

RFP Web2026 — Municipal Website Redesign & CMS

Addendum: Consolidated Vendor Questions & City Responses

Issued by the City of Excelsior Springs, Missouri. This addendum consolidates written questions received from multiple prospective proposers and is provided to all parties for a level playing field. It supersedes any individual answers given informally.

1. Budget

Does the City have an established budget or target range for the one-time project fee and/or ongoing annual maintenance?

The City has not set a published budget ceiling for this project. Proposers should price their proposal based on the scope of work outlined in the RFP. Cost will be evaluated against the quality and completeness of the proposed approach (see Section 6, Evaluation Criteria), not against an undisclosed target figure.

2. Content & Migration Scope

Can the City provide an approximate inventory of pages, documents, media, forms, and any separate WordPress installations or subdomains that must be consolidated (main site plus public services, development, preservation, and related content areas)?

Based on the City's internal review, the current site totals approximately 60 distinct content pages across the main site and its associated department sub-sites (Public Services, Development, Preservation, Municipal Court), plus roughly 37 static PDF documents (forms, permits, applications, reports) linked into the navigation as though they were pages, and approximately 16 links out to unaffiliated or partner websites that are not part of the City's own platform. The Police Department maintains a separate site — structurally distinct and built on a different platform — with roughly 30–35 additional pages of its own that is also in scope for consolidation. This inventory is approximate; proposers should plan for a full content audit as part of Section 3.1 Discovery.

Is content restructuring (rewriting, consolidation) anticipated as part of migration, or is this a like-for-like migration?

Content restructuring is expected. Per Section 3.5, this is a redesign and content reset, not a like-for-like migration. The vendor is expected to deliver specific recommendations on what to add, revise, or delete as part of the content analysis deliverable, and the City will make final content decisions from those recommendations.

3. Priority Forms (RFP placeholder)

How many priority forms should the base proposal price for, and should routing, approvals, payment, file uploads, or records retention be included for any of them?

The City's current form library totals approximately 30 forms hosted directly on the City's site. None exist today as fillable, submittable web forms; all are static downloads, or route through the iWorQ portal for permits and code enforcement. For base proposal pricing, City suggests proposers price the form builder deliverable against approximately 5-6 of the highest-traffic, simplest forms (e.g., occupational license, employment application, volunteer application, records request, event/facility use applications) as straightforward digitize-and-submit conversions. Forms tied to permitting or code enforcement should be priced separately if they require routing/approval workflow logic. Remaining forms may be converted on a rolling basis after launch.

4. Timeline

Can the City confirm the expected launch date, and whether there is flexibility on milestones if justified by scope? If finalist interviews are held September 1, may they be conducted virtually?

Per the RFP: proposals are due August 28, 2026; finalist interviews (if needed) are anticipated September 1, 2026; and anticipated project kickoff is Fall 2026. Finalist interviews may be conducted virtually — the City does not require in-person attendance. The City has not set a fixed go-live date. Per Section 5.F, proposers should submit a realistic schedule from kickoff through launch, and the City will evaluate proposed timelines as part of scoring rather than requiring a specific launch date.

5. System Integrations

Section 3.4 lists eCode360, CivicPlus agendas/minutes, Click2Gov, iWorQ, esgives.org, LocationOne, and the City calendar.

Which integrations are mandatory at launch versus phased/optional? Which systems have APIs or embed support already available, and should third-party license or implementation fees be included in the fixed project fee or itemized separately?

Required at launch: eCode360, CivicPlus (agendas/minutes), Click2Gov, iWorQ, and the City's meetings/events calendar. These support essential transactional functions and Missouri Sunshine Law transparency requirements and must be live when publicly launched. May be phased in after launch: esgives.org (community grants portal) and LocationOne (available sites/buildings), which support secondary and economic-development functions; proposers should state a target integration date for these (e.g., 60–90 days post-launch). For every system, proposers should state clearly whether the integration approach is embed, API, single-sign-on, or link-out, and whether any associated third-party licensing or implementation fees are included in the fixed project fee or itemized separately. The City currently has all the licensing for the systems listed above.

6. Hosting

Does the City have a preferred hosting model (vendor-hosted, City-hosted, third-party cloud), or should vendors propose based on best fit and cost?

The City does not require a specific hosting model; proposers should recommend the arrangement (vendor-hosted, City-hosted, or third-party cloud) that best fits their platform, with associated costs and uptime commitments, per Section 3.8. Regardless of hosting arrangement, the City will retain registrar/DNS control, and upon termination of the vendor relationship, the City retains ownership of the theme/custom code, a full content export, and admin-level platform access.

7. CMS Approach

For the required CMS-native analytics, unified search, inline editing, and accessibility support — is the City open to a transparent open-source implementation using well-supported components, or does it expect these bundled from a single municipal CMS vendor?

The City is open to either approach — a bundled proprietary municipal CMS platform or an open-source implementation using well-supported components — provided the required functionality in Section 3.3 (native analytics, unified search, inline editing, and accessibility support) is met without relying on third-party overlays or external tools, and the proposer documents a clear plan for ongoing support, updates, and security patching of any open-source components used.

8. Portfolio & Reference Requirements

Where a proposer's launched production sites are primarily private-sector, will the City consider live, purpose-built municipal demonstration sites (WCAG 2.1 AA-verified) together with public-sector consulting references toward the portfolio requirement?

The City will consider live, purpose-built municipal demonstration sites (verified to WCAG 2.1 AA) together with public-sector consulting references as a substitute for production municipal launches, where a proposer's primary portfolio is private-sector.

Are three completed local-government references and live municipal websites mandatory, or may comparable public-sector or commercial experience be accepted?

Three completed local-government references and live municipal websites are preferred but not strictly mandatory. Proposers without them may substitute comparable public-sector or enterprise-scale commercial experience, provided they can demonstrate equivalent complexity in accessibility compliance, third-party integrations, and multi-department content governance.

9. Insurance

Can the City state required coverage types and minimum limits (general liability, professional liability, cyber liability)?

Per Section 10 of the RFP: Commercial General Liability — \$1,000,000 per occurrence / \$2,000,000 aggregate; Professional Liability / Errors & Omissions — \$1,000,000 per claim / \$2,000,000 aggregate; Cyber Liability / Technology E&O — \$1,000,000 per occurrence; Workers' Compensation — statutory limits, with Employers' Liability at \$500,000 each accident; Automobile Liability (if applicable) — \$1,000,000 combined single limit. The City must be named as an additional insured on the Commercial General Liability policy, and a Certificate of Insurance is due prior to contract execution.

Is insurance issued by a non-U.S. carrier acceptable, and at what limits?

Insurance carrier must be a U.S. company. See above for limits.

10. Offshore / Non-U.S. Vendor Eligibility

(Raised specifically by an India-based firm; answers apply to any non-U.S. proposer.)

Are firms without a completed municipal project eligible to submit?

Yes, subject to meeting the portfolio/reference standard described in Question 8.

Is U.S.-based hosting/data residency, a Missouri office, local legal entity, representative, bank account, or local counsel required?

The City prefers proposals from U.S.-based firms but will not categorically exclude non-U.S. proposers. The City does not require a Missouri office, local legal entity, representative, or local counsel. The City does require U.S.-based hosting and data residency for any component handling resident PII or payment data.

May interviews, discovery sessions, demonstrations, training, and support be conducted remotely with Central Time overlap?

Yes, interviews, discovery sessions, demonstrations, training, and support may be conducted remotely, provided there is reasonable working-hours overlap with Central Time.

What tax forms, registrations, background checks, subcontracting restrictions, or payment requirements apply to non-U.S. vendors, and which are negotiable?

Companies must be licensed in the U.S.

May offshore team members access City systems or data?

No.

11. Evaluation Criteria

The RFP lists weighted criteria (Experience 25%, Approach 25%, Cost 25%, CMS fit 15%, Team/Timeline 10%). Do finalist interviews or demonstrations adjust these weights, or do the listed percentages govern the final decision?

The weighted criteria published in Section 6 govern the final evaluation. Finalist interviews and demonstrations, where held, are used to inform and refine scoring within those existing categories — primarily Approach and Team/Timeline — rather than to introduce new criteria or alter the published weights.

12. Third-Party Integration Level of Detail

Can the City clarify the expected level of integration for each system in Section 3.4 (display/embed only, a seamless interface, API data exchange, single sign-on, or other), and provide any existing technical documentation, API documentation, integration guides, or vendor contacts? If detailed technical information is not currently available, does the City expect the selected vendor to work directly with each third-party provider during implementation to determine the appropriate method?

The City is not prescribing one integration method uniformly across all systems; per Section 3.4, proposers should recommend the appropriate approach per system and state any cost implications. As a general guide: for eCode360, CivicPlus (agendas/minutes), the community grants portal, and the meetings/events calendar, a seamless embedded or API-driven display within the new site is expected. For Click2Gov (utility payment) and iWorQ (permitting/code enforcement), given the sensitivity of payment and resident data, an embedded or clearly-branded pass-through interface is acceptable in lieu of a full API integration, provided the experience feels native to the site rather than a jarring redirect. For LocationOne, embedding available listings is the goal if their platform supports it. The City does not currently have a consolidated packet of API documentation, integration guides, or vendor technical contacts ready to distribute. The City expects the selected vendor to work directly with each third-party provider during the discovery phase (Section 3.1) to determine the specific integration method available, and to bring any resulting cost or feasibility findings back to the City before implementation begins.

13. Third-Party Embeds & Calendar — Current vs. New Implementation

Should third-party CTA links and embedded scripts be implemented the same way they currently appear on the live site? For the events calendar specifically, should the City continue using its current embedded Google Calendar, or is a different type of interaction expected?

Proposers should not assume the current implementation is the target state. Section 3.4 requires the new site to embed or integrate directly rather than simply link out, which is a change from how several of these systems display on the current site today. For the calendar specifically, the City is not committed to continuing the current Google Calendar iframe embed; proposers should recommend the calendar solution (native CMS calendar, embedded City system, or third-party) that best supports the searchable, prioritized-content requirements in Section 3.3.

14. Role-Based Permissions — Technical Flexibility

Department-level role-based editing beyond a CMS's core user roles may require additional R&D and cannot be guaranteed by all proposers. How strictly will the City hold proposers to this requirement?

Department-level editing control described in Section 3.3 is a required outcome, not a specific technical mechanism — the City is not prescribing how a proposer's CMS achieves it. Proposers should describe their proposed approach (e.g., custom roles, restricted editing permissions, or another mechanism) and any limitations as part of Section 5.D (Proposed Approach), so the City can evaluate whether the proposed method meets the intent of the requirement.

15. Inline Editing — Technical Approach

Is the City looking for a visual, frontend page-builder solution (e.g., Elementor) for inline editing, where staff edit content directly from the frontend once logged in, or a different technical approach?

The City does not require a specific mechanism such as Elementor. The intent behind Section 3.3's inline-editing requirement is that authorized staff can make routine content edits directly from the live page view without navigating to a separate back-end admin screen, reducing training burden and editing errors. Proposers should describe how their recommended CMS achieves this experience as part of their proposed approach.

16. News & Updates — Notification Service

Is a third-party email/newsletter service (e.g., Constant Contact) acceptable for the subscriber notification function described in Section 3.3, or does the City expect this built natively into the CMS?

A third-party email service integrated with the CMS is acceptable for the subscriber notification function, provided it supports both text and email notifications as described in Section 3.3. Any recurring third-party subscription cost should be included as a separate line item in the cost proposal (Section 5.G) rather than folded into the one-time project fee.

17. Search — Implementation & Definition of “Prioritize”

Native CMS search typically does not support unified content-and-document search, so a third-party plugin or application may be required. Can the City clarify what “prioritize/pin results” means in practice — is defining and weighting searchable content types sufficient, or is more required?

The City acknowledges a third-party search plugin or application may be required to meet Section 3.3's unified search requirement, and any associated licensing cost should be included in the cost proposal. By “prioritize,” the City means the ability for staff to manually feature or pin specific high-traffic destinations (e.g., utility bill pay, permit applications, meeting agendas, employment postings) at or near the top of search results for common search terms, rather than relying solely on default relevance ranking. Defining and weighting searchable content by type is an acceptable starting point if it can be combined with the ability for staff to manually pin or feature specific results; proposers should describe their proposed method in Section 5.D.

18. Analytics — Implementation Approach

Native CMS platforms typically do not provide built-in analytics; a third-party plugin or application is likely required to surface analytics directly in the admin dashboard. Please confirm this approach is acceptable.

Confirmed — a third-party analytics plugin or application integrated directly into the CMS admin dashboard satisfies Section 3.3's requirement, provided it gives City staff direct visibility into page performance, search terms, and top-requested content from within the CMS itself, rather than requiring a separate external login such as a standalone Google Analytics account. Any associated licensing cost should be included in the cost proposal.

19. Accessibility — Implementation Approach

One proposer indicated their approach is to follow general HTML best practices, with accessibility compliance otherwise relying primarily on third-party services and limited to what those services provide. Please confirm this approach is acceptable.

This approach is not acceptable as the sole method of compliance. Sections 3.3 and 3.6 of the RFP require native accessibility support within the CMS and template build itself, not primary reliance on a third-party overlay or service — this requirement exists because overlay-based accessibility tools are widely considered insufficient for genuine WCAG 2.1 AA / ADA Title II conformance (see Section 2, Project Goal 2). Proposers must describe a concrete plan for achieving WCAG 2.1 AA conformance through the CMS, theme, and template build itself — semantic HTML, proper heading structure, alt-text workflows, keyboard navigation, color contrast, ARIA labeling, and accessible forms — verified through both automated and manual/assistive-technology testing, with a written conformance report (VPAT or equivalent) delivered at project close per Section 3.6. A third-party overlay may

supplement this work but may not substitute for it. Proposals that rely primarily on third-party overlay tools for accessibility compliance will be scored accordingly under Section 6.

20. Additional Modules

Apart from the modules already described in the RFP, are there any specific additional modules or functionality the City wants proposers to address?

Section 3.3 of the RFP represents the complete required functionality list. Proposers are welcome to recommend additional modules or enhancements as optional value-adds in their proposal, clearly distinguished from the required scope and priced separately.

21. Existing Third-Party System Access & SSO

For the seven named integrations (eCode360, CivicPlus, Click2Gov, iWorQ, esgives.org, Calendar, LocationOne), does the City already hold API or single-sign-on access with each vendor, or should the proposing vendor plan to establish that access independently? If SSO is expected, is there an existing City identity provider these integrations should federate through?

The City holds existing customer/administrative accounts with each of the named systems, but has not established API keys, developer credentials, or single-sign-on federation with any of them specifically for website integration. The selected vendor should plan to work with the City to establish the appropriate access (API credentials, embed codes, or SSO) with each provider during discovery, per Section 12. The City is confirming whether an existing identity provider (e.g., Microsoft 365 or Google Workspace) should be used for any SSO federation, or whether SSO is not currently in scope for this project.

22. Hosting Uptime & Disaster Recovery Standards

Is there a minimum uptime percentage or specific recovery point/recovery time objective (RPO/RTO) the City requires for the backup and disaster-recovery approach, or is the vendor free to propose its own standard? If City-hosted is an option the City would consider, is there existing infrastructure the proposal should be scoped against?

The City has not published a minimum uptime percentage or specific RPO/RTO; per Section 3.8, proposers should recommend commitments appropriate to a public-facing municipal website of this scale, which the City will evaluate as part of the review. As a general guideline, the City anticipates expecting no less than 99.9% uptime and daily backups with a recovery point objective of 24 hours or better, but remains open to an alternative standard if justified. The City is confirming whether City-hosted is genuinely being offered as an option; absent further notice, proposers should assume vendor- or cloud-hosted and not scope against City-owned infrastructure.

23. IA/Sitemap Review & Revision Process

How many review and revision rounds are included before the City's sign-off on the recommended information architecture and sitemap, and what is the expected City turnaround time for that review?

The City anticipates up to two rounds of City review and revision on the recommended information architecture/sitemap before sign-off, with a City review turnaround target of five business days per round. Proposers should price additional rounds beyond that as an optional add-on rather than assuming unlimited revisions are included in the base fee.

24. Design Concepts & Performance Benchmark Threshold

How many initial design concepts should the proposal assume, and how many revision rounds are included before a final direction is selected? Separately, is there a minimum passing threshold for the requested performance benchmarks (e.g., Core Web Vitals), or is any vendor-proposed target acceptable?

The base proposal should assume at least two distinct initial design concepts per Section 3.2, with up to two rounds of revision on the selected direction before final approval; additional rounds should be priced separately. On performance, the City expects proposers to target passing (“Good”) thresholds under Google's Core Web Vitals for the majority of key page templates. The City is not mandating exact numeric thresholds; proposers should state their proposed target and testing methodology for City evaluation.

25. Proposal Format

The RFP does not state a page limit, number of copies, or language requirement for the written proposal. Please confirm whether any such constraints apply, or whether the proposal is unrestricted in length and format aside from PDF submission by email.

There is no page limit, required number of copies, or language requirement for the written proposal. Proposals should be submitted as a single PDF by email per Section 8; proposers are encouraged to be thorough but concise.

26. Sample Contract Terms — Mandatory or Optional

Section 5.H references Sample Contract Terms with conditional language. Please confirm whether submitting Sample Contract Terms with the proposal is mandatory or optional, and if optional, under what circumstances a vendor should include them.

Submission of Sample Contract Terms under Section 5.H is optional. It applies only to proposers who would require the City to sign a standard contract, license agreement, master services agreement, or terms-of-service as a condition of engagement. A proposer with no such standard terms, who is willing to proceed under a contract drafted by the City, is not required to submit anything under this item.

27. Currency

The RFP does not specify a currency for pricing. Please confirm that all pricing should be submitted in USD. All pricing must be submitted in U.S. Dollars (USD).

Questions about this addendum should be directed to Keith Winge, Economic Development Director, at kwinge@excelsiorsprings.gov.