



City of East Ridge

1517 Tombras Avenue
East Ridge, Tennessee 37412
(423)867-7711 • www.eastridgetn.gov

ADDENDUM NO. 1

Project: Website Design, Content Management System & Hosting Services

Project No.: 2026-07-41100-01

Issue Date: September 1, 2026

This Addendum forms a part of the Request for Proposals. Questions of a similar nature have been consolidated where appropriate for clarity. Responses are provided for the benefit of all prospective vendors.

Question 1

Does the City have an anticipated budget range for the primary website project?

Response:

The City has not published a budget range for this project. Vendors are encouraged to submit their best value proposal based upon the scope, goals, and requirements outlined within the RFP.

Question 2

Approximately how many pages, documents, forms, calendars, and other records will need to be migrated?

Response:

The City estimates the existing website contains approximately 150 public-facing content pages along with several hundred downloadable documents. These figures are estimates only and are provided solely to assist vendors in preparing proposals. The City does not anticipate a one-to-one migration of all existing content. One of the primary objectives of this project is to evaluate, consolidate, reorganize, and modernize existing information to create a cleaner, more intuitive user experience. This estimate does not include the separate Animal Services or Parks & Recreation websites for purposes of the initial migration scope.

Question 3

Is WordPress acceptable, and would a fully responsive mobile website satisfy the mobile site or app requirement?

Response:

Yes. The City has not prescribed a specific content management system. WordPress or another comparable CMS is acceptable provided it satisfies all requirements outlined within the Request for Proposals. A fully responsive mobile website is acceptable in satisfaction of the mobile site and/or application requirement.

Question 4

Which existing systems, forms, calendars, mailing lists, or databases must integrate with the new website?

Response:

The City anticipates integration with commonly used municipal communication and service tools, including but not limited to, online forms, employment applications, permitting, business licenses, calendars, social media platforms, email subscription functionality, and similar third-party services. Respondents are encouraged to identify available integrations within their proposed solution and recommend additional functionality that improves usability, accessibility, customer service, and administrative efficiency.

Question 5

What launch date, hosting uptime standard, support expectations, and payment terms should vendors include in their proposals?

Response:

Respondents should prepare proposals based upon the requirements contained within the Request for Proposals. For planning purposes, respondents should assume the sample project timeline beginning with an anticipated contract award on October 15, 2026, as identified in the RFP. Hosting, availability, disaster recovery, accessibility, and support requirements are described within the Request for Proposals and Attachments A and B. Final project schedule, contract terms, scope refinements, and payment provisions will be negotiated with the selected respondent and incorporated into the final professional services agreement approved by the City.

Question 6

Will the City of East Ridge provide written content, photographs, documents, and departmental information for the new site or should respondents include content development services within their proposal?

Response:

The City anticipates providing the majority of existing written content, documents, photographs, and departmental information for review and migration. Respondents are encouraged to identify any content strategy, copywriting, editing, photography, or related content development services included within their proposal and describe how those services would enhance the overall project. The City welcomes recommendations regarding content organization, readability, accessibility, and user experience.

Question 7

What are the City's expectations regarding the content management system, ownership, administrative access, and use of proprietary software?

Response:

The City has not prescribed a specific content management system, hosting environment, or technology platform. The selected solution should provide the City with full administrative access to manage website content, users, and routine website administration. Respondents should clearly identify ownership of website content, data, domains, user accounts, and any proprietary or licensed software components, recurring licensing costs, portability considerations, and limitations associated with their proposed solution.

Question 8

Please clarify the City's expectations regarding document-to-PDF conversion, subscription notifications, and third-party system integrations.

Response:

The City anticipates the website will support common municipal document formats and provide an efficient method for publishing documents in PDF format for public access. At a minimum, the subscription and notification functionality should support user-selected email notifications. Respondents may propose additional notification capabilities, including SMS messaging or comparable technologies. The City anticipates integration with existing and future municipal services including, but not limited to, online forms, employment applications, permitting, business licensing, calendars, social media platforms, payment services, GIS applications, and similar third-party solutions. Respondents are encouraged to identify available integrations and recommend additional functionality that improves customer service and operational efficiency.

Question 9

Is the City targeting a specific website accessibility standard or certification?

Response:

The City expects the completed website to satisfy the accessibility requirements outlined within Attachment B of the Request for Proposals and to comply with the applicable accessibility requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, including conformance with the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.1 Level AA, or any successor standard required under applicable federal law at the time of project implementation. Respondents should identify the accessibility standards supported by their proposed solution and describe any accessibility testing, auditing, reporting, or compliance documentation included within their proposal.

Question 10

Are there additional contractual, insurance, cybersecurity, data hosting, or vendor registration requirements beyond those identified within the Request for Proposals?

Response:

The Request for Proposals identifies the information currently required for proposal submission. The successful respondent will be required to execute a professional services agreement acceptable to the City.

Question 11

Are respondents expected to submit pricing for all alternate projects?

Response:

No. Respondents may submit pricing for any or all alternate projects identified within the Request for Proposals. Pricing for each alternate should be clearly identified separately from the primary website proposal.

Question 12

Will finalist interviews and presentations be conducted remotely or in person?

Response:

Respondents may indicate their preferred interview and presentation format within their proposal. The City is willing to accommodate either in-person or virtual presentations, as appropriate. The final interview format will be determined through mutual coordination between the City and each selected finalist.

Question 13

For the required printed proposal copies, is one originally signed proposal with two duplicate copies acceptable? Are any additional forms, certifications, or signature pages required?

Response:

Yes. One originally signed proposal together with two duplicate copies will satisfy the printed proposal requirement. There are no additional required forms, certifications, or signature pages beyond the materials identified within the Request for Proposals.

Question 14

Is Alternate No. 3 intended to replace an existing citizen request management platform, or would this be a new implementation? Is an estimated request volume available?

Response:

Alternate No. 3 is intended to provide respondents with the opportunity to propose a citizen request submission, tracking, and resolution solution that could be implemented by the City. The City does not currently utilize a centralized, citywide citizen request management platform through which all citizen requests are submitted, tracked, and managed. An estimated request volume is not available. Respondents should propose a scalable solution appropriate for a municipality the size of East Ridge and clearly identify any assumptions made within their proposal.

Question 15

Does the City anticipate any internal staff notification workflows beyond the public-facing subscription and notification features identified within the Request for Proposals?

Response:

The City has not identified any mandatory internal notification workflows as part of this procurement. However, respondents are encouraged to identify any available functionality that supports internal communications, workflow automation, task routing, administrative notifications, or similar features that improve operational efficiency and customer service.

Question 16

Has the City prescribed specific languages, translation methodology, CMS user counts, or training requirements?

Response:

The City has not prescribed specific languages, a preferred translation methodology, a required number of CMS users, or minimum training hours. Respondents are encouraged to recommend a solution that best satisfies the goals and requirements outlined within the Request for Proposals and clearly describe the translation functionality, user management capabilities, training approach, and ongoing support included within their proposal.

Question 17

What platform is the City's current website built upon?

Response:

The City's current website is designed, hosted, and maintained by Local Government Corporation (LGC). The City has not prescribed a preferred content management system or technology platform for this procurement. Respondents are encouraged to propose the solution they believe best satisfies the goals, objectives, and requirements outlined within the Request for Proposals while demonstrating improvements in usability, accessibility, content management, and overall user experience.

Question 18

Will proposals be evaluated using a weighted scoring rubric or a holistic evaluation process?

Response:

As outlined within the Request for Proposals, the Selection Committee will evaluate proposals based upon the completeness and quality of the response, the respondents' qualifications and experience, demonstrated ability to satisfy the City's goals and requirements, references, proposed approach, interviews and presentations (if applicable), and overall value to the City. The City has not established a weighted point-based scoring rubric for this procurement. Rather, proposals will be evaluated holistically to determine the solution that best serves the interests of the City.

Question 19

Are internationally based firms eligible to submit proposals, and is a U.S.-based entity or subcontractor required?

Response:

The City does not prohibit internationally based firms from submitting proposals in response to this solicitation, and a U.S.-based entity or subcontractor is not required for proposal submission. Any respondent ultimately selected for award will be required to satisfy applicable legal, tax, insurance, licensing, registration, and contractual requirements necessary to enter into an agreement with the City of East Ridge.

Question 20

May an internationally based respondent submit its proposal electronically rather than providing the sealed physical copies required by the RFP? If physical submission is required, may an international courier be used?

Response:

No. The City will maintain the proposal submission requirements established within the Request for Proposals for all respondents. One electronic copy of the proposal in PDF format on a USB storage drive together with three printed copies must be submitted in a sealed package and received by the City Clerk no later than the deadline established within the RFP. Email or online submissions will not be accepted in lieu of the required sealed proposal. Respondents may utilize a courier or shipping service of their choosing; however, the respondent is solely responsible for ensuring that the complete proposal package is received by the City Clerk's office prior to the submission deadline.

Question 21

Should the website's search functionality include publicly available documents, such as PDFs, meeting agendas, minutes, and similar files, or be limited to webpage content?

Response:

The City anticipates a comprehensive search experience that enables users to locate relevant website content and publicly available documents, including PDFs and similar files. Respondents should describe the search capabilities included within their proposed solution, including any limitations associated with indexing or searching documents and other website content.

Question 22

What is driving the City's decision to undertake this website project, and are there specific limitations or concerns with the existing website the City hopes to address?

Response:

The City's current website is designed, hosted, and maintained by Local Government Corporation (LGC). This procurement is not being undertaken solely as the result of a contract expiration or dissatisfaction with the City's existing vendor. Rather, the City is evaluating opportunities to modernize its website and digital presence, improve usability and accessibility, provide greater flexibility in content management, improve the overall user and administrative experience, and position the City's website to accommodate future technology and service needs. Respondents are encouraged to demonstrate how their proposed solution best advances the goals and requirements identified within the Request for Proposals.

Question 23

Will the City provide its current annual website hosting and support costs, website traffic statistics, or specific data storage requirements for proposal preparation?

Response:

The City is not establishing the current annual cost of its existing website services as a pricing benchmark for this procurement and has not established average monthly or peak page-view statistics as a requirement for proposal preparation. The City has not prescribed a specific storage allocation for the proposed solution. Respondents should independently propose pricing and a scalable hosting solution appropriate for the scope and requirements of the project and clearly identify any assumptions, usage thresholds, storage limitations, bandwidth considerations, or additional costs associated with their proposal.

Question 24

Does the City require single sign-on for administrative access to the CMS?

Response:

The City has not established single sign-on as a mandatory requirement for CMS administrative access. Respondents should describe the authentication, user management, role-based permissions, and security capabilities available within their proposed solution, including single sign-on functionality if available.

Question 25

What level of discovery, stakeholder engagement, user research, or persona development does the City expect as part of the project?

Response:

The City has not prescribed a specific discovery methodology. Respondents are encouraged to recommend an approach appropriate to the scope, goals, and requirements of the project. Proposals should clearly describe the proposed discovery, stakeholder engagement, information architecture, content strategy, user research, and related activities included within the respondent's approach.

Question 26

Are there limitations on the use of project team members located outside the United States, and has the City established requirements or policies regarding the use of artificial intelligence within the proposed solution?

Response:

The City does not prohibit respondents from utilizing project team members located outside of the United States. The respondent will remain responsible for satisfying all requirements of the RFP and any applicable legal, contractual, security, confidentiality, or data-handling requirements associated with performance of the resulting agreement. The City has not established a project-specific artificial intelligence policy or mandatory AI functionality as part of this procurement. Respondents should disclose any material use of AI-enabled technologies within their proposed solution or service delivery approach and identify associated considerations related to data privacy, security, accessibility, content accuracy, licensing, and ongoing costs. Respondents may also identify optional AI-enabled functionality they believe would enhance the user experience or provide value to the City.

The City considers AI functionality an area of interest and potential future capability rather than a prescribed implementation or required use case. Respondents may describe available or planned AI-assisted functionality, including search, navigation, content discovery, resident assistance, or other appropriate applications. Any proposed AI functionality should clearly identify the information sources utilized, available administrative controls and safeguards, privacy and security considerations, and the City's ability to manage or limit the information upon which public-facing AI functionality is based.

Question 27

May respondents provide multiple solution tiers, service levels, or optional enhancements in addition to the base proposal?

Response:

Yes. Respondents may identify optional features, enhancements, service levels, or alternative solution tiers they believe would provide value to the City, provided the proposal clearly identifies the base solution satisfying the requirements of the RFP and separately identifies the scope and cost of any optional enhancements.

Question 28

Does the City have preferred third-party platforms for online forms, applications, subscriptions, or public notifications, and should users be able to manage their subscription preferences?

Response:

The City currently utilizes OpenGov primarily within the Building & Codes Department for permitting, licensing, inspection requests, and related departmental processes. OpenGov is not currently utilized as a City-wide platform for all forms, applications, or online submissions. The City has not prescribed OpenGov, or any other third-party platform, as the exclusive platform for forms, applications, or online submissions under this procurement. Respondents may propose integration with existing City systems where applicable, native CMS functionality, or other third-party solutions depending upon the specific form, application, or service. Respondents should clearly identify which functionality is provided natively through the proposed CMS, which functionality relies upon integration with OpenGov or other existing or third-party platforms, and any associated licensing, implementation, integration, or recurring costs.

Question 29

What functionality does the City expect for automatic document-to-PDF conversion, OCR, and website translation?

Response:

The intent of the automatic document-to-PDF requirement is to support commonly used office document formats, including Word and Excel files, where applicable. OCR functionality for scanned documents is not established as a mandatory requirement.

The City has not prescribed a specific translation platform or methodology, and automated translation solutions are acceptable for consideration. Respondents should describe the document conversion, OCR, and translation capabilities available within their proposed solution, including supported formats and languages, accessibility considerations, limitations, licensing requirements, and any associated costs.

Question 30

What website analytics, statistics, and reporting capabilities does the City expect?

Response:

The City has not prescribed a specific analytics platform. Respondents should propose website analytics and reporting functionality appropriate for a municipal website and describe the capabilities included within their proposed solution. The City is interested in functionality that provides meaningful insight into website traffic, content performance, user behavior, search activity, and other information useful in evaluating and improving the City's digital services.

Question 31

What social media integration capabilities does the City expect, including embedded feeds or automated publishing?

Response:

Respondents should describe the social media integration capabilities available within their proposed solution, including embedded feeds, content sharing, and automated or coordinated publishing capabilities, where available. Automated publishing to a specific social media platform is not established as a mandatory requirement.

Question 32

Has the City established specific quantities for page templates, calendars, online forms or workflows, departmental sections, or similar components to be included within the initial implementation?

Response:

The City has not prescribed a specific number of page templates, calendars, online forms or workflows, or similar components beyond the requirements and functionality identified within the Request for Proposals. Respondents should recommend an appropriate structure and implementation approach based upon the City's existing website, organizational structure, project goals, and industry best practices. Any assumptions regarding quantities that materially affect pricing should be clearly identified within the proposal.

Question 33

What domain, DNS, deployment, CDN, or traffic-management requirements should respondents account for when proposing implementation and transition of the new website?

Response:

The City intends to retain its existing **eastridgetn.gov** domain. Respondents should identify any DNS, domain configuration, SSL/TLS certificate, or related technical requirements necessary for implementation and launch. The City will coordinate with its existing service providers as necessary during transition. The City has not prescribed an existing deployment methodology, CDN configuration, proxy configuration, or traffic-management methodology that respondents must retain. Respondents should describe the development, deployment, version-control, testing, CDN, web application firewall, caching, DDoS mitigation, and other relevant infrastructure and security capabilities included within their proposed solution. Direct server or Apache log files from the City's existing hosting provider are not being provided as part of this procurement.

Question 34

Does the City have established brand standards, logos, photography, or other design assets that will be provided to the selected respondent?

Response:

The City will provide available official logos, brand assets, photography, and other existing materials to the selected respondent. Respondents should describe their proposed approach to establishing and maintaining a consistent visual design system for the new website.

Question 35

Has the City completed an accessibility audit of the existing website, and will an existing ADA transition plan or similar accessibility documentation be provided to the selected respondent?

Response:

The City has not provided an existing website accessibility audit or ADA transition plan as part of this solicitation. Respondents should prepare their proposals based upon the accessibility requirements identified within the Request for Proposals and applicable federal requirements and should describe their proposed accessibility testing, remediation, quality-assurance, and ongoing compliance approach.

Question 36

Can the City of East Ridge clarify the anticipated scope of the three alternate projects identified within the RFP?

Response:

Alternate No. 1 – Agenda Management System: The City maintains existing agendas and minutes that may require incorporation into a future agenda management solution. The City has not prescribed a specific historical migration period. Respondents should describe their recommended migration approach and clearly identify any assumptions, limitations, or costs associated with historical agenda and minute migration.

Alternate No. 2 – Online Municipal Code: Respondents should clearly describe whether their proposed solution includes legal codification services, ordinance supplementation, online hosting and display

functionality, integration with a separate codification provider, or a combination thereof. The scope and pricing associated with each proposed service should be clearly identified.

Alternate No. 3 – Citizen Request Submission/Tracking/Resolution: A native mobile application is not established as a mandatory requirement. Respondents should propose a solution that provides a convenient, mobile-accessible method for residents to submit requests and allows appropriate tracking, routing, management, and resolution. Respondents may identify native mobile application capabilities as an optional enhancement where available.

Question 37

Does the City provide a preference for Tennessee-based firms or certified Women Business Enterprises, and has the City established a maximum page count or additional formatting requirements for proposals?

Response:

The City has not established a preference or evaluation advantage for Tennessee-based respondents or certified Women Business Enterprises as part of this solicitation. Responsive proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria identified within the Request for Proposals. The City has not established a maximum page count beyond the submission and content requirements identified within the RFP. Respondents should organize proposals in a clear and concise manner that allows the Selection Committee to readily evaluate the firm's qualifications, proposed solution, approach, pricing, and compliance with the RFP requirements.

Question 38

Does the City require integration with an existing emergency notification or mass-communication system, and how should respondents address existing external systems and APIs?

Response:

The City has not established integration with a specific emergency notification or mass-communication platform as a mandatory requirement of the base project. Respondents may identify available emergency notification or mass-communication integrations that could provide value to the City. The City's website currently links to and/or utilizes various external services, and the new website should support integration with existing and future municipal systems as appropriate. Respondents should describe available API and third-party integration capabilities and clearly identify any technical requirements, limitations, licensing, or additional costs associated with their proposed solution.

Question 39

May respondents provide a fixed-fee breakdown for the design and deployment phase in addition to the anticipated hours per task and hourly rates requested within the RFP?

Response:

Yes. Respondents may provide a fixed-fee breakdown in addition to the anticipated hours per task and applicable hourly rates requested within the Request for Proposals. A fixed-fee structure may be provided to offer additional clarity regarding the respondent's proposed total cost; however, it should not replace the hourly and task-level detail requested within the RFP. Respondents should clearly identify the services and deliverables included within any proposed fixed fee, together with any assumptions, exclusions, optional services, recurring costs, or circumstances that could result in additional charges.

Question 40

Does the City currently utilize a specific third-party event management or calendar platform that must be retained or integrated with the new website?

Response:

The City has not established integration with a specific third-party event management platform as a mandatory requirement of this procurement. Respondents should propose calendar and event-management functionality that satisfies the requirements identified within the Request for Proposals, including multiple customizable calendars and “Add to My Calendar”/ICS functionality. Respondents may also identify available integrations with external event-management platforms where they believe those capabilities would provide additional value to the City.

Question 41

Regarding Alternate No. 1 – Agenda Management System, does the reference to agenda and minutes software within the City's FY2027 budget documentation indicate that a platform has already been selected or purchased, and may respondents propose an integrated third-party or SaaS-based solution?

Response:

The reference to agenda and minutes software within the City's FY2027 budget documentation should not be interpreted as establishing a pre-selected platform for Alternate No. 1 under this procurement. Respondents may propose an integrated third-party or SaaS-based agenda management solution, provided the proposed solution satisfies the applicable requirements identified within the Request for Proposals. Respondents should clearly identify the proposed platform, functionality, integrations, implementation requirements, licensing or subscription costs, data ownership and portability considerations, and any other recurring costs.

Question 42

Regarding Alternate No. 2 – Online Municipal Code, approximately how many documents or pages should respondents assume will require digitization, conversion, organization, or migration?

Response:

The City has not established a definitive number of municipal code pages or documents requiring digitization, conversion, organization, or migration as part of this procurement. Respondents should describe their proposed approach and clearly identify any assumptions, limitations, unit pricing, or other factors that materially affect the scope or cost of implementation.

Question 43

What is the purpose and status of the /testsite/ directory currently accessible through the City's domain, and should respondents incorporate or preserve any design, navigation, content, or functionality from that site?

Response:

The /testsite/ directory was created as part of a previous website redesign effort with the City's current website provider, Local Government Corporation (LGC). During that effort, existing City content and information were migrated to the test environment for review and development purposes. That prior redesign effort has since been discontinued. The /testsite/ environment remains in place through LGC; however, it should not be considered an approved design direction, required website structure, or source of functionality that respondents must preserve as part of this procurement. Respondents should prepare their proposals based upon the requirements, goals, and specifications contained within the Request for Proposals and subsequent addenda. Respondents may review the test site for general informational purposes but should not assume that its design, navigation, content organization, or functionality represents the City's desired final direction.

Question 44

Does the City expect the selected respondent to perform accessibility remediation on all existing historical PDFs and documents as part of the base project?

Response:

The City expects the proposed website and document-management environment to support applicable accessibility requirements and provide City staff with appropriate tools and processes for publishing accessible content going forward. Respondents should describe their approach to identifying and addressing accessibility issues associated with existing documents selected for migration. The City has not established that every historical document currently available through the existing website must be remediated as part of the base project. If a respondent recommends remediation services beyond those included within its base proposal, the respondent should clearly identify the proposed methodology, assumptions, prioritization approach, unit pricing or other applicable pricing structure, and associated costs.

Question 45

Will City staff and department representatives be available during implementation to assist with decisions regarding which existing content should be retained, consolidated, revised, archived, or removed?

Response:

Yes. The selected respondent should anticipate coordinating with designated City staff during the content review and migration process. The City will assist with departmental and administrative decisions regarding existing content. Respondents should also describe their recommended content audit, information-architecture, migration, and content-governance process and identify the level of City staff participation anticipated within their proposed implementation approach.

Question 46

Are there specific record-retention requirements respondents should account for when recommending that outdated website content be archived or removed from public navigation?

Response:

Website redesign and content migration should not be interpreted as authorization to dispose of City records that are otherwise subject to applicable records-retention requirements. The City will work with the selected respondent to determine which content should remain publicly accessible, be migrated, archived, or removed from public navigation. Respondents are not expected to establish the City's legal records-retention requirements but should describe any archival, versioning, export, retention, or records-management capabilities available within their proposed solution. Content removed from the public-facing website may still require retention by the City through an appropriate records-management process.

Question 47

How should respondents address existing historical agendas, minutes, meeting documents, and related records within the base website project if Alternate No. 1 – Agenda Management System is not selected?

Response:

Respondents should assume that historical agendas, minutes, meeting documents, and related records selected by the City for continued public access must remain appropriately accessible through the base website regardless of whether Alternate No. 1 is selected. The City does not anticipate that every historical record must necessarily be recreated or manually restructured within a new agenda-management system as part of the base project. Respondents should describe their recommended approach for migrating, organizing, searching, and providing continued public access to applicable historical meeting records within the proposed website and document-management environment. If Alternate No. 1 is proposed, respondents should separately describe any additional migration, conversion, indexing, or functionality associated specifically with the proposed agenda-management solution.

Question 48

Does the City expect the new website to refresh the existing design or establish a new visual direction, and are there specific websites, design styles, user journeys, or usability concerns respondents should use as design references?

Response:

The City is seeking a comprehensive redesign of its primary website rather than a limited visual refresh of the existing site. Respondents are encouraged to propose a modern, professional, accessible, and user-friendly design and information architecture based upon municipal website best practices and the goals and requirements identified within the RFP. The City has not prescribed a specific website, design style, or visual reference that respondents are required to emulate or avoid. Respondents should demonstrate their recommended creative direction and explain how the proposed design, navigation, information architecture, and user experience will improve access to City information and services for residents, businesses, visitors, and other users. The City expects respondents to exercise professional creativity while appropriately incorporating available City branding, logos, photography, and other official assets.

Question 49

Does the City have existing user research, defined user journeys, or usability studies, and should respondents anticipate stakeholder workshops or other discovery activities during implementation?

Response:

The City is not providing formal user research, usability studies, or predefined user journeys as part of this procurement. Respondents should describe the discovery and stakeholder-engagement process they recommend for the project, including any interviews, workshops, user research, content analysis, information-architecture exercises, or other activities they believe are appropriate. Respondents should clearly identify the level of City staff participation anticipated and any assumptions or costs associated with those activities.

Question 50

Beyond compliance with applicable accessibility requirements, has the City established specific accessibility audiences, real-user testing requirements, or plain-language requirements for the new website?

Response:

The City has not established separate accessibility requirements for specific user groups beyond the applicable accessibility requirements identified within the RFP and subsequent addenda. Respondents should propose an inclusive design and testing approach that supports users with a broad range of abilities, devices, and assistive technologies. Real-user accessibility testing has not been established as a mandatory requirement; however, respondents may identify such testing or other accessibility-validation services within their proposed approach. The City encourages clear, understandable, and user-focused content appropriate for a public-facing municipal website. Respondents should describe any plain language, readability, or content-accessibility practices incorporated into their proposed solution or content strategy.

Question 51

What level of content strategy, rewriting, and approval workflow should respondents anticipate during the redesign and migration process?

Response:

The City anticipates providing the majority of its existing written content, photographs, documents, and departmental information. Content will not necessarily be finalized prior to the beginning of design and implementation, and respondents should anticipate that content review and website development may occur concurrently. The selected respondent should anticipate coordinating with designated City staff during the content review and migration process. Respondents are encouraged to identify content strategy, editing, rewriting, information architecture, or related services they recommend as part of their proposed approach and should clearly identify whether those services are included within the base proposal or offered at an additional cost. The City has not prescribed a specific number of content-review or approval rounds. Respondents should describe their recommended review and approval process and identify assumptions regarding City participation and turnaround times.

Question 52

May the three optional alternates—Agenda Management, Online Municipal Code, and Citizen Request Submission/Tracking/Resolution—be provided through separate third-party or SaaS platforms rather than being native components of the proposed CMS?

Response:

Yes. The City has not established that the three optional alternates must be native components of the proposed content management system. Respondents may propose integrated third-party or SaaS-based solutions where appropriate, provided the proposed solution satisfies the applicable requirements of the RFP. Respondents should clearly identify the proposed platform, integration methodology, functionality, data ownership and portability provisions, security considerations, implementation requirements, licensing or subscription costs, and any other recurring costs associated with each proposed alternate.

Question 53

Are there specific security or compliance certifications, such as SOC 2, HIPAA, or StateRAMP, that the City requires for the proposed hosting environment?

Response:

The City has not established SOC 2, HIPAA, StateRAMP, or another specific third-party certification as a mandatory requirement of this procurement beyond the hosting, security, availability, redundancy, backup, disaster recovery, and related requirements identified within the RFP and subsequent addenda. Respondents should describe the security standards, certifications, controls, monitoring, encryption, vulnerability-management practices, data-hosting practices, and other cybersecurity measures applicable to their proposed solution. Any limitations, additional costs, or third-party dependencies should be clearly identified.

Question 54

For the three optional alternate projects, should respondents propose fully defined solutions as part of this procurement, or is the requested pricing intended primarily to establish potential costs for future implementation?

Response:

The three alternate projects are optional components of this procurement. Respondents should provide sufficient information for the City to evaluate the proposed solution, functionality, implementation approach, and associated costs for each alternate included within their proposal. The requested pricing should not be interpreted solely as a request to establish hypothetical future costs. Respondents should identify the solution proposed for each alternate, including applicable implementation requirements, integrations, licensing or subscription costs, recurring costs, assumptions, and other relevant considerations. The City's inclusion of an alternate within the RFP does not guarantee that the alternate will be selected or implemented. Any selection of an alternate will be determined by the City as part of its evaluation, award, negotiation, and contracting process.

Question 55

May respondents include relevant projects and professional experience completed by proposed key personnel during prior or current employment when demonstrating qualifications, and may active client engagements be included as references?

Response:

Respondents may identify relevant professional experience of proposed key personnel, including work performed during prior or current employment, when demonstrating the qualifications and experience of the proposed project team. Such experience should be clearly distinguished from projects performed under the name of the responding firm. Current or active client engagements may also be identified as relevant experience provided that the nature and status of the engagement are accurately disclosed and the identified reference is authorized and able to verify the work described. Respondents remain responsible for satisfying the client-reference requirements established within the RFP. Professional or employer references for individual team members should not be assumed to substitute for required client references of the responding firm unless otherwise permitted by the RFP.

Question 56

May an international respondent utilize a U.S.-based printing, courier, or delivery service to prepare and/or deliver the required physical proposal package?

Response:

Yes. The City has not prescribed the location from which a proposal package must be printed, prepared for shipment, or delivered. Respondents may utilize a printing, courier, or delivery service to facilitate submission. Regardless of the method used, the proposal must fully comply with all requirements of the RFP regarding contents, copies, signatures, packaging, labeling, sealed submission, and delivery and must be physically received by the City Clerk's office prior to the established submission deadline. The respondent remains solely responsible for ensuring timely and compliant delivery. Email or online submission will not substitute for the required physical proposal.

Question 57

May respondents separately identify pricing for future development, enhancements, integrations, or other services outside the initial implementation and ongoing maintenance/support scope?

Response:

Yes. Respondents may identify hourly rates, project-based pricing methodologies, or other fee structures applicable to future enhancements, integrations, development, or other services that fall outside the agreed project scope and ongoing maintenance/support services. Any such rates or pricing methodologies should be clearly identified within the fee proposal. Inclusion of such rates does not obligate the City to purchase additional services.

Question 58

May third-party cloud infrastructure costs be separately identified, and how should respondents address potential increases in hosting costs resulting from future changes in traffic, storage, bandwidth, or other usage?

Response:

Yes. Respondents utilizing third-party cloud or infrastructure services may separately identify applicable recurring infrastructure costs. Respondents should clearly describe the proposed hosting architecture, included usage or capacity, applicable third-party costs, and any circumstances under which increased traffic, storage, bandwidth, computing resources, or other usage may affect the City's costs. Any variable pricing, thresholds, pass-through charges, or other potential cost adjustments should be clearly disclosed within the proposal.

Question 59

May respondents propose a milestone-based invoicing structure for implementation, or has the City established a required payment schedule?

Response:

Respondents may propose a milestone-based or other reasonable invoicing structure for implementation. The proposed payment schedule should clearly identify applicable milestones, deliverables, amounts or percentages, and anticipated timing of invoices. The City has not established a separate mandatory implementation payment schedule through this clarification. The final invoicing and payment structure will be subject to negotiation with the selected respondent and incorporation into the final professional services agreement.

Question 60

How should respondents address annual renewal pricing or future price adjustments for recurring hosting, maintenance, licensing, and support services?

Response:

The City has not established a specific initial contract term or renewal structure as part of this procurement. Respondents should identify any recommended contract term, renewal provisions, pricing guarantees, or other contractual considerations associated with their proposed solution. The final contract term and renewal provisions will be subject to negotiation with the selected respondent and incorporated into the final professional services agreement approved by the City. Respondents should clearly identify recurring hosting, maintenance, licensing, support, and other annual costs within their proposals. Respondents may propose fixed pricing for a defined period and/or clearly disclosed renewal and price-adjustment provisions for subsequent years. Any escalation methodology, percentage increase, index, third-party pass-through cost, renewal provision, or other mechanisms that may affect future pricing should be clearly identified so that the City can evaluate the anticipated long-term cost of the proposed solution.

Question 61

May a respondent utilize a third-party or managed hosting provider as part of its proposed hosting solution?

Response:

Yes. Respondents may propose hosting or infrastructure provided through an established third-party or managed hosting provider. Any such arrangement should be clearly identified within the proposal, including the respective responsibilities of the respondent and hosting provider. Regardless of the underlying hosting arrangement, the proposed solution must satisfy all applicable requirements of the RFP related to availability, security, backups, redundancy, disaster recovery, technical support, and ongoing service. The prime respondent will remain responsible for the performance of the services proposed to and contracted with the City.

Question 62

Does the City anticipate awarding the primary website project to a single respondent or multiple respondents?

Response:

The City anticipates selecting a single prime respondent for the primary Website Design, Content Management System & Hosting Services engagement. Respondents may identify subcontractors, third-party providers, technology partners, or other resources within their proposals where appropriate; however, the prime respondent will remain responsible for the services proposed to and contracted with the City. The City's inclusion of optional alternates does not obligate the City to award or implement any or all alternate services.

Question 63

Will the City consider extending the September 14, 2026 proposal submission deadline?

Response:

Currently, the City does not anticipate extending the established proposal submission deadline. Proposals remain due no later than 3:00pm EST on September 14, 2026, in accordance with the submission requirements contained within the Request for Proposals and subsequent addenda. Should the City determine that a modification to the procurement schedule is necessary, any change will be communicated to prospective respondents through a formal addendum.

Question 64

May respondents rely upon the experience, qualifications, and client references of identified subcontractors, teaming partners, or other proposed project team members when demonstrating compliance with the RFP's experience and reference requirements?

Response:

Respondents may identify and describe relevant experience, qualifications, government project experience, graphic design capabilities, and other professional expertise of subcontractors, team partners, and proposed project team members as part of their proposal. The City will consider the qualifications and experience of the proposed project team when evaluating the respondent's overall ability to successfully perform the work. However, experience or client references attributable to a subcontractor, teaming partner, or individual team member should be clearly identified as such and should not be represented as experience or client references of the prime respondent. Respondents remain responsible for satisfying the proposal and client-reference requirements established within the Request for Proposals. Proposals should clearly identify the role and responsibilities of each proposed subcontractor, team partner, or key project team member.

Question 65

What business license or vendor registration requirements apply to an out-of-city respondent, and at what point in the procurement or contracting process would those requirements apply?

Response:

An East Ridge business license is not required for an out-of-city respondent to perform work for the City. However, prior to conducting business with the City, the selected respondent will be required to complete the City's applicable vendor registration requirements. As part of that process, the selected respondent will be required to provide documentation necessary to become an approved City vendor, including a copy of its applicable business license and a current Certificate of Insurance (COI), along with any other applicable vendor registration documentation. These requirements apply to the selected respondent as part of the City's contracting and vendor registration process and are not required solely for the submission of a proposal.

Question 66

Regarding Alternate No. 2 – Online Municipal Code, what is the current format of the City's Municipal Code, and is the City seeking legal codification services or only hosting and online publication of a separately codified municipal code?

Response:

The City currently partners with the Municipal Technical Advisory Service (MTAS) to host the City's Municipal Code. The current Municipal Code is available electronically as a downloadable PDF that may be viewed, searched within the PDF, downloaded, or printed. Existing search functionality is provided within the PDF document itself rather than through a separate web-based municipal code search or codification platform. For purposes of Alternate No. 2, the City is seeking a vendor to provide codification and updating of the City's ordinances together with online municipal code hosting, search functionality, and ongoing maintenance. Respondents should account for the City's existing PDF-based Municipal Code when describing their proposed approach and should clearly identify any codification, supplementation, conversion, implementation, hosting, search, maintenance, or related services included within their proposal, together with applicable implementation and recurring costs.

Question 67

Regarding Alternate No. 3 – Citizen Request Submission/Tracking/Resolution, will the proposed solution be required to integrate with an existing City work-order, service-request, asset-management, ERP, or similar system?

Response:

No. The City does not currently utilize an existing work-order, service-request, asset-management, ERP, or similar centralized system through which resident requests are submitted, tracked, routed, or resolved. Respondents should propose a standalone or integrated solution appropriate for the City's needs and clearly identify the proposed workflow, routing, tracking, administrative functionality, integrations, and any assumptions or additional requirements associated with implementation.

Question 68

For the requirement that respondents provide at least three client references for similar website design projects completed within the past five years, may references from proposed subcontractors, teaming partners, or individual key personnel be used to satisfy the three-reference requirement?

Response:

The three required client references should be for projects performed by the prime contractor/respondent submitting the proposal. References from proposed subcontractors, teaming partners, or individual personnel may be included as supplemental information and may be considered by the City in evaluating the overall qualifications and experience of the proposed project team; however, such references should not be used to satisfy the minimum requirement for three client references of the prime contractor. Respondents are encouraged to clearly identify the role of any subcontractors, teaming partners, or key personnel and provide relevant qualifications and project experience as part of their proposal.

Question 69

For Alternate No. 1 – Agenda Management System, how many City boards, commissions, authorities, committees, or other public bodies should respondents anticipate supporting?

Response:

The City has not established a fixed number or specific list of boards, commissions, authorities, committees, or other public bodies that will utilize the Agenda Management System. The City currently maintains multiple regularly scheduled public bodies, and that structure may change over time as boards or other bodies are created, dissolved, reorganized, or otherwise modified. Respondents should propose a solution capable of supporting multiple boards, commissions, authorities, committees, and other public bodies as designated by the City. Respondents should clearly identify any licensing structure, user or board limitations, pricing thresholds, or additional costs associated with adding or modifying participating bodies.

Question 70

Does the City currently livestream public meetings, and are respondents expected to integrate the Agenda Management System with the City's existing video recording or streaming equipment or platform?

Response:

The City does not currently livestream its public meetings. Meetings are recorded by City staff using camera/recording equipment and OBS Studio and are subsequently uploaded to the City's YouTube account for public viewing. The recording and upload process is currently managed internally by City IT staff. Integration with the City's existing recording equipment or OBS Studio is not established as a mandatory requirement of Alternate No. 1. Respondents should identify any video recording, publishing, YouTube integration, or related capabilities included within their proposed solution and clearly identify any additional hardware, software, licensing, integration, implementation requirements, or associated costs.

Question 71

For Alternate No. 1 – Agenda Management System, is agenda-to-video timestamp linking or automated meeting transcription required?

Response:

No. The City has not established agenda-to-video timestamp linking or automated meeting transcription as mandatory requirements of Alternate No. 1. Respondents may identify these capabilities as optional or value-added features and should clearly identify any associated implementation, licensing, and recurring costs.

Question 72

For hosting and ongoing support, does the two-hour response-time target identified within the RFP apply only during the stated normal business hours, and has the City established specific uptime, backup-retention, Recovery Time Objective (RTO), or Recovery Point Objective (RPO) requirements beyond those contained within the RFP?

Response:

For purposes of this requirement, the response-time target refers to acknowledgment and initial response to a support request and should not be interpreted as a mandatory two-hour resolution time for all support issues. Respondents should describe their applicable response and resolution targets, escalation procedures, and service levels within the proposal. The two-hour response-time target identified under Ongoing Support applies to troubleshooting and support requests during the City's stated normal business hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST. This should be distinguished from the website availability requirements contained within Attachment A. The website is required to be available 24/7, and respondents should provide a hosting and support model capable of satisfying the availability, scheduled maintenance, redundancy, system monitoring, backup, recovery, and disaster-recovery requirements identified within the RFP. The City has not established additional mandatory numerical uptime percentages, backup-retention periods, Recovery Time Objectives (RTO), or Recovery Point Objectives (RPO) beyond the requirements stated within the RFP. Respondents should clearly describe the service levels, monitoring, redundancy, backup and recovery practices, disaster-recovery procedures, and escalation processes included within their proposed solution, along with any assumptions or limitations that may materially affect service or pricing. The proposed hosting environment should also be capable of accommodating reasonable temporary increases in website traffic associated with emergencies, severe weather, public safety incidents, major announcements, or other events that may result in increased public demand for City information. Respondents should describe the scalability and related capabilities of their proposed hosting environment to accommodate such increases in demand.

Question 73

For the requirement for document storage and automatic PDF conversion, what source formats or user workflow does the City expect the selected CMS to support? Should City staff be able to upload common Office documents and have the system automatically create a web-publishable PDF, or is another conversion workflow intended?

Response:

The City has not prescribed specific source file formats or a required technical workflow for automatic PDF conversion. Respondents should describe the document storage and conversion capabilities available within their proposed solution, including supported source file types and the process by which authorized City staff may upload, convert, manage, and publish documents. Where automatic PDF conversion is supported, respondents should identify whether common office-document formats may be converted directly through the CMS or proposed platform, any limitations associated with that functionality, and any additional software, licensing, third-party services, or staff processes required. Respondents should also describe how the proposed document workflow supports accessibility requirements applicable to published documents.

Question 74

Does the City expect respondents to identify and commit to a specific CMS product and hosting architecture within the proposal, including associated licensing and recurring costs, or may final platform selection occur during discovery?

Response:

Respondents should identify the CMS, hosting approach, and principal technology components upon which their proposal and pricing are based. The proposal should provide sufficient detail for the City to evaluate the proposed solution, functionality, implementation approach, hosting environment, licensing requirements, and initial and recurring costs. Discovery may be used to refine configuration, information architecture, workflows, integrations, implementation details, and other project requirements following award; however, respondents should not rely upon post-award discovery to defer identification of the principal CMS or hosting solution being proposed. Any alternatives, assumptions, dependencies, optional components, or circumstances that could materially affect platform selection or pricing should be clearly identified within the proposal.

Question 75

Of the three alternate projects identified within the RFP—Agenda Management, Online Municipal Code, and Citizen Request Submission/Tracking—has the City established a priority among the three alternates?

Response:

The City has not established or published a priority ranking among the three alternates. Respondents may submit proposals for any or all of the alternate projects identified within the RFP. For each alternate included within a respondent's proposal, the requested information and pricing should be clearly identified separately from the primary website proposal. The City reserves the right to award any, all, or none of the alternates based upon its evaluation of the proposals received, available funding, overall project needs, and the best interests of the City.

Question 76

Has the City established specific website performance requirements or benchmarks beyond the hosting and availability requirements contained within the RFP, such as Core Web Vitals or page-load targets?

Response:

The City has not established additional mandatory numerical website performance benchmarks, Core Web Vitals thresholds, or page-load targets beyond the requirements identified within the RFP. Respondents should propose a modern, responsive, and performance-optimized website and should describe the performance standards, optimization practices, monitoring tools, or other measures incorporated into their proposed solution.

Question 77

Has the City established specific privacy, cookie-consent, or other regulatory requirements for the proposed website beyond those identified within the RFP?

Response:

The City has not established additional project-specific privacy or cookie-consent requirements beyond those identified within the RFP and applicable law. Respondents should identify any privacy, consent-management, data-collection, tracking, analytics, or related functionality incorporated into their proposed solution and describe applicable administrative controls, data practices, third-party dependencies, and associated costs.

Question 78

Has the City conducted a Vulnerability Assessment and Penetration Testing (VAPT) or other formal security assessment of the current website, and will any related report or findings be provided to respondents?

Response:

The City has not conducted a Vulnerability Assessment and Penetration Testing (VAPT) or other formal security assessments of the current website and will not be providing a security assessment report or related findings as part of this procurement. Respondents should base their proposed security approach upon the requirements contained within the RFP and subsequent addenda and should describe the security assessment, testing, monitoring, vulnerability-management, and remediation practices included within their proposed solution.

Question 79

For Alternate No. 2 – Online Municipal Code, does the City require the Municipal Code to be hosted directly within and fully integrated into the new City website, or may respondents propose a separately hosted platform that is linked or integrated with the City website?

Response:

The City has not prescribed that the Municipal Code must be hosted directly within the same content management system or hosting environment as the City's primary website. Respondents may propose a separately hosted municipal code platform, an integrated solution, or another appropriate approach, provided the proposed solution satisfies the applicable requirements of Alternate No. 2. Respondents should clearly describe the proposed hosting arrangement, method of integration or connection with the City website, search functionality, user experience, administrative responsibilities, data ownership and portability, accessibility considerations, ongoing supplementation and maintenance processes, and any implementation, hosting, licensing, subscription, or recurring costs associated with the proposed solution.