



# SYRACUSE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Pamela J. Odom, Superintendent of Schools

Office of Finance

Michael Puntschenko, Chief Financial Officer

March 19, 2026

## **RFP #SCSD2026-003 – Actuarial Valuation Services for Self-Insured Workers' Compensation Liability: Addendum #1**

### **NOTICE TO ALL POTENTIAL RESPONDENTS**

This Request for Proposals (RFP) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFP Documents and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFP. Respondent shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Proposal.

### **PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL DEADLINE**

The Proposal submittal deadline remains the same and is not changed by this Addendum.

### **1.0 – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

The following questions and answers are provided as a matter of information to clarify issues raised about the RFP. To the extent that changes to the RFP are required based on the questions received, the RFP has been modified as noted above in the RFP section of this Addendum.

Item	Questions and Answers
1.1	<p><u>Question:</u> Have meetings taken place with the actuary in Syracuse during the past three years?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> Yes, the actuary has met in-person in Syracuse with the Syracuse City School District every year.</p>
1.2	<p><u>Question:</u> Is the scope of work within this RFP different than the scope of work currently being provided by the incumbent?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> The scope of work currently being performed by the incumbent is the same as the scope of work within this RFP.</p>
1.3	<p><u>Question:</u> Could you please provide an electronic copy of the prior year's actuarial report(s) prior to the deadline for submitting the bid? If not, will the District provide the prior actuarial report to the firm awarded the work?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> The prior actuarial report will be provided to the firm awarded the work.</p>

1.4	<p><u>Question:</u> The RFP states on page 3 that “The Proposer is required to address each of the requirements identified below in their response,” and then lists requirements in Sections I–IV under the Scope of Services. Beginning on page 5, the RFP provides a different outline for proposal submission that appears to be the structure the District would like proposers to follow. Could the District clarify how proposers should address the requirements listed in Sections I–IV (pages 3–4)? Should those requirements be addressed within the narrative responses in the proposal outline on page 5 (e.g., within the Approach or Project Staffing sections), or does the District expect proposers to respond to Sections I–IV separately?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> The requirements defined in the Scope of Services section should be addressed in the Proposer’s submission. Please refer to the Proposal Submission Requirements section for submission formatting and content.</p>
1.5	<p><u>Question:</u> Are wet signatures required on the original copy of the proposal, or will digital signatures suffice?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> Original (wet) signatures are required on the original copy of the proposal.</p>
1.6	<p><u>Question:</u> The RFP page 5, requests that proposers identify the local office that would handle the District’s engagement. Could the District clarify whether proposers without a physical office in the Syracuse area or within New York State are still eligible to submit proposals, provided they are able to meet the engagement requirements, including availability for consultation and in-person meetings if requested?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> Proposers without a physical office in the Syracuse area or within New York State are still eligible to submit proposals, provided they are able to meet the engagement requirements, including the in-person meetings that are required.</p>
1.7	<p><u>Question:</u> RFP page 6, the Evaluation Criteria section states that “Organization’s Qualifications” includes status as an M/WBE certified business and/or a business with a physical location within New York State, as allowable under funding source guidelines. Could the District clarify how these factors will be considered in scoring? Specifically, if a proposer is not an M/WBE and does not have a physical location within New York State, how would that affect eligibility and/or the number of points available under this criterion?</p> <p><u>Answer:</u> If a proposer is not an M/WBE and does not have a physical location within New York State, the proposer would receive fewer points than the total maximum amount of points available for this evaluation category.</p>

Sincerely,

Michael Puntschenko  
Chief Financial Officer

**END OF ADDENDUM**