSB anticipate distributing project assignments and allocating the annual budget among the awarded firms?

Response to Question 35: See Questions 7 and 8.

36. On-Site Staffing Requirements

Will the selected firm be required to provide full-time, on-site construction management or field inspection personnel, or will field staffing requirements be determined based on individual project assignments?

Response to Question 36: See Questions 2 and 3.

37. Task Orders and Work Authorizations

Will services be assigned through individual task orders or work authorizations identifying specific scopes of work, schedules, staffing requirements, and deliverables?

Response to Question 37: See Question 17(b) and 17(c).

PRICING AND CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

38. Annual Fee and Additional Services

Appendix A, Section 9.0 requests a single annual fee for project and construction management services. Should proposers base this fee on a fixed staffing commitment or anticipated level of effort? If the number of projects or required staffing exceeds the anticipated workload, will additional services be compensated separately?

Response to Question 38: See Questions 9, 17(d)–(f), 21, and 23. The annual fee should be based on the proposer's stated staffing plan and anticipated level of effort. It is not intended to cover an unlimited volume of assignments. Services materially exceeding the agreed scope or authorized level of effort require prior written authorization and, where applicable, an approved contract amendment, subject to available funding.

PREPROPOSAL ATTENDANCE AND TEAMING OPPORTUNITIES

39. Preproposal Attendance List and Interested Prime Contractors

Response to Question 39: See Questions 40 and 41.

40. Could OPSB please provide a copy of the October 9, 2026, preproposal meeting attendance or registration list, including company names and contact information, if available?

Response to Question 40: The October 9, 2026 pre-proposal meeting registration list is attached to this addendum.

41. If OPSB maintains a list of firms that have expressed interest in submitting proposals as prime contractors, including general contractors and project/construction management firms, we would appreciate receiving that information.

Response to Question 41: NOLA-PS does not maintain a list of firms intending to submit proposals as prime consultants. See Question 40 for the pre-proposal meeting registration list.

42. The RFP document refers to a Capital Improvement Program in the scope of services on page 12. Is there an existing Capital Improvement Program document that can be shared with proposers? (if not, we will assume that development of the plan is part of the services to be provided). Please clarify the current scenario with respect to this Program.

Response to Question 42: The consultant's scope includes program-wide planning, coordination and reporting, including maintaining master schedules, budgets and project controls. The absence of a formal program document should not be interpreted as a requirement to develop a new comprehensive capital improvement plan. Any such requirement will be expressly identified in the scope.

43. Cost and timeline – Is there any information about the Capital Improvements Program currently available to proposers such as a proposed list of projects, a total budget or funding amount associated with these services? This information is typically used to calculate a staffing workplan, cost and program timeline.

Response to Question 43: See Questions 17 and 42.

44. Does Orleans Parish School System use a particular software to track and maintain program/project finances and documents? If so, please share the name of the software.

Response to Question 44: See Question 19.

45**. Page Limit:** The RFP states that the Table of Contents counts toward the 20-page limit. Do divider pages separating sections also count toward the 20-page limit?

Response to Question 45: No. Tab divider pages, the cover sheet, and the table of contents do not count toward the 20-page limit, which applies to the narrative proposal only. See Question 26.

46**. Oral Presentations:** Will oral presentations be conducted in person or virtually?

Response to Question 46: Oral presentations, if deemed necessary, will be conducted virtually via Zoom. Vendors selected to participate will receive a presentation invitation, as outlined in the RFP.

47. The requested scope of work in Section 2.4 – Field Inspection Services, Services shall include:

Item A. states, "Performance of routine and periodic site inspections:"

Item F. states, "Preparation of daily inspection reports and photographic documentation:"

Is the scope of work requested, Item A., where contractor's subject matter experts perform site inspections and generate reports during any site visits and on-site progress meetings?

Or Item F., where contractor's staff travel to each active construction site daily and generate a report daily ?

We are requesting additional direction clarifying the scope of work required for "routine and periodic site inspections"

Response to Question 47: See Questions 3 and 20.

48. Section 7.1 requires three (3) to five (5) references from school districts, while Section 7.2, Tab 9, requests references involving services of similar scope.

Response to Question 48: See Question 14.

49. Will the District accept relevant project and construction management references from public universities, community colleges, or other accredited educational institutions in satisfaction of the school district reference requirement?

Response to Question 49: No. References from universities, community colleges, or other educational institutions do not satisfy the school district reference requirement of Section 7.1, but they may be submitted as additional references and will be considered. See Question 14.

50. Will the District accept references involving educational facilities completed internationally, including facilities developed under U.S. government or military programs?

Response to Question 50: References for educational facilities completed internationally, including under U.S. government or military programs, do not satisfy the school district reference requirement of Section 7.1, but they may be submitted as additional references and will be considered under Section 6.0. See Question 14.

51. May references include projects performed by proposed key personnel while employed by previous organizations, provided their individual responsibilities and client references can be verified?

Response to Question 51: Yes. References may include school district projects performed by proposed key personnel while employed by another organization, provided the proposal clearly identifies the individual's role and responsibilities and the reference can verify them. Such references will be considered as evidence of key personnel experience under Section 6.0. See Question 14.

52. Section 4 recognizes relevant experience on school, municipal, and other public-facility projects.

a. Will the District accept comparable federal, military, state, municipal, and commercial project and construction management experience when evaluating a proposer's qualifications and past performance?

b. Is there a minimum number of years the proposing company must have been in operation, or may qualifications be demonstrated through the combined experience of the firm's principals and proposed key personnel?

Response to Question 52: (a) Yes. Comparable federal, military, state, municipal, and commercial project and construction management experience will be considered in evaluating qualifications and past performance under Section 6.0, in addition to the school district references required by Section 7.1. See Question 14. (b) The RFP does not establish a minimum number of years in operation. Tab 2 asks proposers to state the number of years in business, and the combined experience of the firm's principals and proposed key personnel will be considered under Section 6.0.

53. To develop an appropriate management approach and accurate cost proposal, please clarify:

a. Approximately how many projects does the District anticipate assigning annually under this contract?

b. What is the anticipated number of projects requiring concurrent management?

c. What are the expected project types, approximate construction values, and typical durations?

d. Is a preliminary capital improvement project list or anticipated project schedule available to prospective proposers?

Response to Question 53(a): See Question 1.

Response to Question 53(b)–(d): NOLA-PS has not established a fixed number of concurrent projects, construction values, or durations for this contract, and no confirmed project list is available. See Questions 1 and 18. Proposers should state their workload assumptions in their proposals.

54. Sections 2.3 and 2.4 describe construction management oversight and field inspection responsibilities.

a. Does the District require dedicated full-time personnel for each assigned project, or may qualified personnel manage multiple concurrent projects based on project size, complexity, and workload?

b. May the field inspection and quality assurance responsibilities described in Section 2.4 be performed by a qualified Project Manager or QCM, or does the District require separately assigned field inspection personnel?

c. What is the anticipated frequency of required site inspections, and are there circumstances requiring continuous on-site coverage?

Response to Question 54(a): See Questions 2, 29, and 30.

Response to Question 54(b): A qualified Project Manager or Quality Control Manager may perform field inspection responsibilities, provided the individual meets the solicitation's qualifications and has sufficient availability. Separate inspection personnel are not anticipated as a standard requirement but may be required for specific assignments.

Response to Question 54(c): See Questions 3 and 20.

55. Section 9 requires proposers to provide an annual fee evaluated over the initial three-year contract term.

a. What baseline project workload, staffing level, or anticipated service hours should proposers use when developing the annual fee?

b. Will the District accept an annual fee supported by proposed labor classifications, hourly or monthly billing rates, and clearly stated workload assumptions?

c. Will individual projects be assigned through separate written work authorizations identifying the required scope, personnel, schedule, and compensation?

d. If actual project assignments or required service levels exceed the assumptions supporting the proposed annual fee, will compensation be adjusted through additional work authorizations or contract modifications?

Response to Question 55(a): See Questions 1 and 17(d).

Response to Question 55(b): See Question 21(a).

Response to Question 55(c): See Question 17(b) and 17(c).

Response to Question 55(d): See Questions 9 and 2(a).

56. Section 5.3 identifies an annual budget of $1,680,000, and the solicitation permits multiple contract awards.

a. Does the stated annual budget represent the total amount available for all firms selected under this solicitation, or the anticipated annual value of an individual contract?

b. Does the District anticipate selecting one primary PM/CM consultant or multiple firms receiving individual project assignments?

c. Will successful proposers receive any guaranteed minimum annual volume of work or compensation?

Response to Question 56(a): See Questions 7 and 21(b).

Response to Question 56(b): OPSB reserves the right to select one or multiple firms. The number of awards will depend on the evaluation results and OPSB's service needs.

Response to Question 56(c): See Question 8.

57. The evaluation criteria identify a 35% Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) participation goal.

a. Is achieving the full 35% DBE participation goal a mandatory condition of award, or may a proposer remain responsive by documenting good-faith efforts and an alternative participation commitment in accordance with Appendix B?

b. May qualifying DBE professional services subcontractors providing project management, construction management, project controls, or field inspection services count toward the participation goal?

c. Will the District recognize a certified Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) as an eligible disadvantaged business for purposes of the 35% DBE participation goal? If not, may SDVOSB status be considered as an alternative to, or partial credit toward, the required DBE participation percentage?

Response to Question 57(a): Achieving the full 35% goal is not an absolute condition of award. Under DBE Responsiveness Form 1, a proposer that cannot meet the goal may commit to a lower minimum percentage and document its Good Faith Efforts as described in Appendix B, Section E. The DBE goal is worth 10 points under Section 6.0. If the DBE office determines that a proposer's Good Faith Efforts are not satisfactory, the related points will be deducted or the proposal may be recommended for rejection. All required DBE forms must be fully completed and submitted with the proposal.

Response to Question 57(b): Yes. Participation by DBE subconsultants providing project management, construction management, project controls, or field inspection services counts toward the goal, provided the firm is certified by the Louisiana Unified Certification Program (LAUCP) or one of the agencies recognized in Appendix B, Section III.A, and performs a commercially useful function.

Response to Question 57(c): No. Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) status, by itself, does not qualify a firm as a DBE for purposes of the goal, and no partial credit is given for SDVOSB status. A firm counts toward the goal only if it holds current DBE certification from the LAUCP or one of the agencies recognized in Appendix B, Section III.A.

58. May a prime propose a team that includes independent CM specialists, and may their references count toward experience?

    Response to Question 58: Yes. The team may include qualified subconsultants or independent specialists, subject to Section 18.0(C) (see Question 31). Their experience will be considered under Section 6.0, and school district references for key personnel may come from prior employers (see Question 51).

59. Must the prime firm itself show a minimum number of school construction management engagements?

    Response to Question 59: The RFP sets no minimum number of engagements. The three to five school district references required by Section 7.1 still apply (see Questions 14 and 51).

60. Would you please confirm the maximum allowable email size within the District's email system?

    Response to Question 60: Microsoft 365 / Exchange Online (Business): The default maximum receive limit is 35 MB to 36 MB (see Question 27(a))

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2