

RFP NO. 2026-05 – WEBSITE REDESIGN, CMS, HOSTING, AND ACCESSIBILITY
COMPLIANCE SERVICES QUESTIONS & RESPONSES
POSTED SEPTEMBER 1, 2026

1. Does the City require a specific CMS platform for the new website, or should proposers recommend the platform they consider the best fit?

City Response: The City does not require a specific CMS platform. Proposers should recommend the platform they believe best meets the requirements and objectives identified in the RFP, including ease of use, accessibility, security, functionality, and ongoing support.

2. Should proposers price remediation of the City's existing document library (roughly 1,370 documents) to WCAG 2.1 AA, or is the PDF accessibility requirement in Section 5 aimed at documents published going forward?

City Response: The City is not requesting that proposers include remediation of the entire existing document library within the base proposal. Proposers should include the tools, functionality, and/or services available to support accessibility of documents published going forward. Proposers may separately identify any optional services and associated costs available for remediation of existing documents.

3. For the Spanish translation capability in Section 5, does the City expect automated translation across the site, or professionally translated Spanish content for a defined set of pages?

City Response: The City is seeking site-wide Spanish translation capability. Proposers should describe the translation solution offered by their platform, including whether translation is automated, professionally translated, or utilizes another method, and identify any associated costs.

4. Does the City use, or plan to procure, a separate agenda management or meeting platform that the new website must integrate with?

City Response: The City does not currently require integration with a specific agenda management or meeting platform. Proposers should describe the agenda and meeting functionality included with their proposed solution, as well as available integration capabilities with third-party agenda or meeting management platforms.

5. How many of the City's current PDF and paper forms should proposers plan to convert into online forms at launch?

City Response: The City has not established a specific number of existing forms that must be converted at launch, but it will be many. Proposers should describe the online form functionality included with their proposed solution, including the City's ability to create and manage forms internally. Any assumptions regarding the number of forms included in implementation should be clearly identified in the proposal.

6. Has the City established a budget or not-to-exceed amount for the one-time design and implementation work in Appendix B?

City Response: The City has budgeted approximately \$30,000 for the website redesign project. Proposers should submit their best proposed pricing based on the scope and requirements identified in the RFP. Cost will be evaluated as part of overall value and is one component of the City's evaluation criteria.

7. What annual budget is available for the recurring hosting, maintenance, support, and accessibility monitoring costs in Appendix B?

City Response: The City has not established a separate not-to-exceed annual budget for recurring hosting, maintenance, support, and accessibility monitoring costs. Proposers should clearly identify all annual recurring costs using the Cost Proposal Form in Appendix B.

8. Appendix B asks for one-time and annual costs while Article III of the Professional Services Agreement sets compensation as a monthly sum not to exceed a stated amount, so how should the one-time implementation cost be invoiced?

City Response: Proposers should complete Appendix B as provided, separately identifying one-time implementation costs and annual recurring costs. The payment structure and invoicing schedule for the selected proposer will be incorporated into the final agreement based upon the accepted proposal. Proposers may identify their proposed implementation payment schedule or invoicing structure within their proposal.

9. Is there an approved budget range for the Website Redesign, CMS, Hosting, and Accessibility Compliance Services project, including both one-time implementation costs and ongoing annual costs?

City Response: The City has budgeted approximately \$30,000 for the website redesign project. The City has not established a separate not-to-exceed annual budget for recurring hosting, maintenance, support, and accessibility monitoring costs. Proposers should submit their best proposed pricing based on the scope and requirements identified in the RFP and clearly identify all one-time and annual recurring costs using the Cost Proposal Form in Appendix B.

10. The Scope of Services includes content migration. Approximately how many existing webpages, PDFs, documents, and other content assets are expected to be migrated to the new website?

City Response: The City has not completed a comprehensive inventory establishing a specific number of webpages or other content assets to be migrated, but it will be quite a bit. Proposers should base their proposal on migration of the City's existing website content necessary to implement the new website and clearly identify any assumptions, limitations, or thresholds associated with content migration in their proposal.

11. The Scope of Services references Agenda and Meeting Integration. Does the City currently utilize a specific agenda management, meeting management, or document publishing platform that must be integrated with the new website?

City Response: The City does not currently require integration with a specific agenda management or meeting platform. Proposers should describe the agenda and meeting functionality included with their proposed solution, as well as available integration capabilities with third-party agenda or meeting management platforms.

12. With respect to website accessibility requirements, what are the City's expectations regarding existing PDF documents and other downloadable files currently published on the website? Is document accessibility remediation considered part of the project scope?

City Response: The City is not requiring that proposers include remediation of the entire existing document library within the base proposal. Proposers should include the tools, functionality, and/or services available to support accessibility of documents published going forward. Proposers may separately identify any optional services and associated costs available for remediation of existing documents.

13. If document remediation is within scope, could the City provide an estimate of the number of PDF and other document files that would require accessibility review and remediation prior to launch?

City Response: Remediation of the City's entire existing document library is not required as part of the base proposal. Accordingly, the City is not establishing a required number of existing documents to be remediated prior to launch. Proposers may identify optional document remediation services, including their proposed pricing structure and any applicable assumptions or limitations.

14. Section 6 and Appendix C of RFP No. 2026-05 request experience and references from California municipal government website clients. Would the City of Exeter consider comparable public-sector experience, including work for a regulated public-service corporation in Arizona and California service providers whose web applications support municipal contracts, when evaluating these qualifications? If so, may those organizations be included among the required references?

City Response: Proposers are welcome to include comparable public-sector experience and additional references that demonstrate relevant qualifications and experience. Such experience may be considered as part of the City's overall evaluation of the proposal.

15. Are India-based firms eligible to participate and perform the services fully remotely, including meetings and vendor demonstrations with convenient time-zone overlap?

City Response: The RFP does not restrict participation based on the geographic location of the proposer. should demonstrate their ability to satisfy all requirements of the RFP and resulting

agreement, including communication, meetings, demonstrations, implementation, training, ongoing support, and other required services. Any assumptions regarding remote performance or availability should be clearly identified in the proposal.

16. As an offshore vendor, our proposed delivery model will not involve onsite employee deputation in California. Therefore, please advise whether Workers' Compensation and Business Automobile Liability insurance requirements would apply.

City Response: The insurance requirements contained in the RFP and Professional Services Agreement remain applicable unless otherwise modified or waived by the City. Proposers whose proposed service model may make a particular insurance requirement inapplicable should clearly identify the requested exception and the basis for the request in their proposal. Any requested modification will be reviewed by the City as part of the procurement and contracting process.

17. Please confirm whether equivalent liability coverage and certificates issued by Indian insurers will be acceptable.

City Response: The Professional Services Agreement currently requires insurance coverage to be placed with insurers approved to do business in California with an AM Best Rating of A-;VII or higher. Proposers should identify any requested exceptions or proposed alternative insurance arrangements in their proposal. Acceptance of alternative or equivalent coverage, including coverage issued by an insurer outside the United States, is not guaranteed and would be subject to review and approval by the City.

18. Initial Website Size / Page Count

City Response: The City has not completed a comprehensive inventory establishing a specific number of webpages to be included in the initial website launch and does not have a proposed sitemap available at this time, however there are quite a bit. Proposers should review the City's existing website and base their proposal on the scope necessary to implement the new website. Any assumptions, limitations, or thresholds regarding the number of webpages included should be clearly identified in the proposal.

19. Fixed Project Price vs. Hourly Implementation

City Response: Proposers should complete Appendix B as provided and submit a proposed total one-time cost for website design and implementation, along with the requested component costs. Any assumptions, limitations, or quantities upon which the proposed pricing is based should be clearly identified. Hourly rates for additional services should also be provided as requested in Appendix B.

20. Current Website Content Inventory

City Response: The City has not completed a comprehensive inventory establishing specific quantities for all existing webpages, news posts, documents/PDFs, images, forms, and other content assets. Proposers should review the City's existing website in developing their proposal and clearly identify any assumptions or limitations associated with content migration.

21. Content Migration Scope

City Response: The City does not necessarily anticipate migrating all existing content without review. As part of the implementation process, the City expects to work with the selected proposer to identify content that should be migrated, removed, archived, consolidated, or otherwise excluded from the new website. Proposers should describe their proposed content migration and review process.

22. Content Editing and Reorganization

City Response: Proposers should include recommendations regarding organization, navigation, consolidation, and presentation of existing website content as part of the redesign process. The City is not requesting comprehensive professional copywriting or rewriting of all existing content as part of the base scope. Proposers may identify any additional content development or copywriting services available as optional services.

23. New Website Content

City Response: The City anticipates providing substantive City-specific content and materials for new pages where needed. Proposers should include the placement, formatting, and configuration of City-provided content necessary for implementation of the new website. Any professional copywriting, photography, or other content creation services offered may be separately identified as optional services.

24. Online Forms

City Response: The City has not established a specific number of existing forms that must be converted at launch. Proposers should describe the online form functionality included with their proposed solution, including the City's ability to create and manage forms internally. Any assumptions regarding the number of forms included in implementation should be clearly identified in the proposal.

The City is not requiring integration of online forms with a specific third-party system unless otherwise identified in the RFP. Proposers should describe available integration capabilities.

25. Agendas and Meetings

City Response: The City does not currently require integration with a specific agenda management or meeting platform. Proposers should describe the agenda and meeting functionality included with their proposed solution, as well as available integration capabilities with third-party agenda or meeting management platforms.

26. Calendar

City Response: Proposers should describe the calendar functionality included with their proposed solution, including the ability for City staff to create and manage events and any available integration capabilities with external calendar systems.

27. Staff Directory and Staff Biography Pages

City Response: The City has not established a specific number of staff directory entries or individual biography/profile pages for purposes of the RFP. Proposers should describe the staff directory functionality included with their proposed solution. The City does not currently require individual biography/profile pages for every staff member. Any assumptions regarding staff directory implementation should be clearly identified in the proposal.

28. Other City Systems / Website Connections

City Response: Proposers should review the City's existing website when developing their proposal and describe the proposed solution's ability to link to or integrate with third-party services. Specific integration requirements, if any, will be further identified during discovery and implementation.

29. Existing PDF and Document Accessibility

City Response: The City is not requesting that proposers include remediation of the entire existing document library within the base proposal. Proposers should include the tools, functionality, and/or services available to support accessibility of documents published going forward. Proposers may separately identify any optional services and associated costs available for remediation of existing documents.

30. Ongoing Accessibility Services

City Response: Proposers should describe the ongoing accessibility monitoring services included with their proposed solution, including automated scanning and reporting, manual review services, identification and correction of accessibility issues, frequency of monitoring, reporting capabilities, and any associated limitations or additional costs. The City will evaluate the proposed level of service as part of its review of accessibility capabilities and overall value.

31. Spanish Translation Capability

City Response: Proposers should describe the translation solution offered by their platform, including whether translation is automated, professionally translated, staff-managed, or utilizes another method, and identify any associated costs.

32. Warranty and Ongoing Support Period

City Response: The City has not established a specific required warranty period beyond the requirements identified in the RFP. Proposers should identify the warranty coverage included with their proposed solution, including the duration and scope of coverage.

Proposers should also provide annual pricing for ongoing hosting, maintenance, technical support, accessibility monitoring, and other recurring services and identify any renewal terms and annual cost escalation, if applicable.

33. Ongoing Maintenance and Technical Support

City Response: The City has not established a predetermined number of support hours or specific response-time requirements. Proposers should describe their standard support model, including support hours, methods of requesting support, response and resolution targets, services included in the annual cost, any limitations on support hours or requests, and pricing for services outside the standard support plan.

The City anticipates that routine website content management will primarily be performed by trained City staff.

34. Staff Training

City Response: The City has not established a specific number of employees or required training hours. Proposers should describe their recommended training approach and identify the amount and type of training included in the proposal. The City is open to remote and/or onsite training and encourages proposers to identify any recorded training resources, written documentation, or other ongoing training materials included with their solution.

35. Existing / Incumbent Website Contract

City Response: The City currently maintains an existing municipal website and associated services. Proposers should base their proposals on the requirements of RFP No. 2026-05 rather than the scope or pricing of the City's existing service arrangement.

36. Exhibit A – Scope of Work

City Response: No additional Exhibit A was inadvertently omitted from the RFP package. The final Exhibit A – Scope of Work and Schedule of Fees for Services will be developed based upon the scope and pricing accepted by the City from the selected proposer and incorporated into the final Professional Services Agreement.

37. Standard Pricing Assumptions

City Response: The City is not establishing additional standard quantities beyond the requirements identified in the RFP. Where exact quantities are not provided, proposers should review the City's existing website, develop reasonable assumptions based upon the stated scope and their proposed approach, and clearly identify those assumptions, quantities, limitations, or thresholds in their proposal and cost proposal.

Please note that questions received and the City's responses will be compiled and posted in accordance with the RFP schedule.

38. Does the City have a local preference, or is the City open to a Canadian agency with similar experience serving clients across the United States?

City Response: The RFP does not establish a local preference or restrict participation based on the geographic location of the proposer. Firms located outside California or the United States may submit proposals for consideration, provided they can satisfy the requirements of the RFP and resulting agreement.

39. Is there a CMS that the City prefers?

City Response: The City does not require or prefer a specific CMS platform. Proposers should recommend the platform they believe best meets the requirements and objectives identified in the RFP, including ease of use, accessibility, security, functionality, and ongoing support.

40. Can the City confirm that it is not seeking a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) solution, but rather a custom solution?

City Response: The City has not restricted the proposed solution to either a custom-developed or commercial off-the-shelf platform. Proposers should recommend the solution they believe best satisfies the requirements and objectives of the RFP and clearly describe the proposed platform, licensing model, customization capabilities, and any associated limitations.

41. Does the City have an incumbent, and will the incumbent be participating in this RFP?

City Response: The City currently has an existing website service provider. The City does not know whether the incumbent provider will submit a proposal in response to this RFP.

42. Are there existing brand guidelines that the website should follow?

City Response: The City does not have formal website-specific brand guidelines that proposers are required to follow. The selected proposer will work with the City during the discovery and design process to establish an appropriate visual direction consistent with the City's identity.

43. Is the expectation to refresh the existing design or create a completely new visual direction?

City Response: The City is seeking a redesign and modernization of its existing website and is open to a new visual direction. Proposers are encouraged to recommend a design approach that improves usability, accessibility, navigation, mobile responsiveness, and the overall user experience.

44. Are there examples of websites that reflect the desired look and feel?

City Response: The City has not identified specific websites that proposers are required to use as design references. Proposers are encouraged to provide examples and recommendations based on their experience with municipal and public-sector websites.

45. Are there websites or design styles that should be avoided?

City Response: The City has not identified specific websites or design styles that must be avoided. Proposed designs should prioritize usability, accessibility, clarity, professionalism, mobile responsiveness, and ease of navigation.

46. How much creative flexibility is expected from the successful proposer?

City Response: The City welcomes creative recommendations from proposers. The selected proposer will have flexibility to recommend an appropriate visual and functional approach while working collaboratively with City staff and meeting the requirements and objectives identified in the RFP.

47. Are there visual elements or brand assets that must be incorporated?

City Response: Existing City logos and other applicable City identity elements should be incorporated as appropriate. Additional visual and branding decisions will be addressed during the discovery and design process.

48. Should the design align with existing marketing materials or other digital platforms?

City Response: The website should maintain an appropriate and recognizable City identity. The City is also open to recommendations for modernization and improved visual consistency as part of the redesign process.

49. What are the primary goals users should accomplish on the website?

City Response: As identified in the RFP, the City's primary objectives include modernizing the website, improving navigation and search, meeting accessibility requirements, providing an easy-to-use CMS, improving cybersecurity, and providing reliable ongoing hosting, maintenance, and support. The website should allow residents, businesses, and visitors to efficiently locate City information, services, documents, meetings, forms, news, and other commonly requested resources.

50. Are there specific user journeys that should be prioritized?

City Response: The City has not established prescribed user journeys as part of the RFP. Proposers should recommend an information architecture and user experience appropriate for a municipal website and may identify proposed priority user journeys as part of their approach.

51. Have usability issues been identified with the current website?

City Response: The City's RFP identifies improving navigation, search, mobile responsiveness, accessibility, and overall website modernization as project objectives. Proposers are encouraged to evaluate the existing website and identify additional opportunities for improvement as part of their proposed approach.

52. Is user research available to inform the design process?

City Response: The City does not have formal user research available for this project. Proposers should describe any discovery or user research activities they recommend as part of their proposed approach.

53. Will stakeholder or user workshops be required?

City Response: The City has not established a specific requirement for stakeholder or user workshops. Proposers should describe their recommended discovery and stakeholder engagement process and identify any workshops, meetings, or other activities included in their proposal.

54. Beyond WCAG compliance, are there accessibility goals specific to the City's audience?

City Response: The City's minimum accessibility requirement is WCAG 2.1 Level AA compliance as identified in the RFP. Proposers are encouraged to describe any additional accessibility practices, capabilities, or standards included with their proposed solution.

55. Are screen reader users a priority audience?

City Response: The City expects the website to be accessible to users with disabilities consistent with the accessibility requirements identified in the RFP. Proposers should describe how their proposed solution supports screen readers and other assistive technologies.

56. Will accessibility testing involve real users?

City Response: The City has not established a requirement for accessibility testing involving end users. Proposers should describe their proposed accessibility testing methodology, including automated and manual testing and any user-based testing included or available.

57. Is plain language required?

City Response: The RFP does not establish a separate plain-language standard. The City expects the website to present information in a clear, understandable, and user-friendly manner.

58. Are multilingual accessibility considerations required?

City Response: Proposers should describe how accessibility is maintained when using the translation functionality included with their proposed solution.

59. Will content be finalized before design begins?

City Response: No. The City anticipates that content review, organization, migration, and design may occur concurrently during portions of the project. Proposers should describe their recommended workflow for coordinating content and design activities.

60. Will placeholder content be acceptable?

City Response: Placeholder content may be used during the design and development process as appropriate. Final City-approved content should be incorporated prior to launch where applicable.

61. Is content strategy expected?

City Response: Proposers should include recommendations regarding information architecture, organization, navigation, consolidation, and presentation of existing website content as part of their proposed approach.

62. Is content rewriting included?

City Response: The City is not requesting comprehensive professional copywriting or rewriting of all existing content as part of the base scope. Proposers may separately identify any additional content development or copywriting services available as optional services.

63. Who approves content?

City Response: Final content and website approvals will be coordinated through designated City staff. Specific roles and approval workflows will be established with the selected proposer during project kickoff and discovery.

64. How many approval rounds should be anticipated?

City Response: The City has not established a specific number of approval rounds. Proposers should describe the review and approval process included within their proposed project approach and clearly identify any limits on the number of design or revision rounds included in their pricing.

65. Are there existing photography or video assets available?

City Response: The City has existing photographs and other visual assets that may be made available for use where appropriate. The specific assets to be used will be identified during the design process.

66. Does the City require original or stock videography or photography? If so, can the City quantify the requirement?

City Response: Original photography or videography is not a required component of the base scope. Proposers may identify available photography, videography, stock imagery, or related creative services as optional services and separately identify any associated costs.

67. Given our experience with municipal and government websites globally, would the City consider waiving the requirement for five California-specific municipal projects completed within the past five years if comparable experience in other jurisdictions can be demonstrated?

City Response: Proposers are welcome to include comparable municipal, governmental, and public-sector experience from other jurisdictions as supplemental experience demonstrating their qualifications. Such experience may be considered as part of the City's overall evaluation of the proposal.

68. Do you happen to know how many total webpages and files exist on the current website?

City Response: The City has not completed a comprehensive inventory establishing the total number of webpages, documents, or other files currently maintained on the City's website, but it's quite a few. Proposers should review the City's existing website when developing their proposal and clearly identify any assumptions, quantities, limitations, or thresholds associated with content migration.

69. In an ideal world, would you like all forms to be fillable on the City's website, including forms that collect sensitive information such as utility direct payment authorization forms or job applications?

City Response: The City is interested in expanding the availability and use of online forms where appropriate; however, the City is not requiring that all existing forms be converted to online forms as part of the initial project. Proposers should describe the online form functionality included with their proposed solution, including security and privacy features available for forms that may collect sensitive or confidential information. Any assumptions regarding the

number or types of forms included in implementation should be clearly identified in the proposal.

70. Is the City interested in replacing its downloadable facility request forms with configurable online workflows that can collect custom information, route requests for review, and connect with its existing recreation management processes?

City Response: The City is interested in learning about configurable online form and workflow capabilities available through the proposed solution; however, replacement of the City's existing facility request process with a specific online workflow is not a required component of the base scope. Proposers should describe available capabilities for configurable forms, internal routing, approvals, notifications, and integration with third-party systems, including any additional costs associated with these features.

71. Can the City describe its desired capability for "Agenda and meeting integration"? What solution does the City currently use for hosting agendas and minutes?

City Response: The City does not currently require integration with a specific agenda management or meeting platform. Proposers should describe the agenda and meeting functionality included with their proposed solution, as well as available integration capabilities with third-party agenda or meeting management platforms.

72. Is there a budget amount the City is hoping to stay under for the initial year and recurring years?

City Response: The City has budgeted approximately \$30,000 for the website redesign project. The City has not established a separate not-to-exceed annual budget for recurring hosting, maintenance, support, and accessibility monitoring costs. Proposers should submit their best proposed pricing based on the scope and requirements identified in the RFP and clearly identify all one-time and annual recurring costs using the Cost Proposal Form in Appendix B.

73. Is the current content being rewritten during the build, or migrated as it stands?

City Response: The City is not requesting comprehensive professional copywriting or rewriting of all existing website content as part of the base scope. Proposers should include recommendations regarding organization, navigation, consolidation, and presentation of existing content as part of the redesign and migration process. The City anticipates working with the selected proposer during implementation to identify content that should be migrated, updated, consolidated, archived, or excluded from the new website. The City will generally be responsible for providing and approving substantive City-specific content. Proposers may separately identify any additional content development, editing, or copywriting services available as optional services.

74. CMS Preference – The RFP specifies an easy-to-use CMS. Does the City have a preferred platform, or should vendors propose the CMS they believe best meets Exeter’s needs?

City Response: The City does not require or prefer a specific CMS platform. Proposers should recommend the platform they believe best meets the requirements and objectives identified in the RFP, including ease of use, accessibility, security, functionality, and ongoing support.

75. Content Migration – The RFP notes migration of existing content but does not specify the number of pages or files. Can you confirm the approximate volume of content to be migrated?

City Response: The City has not completed a comprehensive inventory establishing the total number of webpages, documents, or other files currently maintained on the City’s website. Proposers should review the City’s existing website when developing their proposal and clearly identify any assumptions, quantities, limitations, or thresholds associated with content migration.

76. Budget Range – No budget estimate is provided. Can you confirm whether the City has allocated a specific budget range for this project?

City Response: The City has budgeted approximately \$30,000 for the website redesign project. The City has not established a separate not-to-exceed annual budget for recurring hosting, maintenance, support, and accessibility monitoring costs. Proposers should submit their best proposed pricing based on the scope and requirements identified in the RFP and clearly identify all one-time and annual recurring costs using the Cost Proposal Form in Appendix B.

77. Accessibility Monitoring – Beyond initial WCAG 2.1 AA compliance, does the City expect ongoing accessibility audits (manual or third-party), or will automated monitoring tools be sufficient?

City Response: Proposers should describe the ongoing accessibility monitoring services included with their proposed solution, including automated scanning and reporting, manual review services, identification and correction of accessibility issues, frequency of monitoring, reporting capabilities, and any associated limitations or additional costs. The City will evaluate the proposed level of service as part of its review of accessibility capabilities and overall value.

78. Support Scope – The RFP references warranty and ongoing support. Should this support cover only technical/security maintenance, or also minor content updates and analytics reporting?

City Response: Proposers should describe their standard support model, including technical and security maintenance, support hours, methods of requesting support, response and resolution

targets, services included in the annual cost, analytics and reporting capabilities, and any limitations or additional costs.

The City anticipates that routine website content management will primarily be performed by trained City staff. Proposers should clearly identify whether minor content updates performed by the vendor are included within the proposed annual support cost or are available as an additional service.

79. Training Delivery – Should staff training be delivered on-site, virtually, or through documentation only?

City Response: The City has not established a required training delivery method. Proposers should describe their recommended training approach and identify the amount and type of training included in the proposal. The City is open to remote and/or onsite training and encourages proposers to identify any recorded training resources, written documentation, or other ongoing training materials included with their solution.

80. Appendix C requires three California municipal government client references from the past five years, and Section 6 requires five comparable projects. Our municipal and public-sector website work is outside California. Would comparable non-California municipal or public-agency projects be accepted for those forms, or is California experience a strict pass/fail qualification?

City Response: The requirements stated in the RFP remain unchanged. Section 6 requires demonstrated experience with California municipal government websites, including at least five comparable projects completed within the past five years, and Appendix C requests at least three California municipal government client references for comparable services.

Proposers may include additional non-California municipal or public-sector experience as supplemental information for the City's consideration; however, such experience does not replace the California municipal experience and reference requirements stated in the RFP.

81. Submission method and format – is the proposal to be emailed to your office, uploaded to a portal, or delivered in hard copy, and if hard copy, how many bound sets? Is there a page limit?

City Response: Proposals must be submitted electronically via email in PDF format to fquintana@exetercityhall.com by 4:00 p.m. on September 18, 2026. Hard-copy submission is not required. The RFP does not establish a proposal page limit. Proposers should follow the proposal content and organization requirements identified in the RFP.

82. Is a pre-proposal conference or site visit planned?

City Response: No pre-proposal conference or site visit is currently scheduled or required as part of this RFP process.

83. What insurance limits and any local business license or DIR registration will the successful firm be required to carry?

City Response: The insurance requirements are identified in the RFP and sample Professional Services Agreement. Required coverage includes Commercial General Liability of \$1,000,000 per occurrence/\$2,000,000 aggregate; Professional Liability of \$2,000,000 per claim; Automobile Liability of \$1,000,000 combined single limit; Workers' Compensation at statutory limits; Employer's Liability of \$1,000,000; and Cyber Liability of \$2,000,000 per claim.

The RFP does not identify DIR registration or a City business license as a proposal submission requirement. The selected proposer will be required to comply with all applicable requirements associated with entering into and performing the resulting agreement with the City.

84. Please confirm we have been added to the City's vendor list for future website, hosting and accessibility solicitations regardless of the outcome here.

City Response: Thank you for your interest in future City opportunities. The City does not maintain a guaranteed notification list for future solicitations. Vendors are encouraged to monitor the City's website and BidNet for future contracting opportunities and solicitations.

Section 6 (Vendor Qualifications) requires demonstrated experience with California municipal government websites and at least five comparable projects completed within the past five years. Will the City consider comparable municipal-scale website projects completed outside California, or projects delivered for non-municipal clients, toward this requirement?

City Response: The requirements stated in the RFP remain unchanged. Section 6 requires demonstrated experience with California municipal government websites, including at least five comparable projects completed within the past five years.

Proposers may include additional non-California municipal, public-sector, or other comparable experience as supplemental information for the City's consideration; however, such experience does not replace the California municipal experience requirement stated in the RFP.

86. Appendix A requests the population served and contract amount for each reference, suggesting public agency clients. May a proposer submit references from private-sector clients where the scope, technical requirements, and accessibility obligations are comparable?

City Response: The RFP requires references from California municipal government clients for comparable website redesign, CMS, hosting, and accessibility services. Proposers may provide additional private-sector or other comparable references as supplemental information; however, such references do not replace the California municipal government reference requirements stated in the RFP.

87. Our firm builds a live, purpose-built demonstration site for the specific agency as part of our proposal, which is independently verifiable against WCAG 2.1 Level AA. Will the City consider such a demonstration as evidence of capability under the Qualifications and Experience criterion?

City Response: Proposers may include a live demonstration site or other supplemental materials demonstrating their proposed solution and capabilities. The City may consider such materials as part of its overall evaluation of the proposal; however, a demonstration does not replace the experience, qualifications, references, or other submission requirements identified in the RFP.

88. For content migration, approximately how many pages and documents are in scope? Additionally, is the remediation of existing PDF documents to WCAG 2.1 AA included in the scope, or is it limited to migrating documents as they currently exist?

City Response: The City has not completed a comprehensive inventory establishing the total number of webpages, documents, or other files currently maintained on the City's website. Proposers should review the City's existing website when developing their proposal and clearly identify any assumptions, quantities, limitations, or thresholds associated with content migration.

The City is not requesting remediation of the entire existing document library as part of the base proposal. Proposals should include the tools, functionality, and/or services available to

support accessibility of documents published going forward. Proposers may separately identify and price optional services for remediation of existing documents.

89. What platform hosts the current website, who holds the domain registration, and which third-party systems must continue to function after launch (e.g., agenda management, permitting, utility billing, GIS, job postings, or online payments)?

City Response: Proposers should review the City's existing website and anticipate maintaining appropriate links and connections to existing third-party services as part of the redesign. Specific third-party integrations and transition requirements will be further identified during the discovery and implementation process with the selected proposer.

90. Given the community Exeter serves, is Spanish-language content within scope? If so, does the City require human-authored Spanish content, or is a machine-translation widget acceptable?

City Response: The City is seeking Spanish-language translation capability as part of the proposed website solution. The City has not prescribed a specific translation method. Proposers should describe the translation functionality included with their proposed solution, including whether it utilizes automated/machine translation, professional translation, staff-managed translations, or another method, and clearly identify any associated costs or limitations.

91. The Cost Proposal Form separates one-time costs from annual hosting, licensing, maintenance, and accessibility monitoring. Over what term will the City evaluate these annual costs under the Cost Proposal and Overall Value criterion?

City Response: The RFP does not establish a specific multi-year term over which annual recurring costs will be calculated for evaluation purposes. Proposers should clearly identify all one-time implementation costs and annual recurring costs as requested in the Cost Proposal Form, including any anticipated annual escalation or renewal pricing. The City will consider the proposed costs and overall value as part of its evaluation.

92. Please confirm the URL of the current City website, the current CMS/hosting platform, and whether the selected vendor will be provided administrative access and/or a complete content/database export for migration.

City Response: The City's current website is cityofexeter.ca.gov. The City will work with the selected proposer during implementation to provide available access, content, files, and other information reasonably necessary to facilitate migration. Proposers should describe their preferred migration process and identify any access, exports, or other information they would require from the City. Specific transition and access requirements will be coordinated with the selected proposer during implementation.

93. Please provide, if available, the current website inventory, including the approximate number of webpages, PDF/document files, images/media files, online forms, calendar items, news posts, staff directory records, and agenda/minutes records to be migrated. The proposer identified 1,357 internal webpages, 24 external webpages, 946 images, 1,101 PDF files, 3,428 working links, 30,213 pages within PDF files, and 32,518 images within PDF files. Please confirm whether these numbers are acceptable.

City Response: The City has not completed a comprehensive inventory establishing the total number of webpages, documents, images, links, or other files currently maintained on the website and therefore cannot independently confirm the quantities identified by the proposer. Proposers should review the existing City website when developing their proposals and clearly identify any assumptions, quantities, limitations, or thresholds associated with content migration.

94. Does the City expect all existing content to be migrated, or should the vendor conduct a content review and recommend content to retain, revise, consolidate, archive, or remove?

City Response: The City does not necessarily expect all existing content to be migrated. The City anticipates working with the selected proposer during implementation to identify content that should be migrated, updated, consolidated, archived, removed, or otherwise reorganized. Proposers should describe their recommended content review and migration process.

95. Is the selected vendor expected to rewrite or substantially edit existing content, or will the City provide/approve final content while the vendor focuses on migration, formatting, organization, and minor editorial cleanup?

City Response: The City is not requesting comprehensive professional copywriting or rewriting of all existing website content as part of the base scope. The City will generally be responsible for providing and approving substantive City-specific content. Proposers should include recommendations regarding organization, navigation, consolidation, formatting, and

presentation of existing content. Optional copywriting or additional content-development services may be separately identified and priced.

96. Does the City require a formal URL redirect/SEO migration plan, including 301 redirects, metadata migration, and preservation of existing search-engine rankings and inbound links?

City Response: Proposers should describe their recommended approach for URL redirects, metadata, SEO preservation, and minimizing broken links or disruption to existing inbound links as part of the website migration and launch process. Any assumptions, limitations, or additional costs should be clearly identified.

97. For existing PDF and document content, is the selected vendor expected to remediate legacy files for accessibility? If yes, please provide the approximate number of documents and/or total PDF pages to be remediated and identify any priority document categories.

City Response: The City is not requesting remediation of the entire existing document library as part of the base proposal. Proposals should include the tools, functionality, and/or services available to support accessibility of documents published going forward. Proposers may separately identify and price optional services for remediation of existing documents.

98. What does the City expect under “PDF accessibility tools” – CMS-based accessibility checking tools, document remediation services, staff tools/training for creating accessible PDFs, or a combination of these?

City Response: Proposers should describe the PDF accessibility tools and services included with their proposed solution, including any CMS-based checking tools, staff tools, training, document remediation capabilities, or other functionality available to assist the City in maintaining accessible documents. Proposers should clearly identify what is included in the base proposal and what, if anything, is available at additional cost.

99. For annual accessibility monitoring, what frequency and scope does the City expect, and should remediation work be included in the recurring fee or priced separately?

City Response: Proposers should describe their recommended ongoing accessibility monitoring services, including automated scanning, manual review, reporting, remediation assistance,

monitoring frequency, and issue-resolution processes. Proposers should clearly identify which services are included in the annual recurring fee and separately identify any remediation or other services subject to additional charges.

100. For Spanish translation capability, will automated/machine translation be acceptable, or does the City require human-translated content? Should translation apply to the entire website or only designated pages and content types?

City Response: Proposers should describe whether their proposed solution utilizes automated/machine translation, professional translation, staff-managed translations, or another method and identify any associated costs or limitations.

101. Approximately how many online forms are currently in use or expected at launch, and what functionality is required (e.g., file uploads, conditional fields, routing/approvals, electronic signatures, email notifications, payments, database integration, or export to other systems)?

City Response: The City has not established a specific number of forms to be converted or implemented at launch. Proposers should describe the online form functionality available through their proposed solution, including capabilities such as file uploads, conditional fields, routing and approvals, notifications, electronic signatures, payments, and integrations where available. Any assumptions, limitations, or additional costs should be clearly identified.

102. What system or vendor does the City currently use for agendas, minutes, packets, and meeting management, and what level of integration is expected with the new website? Please identify any available API, feed, or integration method.

City Response: The City does not currently require integration with a specific agenda or meeting management platform. Proposers should describe the agenda and meeting functionality included with their proposed solution and available capabilities for integration with third-party agenda or meeting management platforms.

103. Is the emergency alert requirement limited to a CMS-managed website banner, or must the website integrate with an existing emergency notification/mass-communication platform? If integration is required, please identify the current system.

City Response: The base requirement is for emergency alert banner functionality that can be managed by authorized City staff through the website/CMS. Proposers may also describe

available integration capabilities with third-party emergency notification or mass-communication systems, including any additional costs.

104. Does the City have specific search requirements beyond standard site-wide keyword search, such as PDF/document indexing, filters, autocomplete, relevance tuning, multilingual search, or search analytics/reporting?

City Response: The City has not prescribed specific search technology beyond the functionality identified in the RFP. Proposers should recommend and describe the search functionality included in their proposed solution, including document indexing, filtering, autocomplete, relevance tuning, multilingual capabilities, and analytics where available.

105. Should existing historical calendar events and news items be migrated? For social media, does the City expect simple outbound links, embedded feeds, automated publishing, or another level of integration?

City Response: Historical calendar and news content will be reviewed during implementation to determine what should be migrated, archived, or excluded. For social media, proposers should describe the functionality included with their proposed solution, including links, embedded feeds, publishing capabilities, or other available integrations, and identify any associated costs or limitations.

106. Does the City currently use an analytics platform such as Google Analytics 4, and is the selected vendor expected to preserve the existing account/property and tracking history, configure a new analytics environment, and/or provide ongoing analytics dashboards or reports?

City Response: Proposers should describe the analytics functionality included with their proposed solution, including implementation or configuration, dashboards, reporting, and the ability to preserve or transition existing analytics where technically feasible. Specific analytics transition requirements will be identified with the selected proposer during implementation.

107. Approximately how many City staff members and departments are expected to use the CMS? Are there required content approval workflows, department-level permissions, or other role structures beyond standard role-based access?

City Response: The City has not established a specific number of CMS users. The RFP requires unlimited staff editors and role-based permissions. Proposers should describe available user roles, department-level permissions, approval workflows, and administrative controls and clearly identify any user limitations or additional costs.

108. How many staff members should be trained, how many training sessions are anticipated, and does the City prefer remote training, on-site training, recorded sessions, written documentation, or a combination of these?

City Response: The City has not established a specific number of employees or training sessions. Proposers should recommend an appropriate training approach and identify the amount and type of training included. The City is open to remote and/or onsite training and encourages proposers to identify recorded sessions, written documentation, and other ongoing training resources included with the solution.

109. Please provide the current website storage footprint and approximate annual growth, if available, including documents and media, so that hosting and storage requirements can be accurately sized.

City Response: The City does not currently have a verified website storage footprint or annual growth estimate available for purposes of this RFP. Proposers should review the existing website, identify any assumptions used to size the proposed hosting environment, and describe available storage capacity, limitations, scalability, and any costs associated with increased storage.

110. Beyond the requirements stated in the RFP, does the City have any mandatory hosting or security standards, such as U.S.-based data hosting, MFA, SSO, WAF/DDoS protection, penetration testing, specific security certifications, backup retention periods, disaster-recovery objectives, or incident-response requirements?

City Response: Proposers must meet the hosting and security requirements identified in the RFP. The City has not established additional mandatory technical standards beyond those stated in the RFP for purposes of proposal submission. Proposers should describe the security measures included with their proposed solution, including data hosting location, MFA, SSO, WAF/DDoS protection, security testing, certifications, backup and disaster recovery, and incident-response practices, as applicable.

111. What support coverage does the City expect after launch, including normal support hours, after-hours/emergency support, target response/resolution times, and whether recurring support should include vendor-performed content updates in addition to technical support?

City Response: Proposers should describe their standard support model, including support hours, methods for requesting assistance, after-hours or emergency support, response and resolution targets, services included in the annual cost, and any limitations or additional charges. Routine website content management is anticipated to be primarily performed by trained City staff. Proposers should identify whether vendor-performed minor content updates are included or available as an additional service.

112. Does the City have an existing brand/style guide, approved logo files, colors, typography, photography standards, or other branding assets that must be followed?

City Response: The City seeks a modernized website that retains a recognizable City identity. Existing City logos and identity elements should be incorporated as appropriate. The selected proposer will work with City staff during discovery and design to establish the website's visual direction and use of available branding assets.

113. Does the City have an expectation for the number of initial design concepts and revision rounds, and should the project include stakeholder workshops, resident/public input, usability testing, or formal user testing?

City Response: The City has not prescribed a specific number of initial design concepts, revision rounds, workshops, or formal user-testing sessions. Proposers should describe their recommended discovery, stakeholder-engagement, design-review, and usability-testing process and clearly identify what is included in the proposed cost.

114. Does the City have a preferred or required launch date within the January–March 2027 window, and are there any fixed milestones, public meetings, election periods, budget cycles, or other dates that should be reflected in the implementation schedule?

City Response: The City's target launch remains January–March 2027 as identified in the RFP. A specific launch date within that period has not been established. Proposers should provide a

recommended implementation schedule identifying major milestones, City responsibilities, review periods, training, testing, and launch activities.

115. What initial contract term and renewal/extension structure does the City anticipate for hosting, software licensing, maintenance/support, and accessibility monitoring services?

City Response: The RFP does not establish a specific initial multi-year term or renewal structure for recurring hosting, licensing, maintenance/support, and accessibility monitoring services. Proposers should clearly identify their proposed annual recurring costs, renewal terms, and any anticipated annual escalation. Final terms will be incorporated into the agreement with the selected proposer.

116. The Professional Services Agreement references compensation as a “monthly sum not to exceed,” while Appendix B requests separate one-time implementation costs and annual recurring costs. Please clarify the City’s preferred invoicing/payment structure for one-time project fees and recurring annual services.

City Response: Proposers should complete Appendix B as provided, separately identifying one-time implementation costs and annual recurring costs. The final invoicing and payment structure will be incorporated into the agreement based upon the accepted proposal. Proposers may identify their proposed implementation payment schedule or billing milestones within their proposal.

117. Please confirm that the City's ownership and license rights apply to project-specific content and deliverables, while a proposer may retain ownership of its pre-existing or proprietary CMS software, source code, frameworks, tools, and other background intellectual property used to provide the services.

City Response: The terms of the City’s Professional Services Agreement remain as provided in the RFP. Proposers should clearly identify within their proposal any proprietary software, licensing requirements, background intellectual property, or requested exceptions or modifications to the agreement. Any requested contractual modifications will be subject to City review and approval.

118. Section 6 requires at least five comparable projects completed within the past five years, while Appendix C requests at least three California municipal government client references.

Must all five comparable projects be California municipal projects, or is the requirement five comparable projects overall with at least three California municipal references?

City Response: The requirements stated in the RFP remain unchanged. Section 6 requires demonstrated experience with California municipal government websites, including at least five comparable projects completed within the past five years. Appendix C requires at least three California municipal government client references for comparable services.

Additional non-California municipal, public-sector, or other comparable projects may be submitted as supplemental information but do not replace the California municipal experience requirements stated in the RFP.

119. Are there any specific optional services or alternate features that the City would like all proposers to price separately so that proposals can be evaluated on a consistent basis?

City Response: The City has not identified additional mandatory optional services beyond the scope and Cost Proposal Form provided in the RFP. Proposers may separately identify and price optional services or enhancements they believe would provide value to the City. Optional services should be clearly distinguished from the base proposal and should not be included in the base project total unless otherwise specified.

120. Has the City established an anticipated project budget or not-to-exceed range for the one-time implementation and/or annual recurring services?

City Response: The City has budgeted approximately \$30,000 for the website redesign project. The City has not established a separate not-to-exceed annual budget for recurring hosting, maintenance, support, and accessibility monitoring costs. Proposers should submit their best proposed pricing based on the scope and requirements identified in the RFP and clearly identify all one-time and annual recurring costs using the Cost Proposal Form in Appendix B.

121. Can the City provide the estimated budget or anticipated contract value for this opportunity?

City Response: The City has budgeted approximately \$30,000 for the website redesign project. The City has not established a separate not-to-exceed annual budget for recurring hosting, maintenance, support, and accessibility monitoring costs. Proposers should submit their best proposed pricing based on the scope and requirements identified in the RFP and clearly identify all one-time and annual recurring costs using the Cost Proposal Form in Appendix B.

122. Section VIII.A of the Professional Services Agreement states that the Provider may not subcontract any portion of the services without the City's prior written approval. Can the City clarify when this approval must be obtained and identify the information or documentation required to request approval of a proposed subcontractor?

City Response: Any proposed subcontractors anticipated at the time of proposal should be identified in the proposal, including the subcontractor's role and the services proposed to be performed. Formal written approval must be obtained from the City prior to the subcontractor performing services under the resulting agreement.

The selected proposer will also be responsible for complying with the subcontractor requirements contained in the Professional Services Agreement, including applicable contractual, indemnification, and insurance requirements.

123. Section VIII.B excludes specialized services from the 50% subcontracting limitation. Can the City identify the services or areas it considers specialized under this procurement and clarify how a proposer should determine whether a proposed subcontracted service qualifies for this exclusion?

City Response: The Professional Services Agreement defines specialized services as services "not ordinarily furnished by a Provider performing the particular type of services." The City has not established a predetermined list of services that will qualify as specialized services for this procurement.

Proposers intending to rely on the specialized-services exclusion should clearly identify the proposed service, the subcontractor that would perform the service, and the basis for considering the service specialized. The City will review the proposed arrangement based on the nature of the services and the requirements of the resulting agreement.

124. Does the City permit offshore personnel to serve as key personnel for this contract? If permitted, are there any restrictions regarding their work location?

City Response: The RFP does not establish a geographic restriction on personnel performing the services. Proposers should identify the key personnel proposed for the project, their roles, qualifications, and work locations, and should identify any offshore resources or subcontractors proposed to perform services.

All personnel and subcontractors must be capable of satisfying the requirements of the RFP and resulting agreement, including applicable security, confidentiality, accessibility, support, insurance, and performance requirements. Use of subcontractors remains subject to the subcontracting provisions of the Professional Services Agreement.

125. Please confirm the designated place of performance and whether the services may be performed remotely or whether any activities or key personnel are required onsite.

City Response: The RFP does not establish a required physical place of performance or require that key personnel be located onsite. Services may generally be performed remotely, provided the proposer can satisfy all requirements of the RFP and resulting agreement.

126. Qualifications and references: May a prime proposer count comparable California municipal website projects performed by a named subcontractor or committed team member toward the five-project minimum and Appendix C's three California municipal references? If yes, how should the proposer identify each entity's role and complete/certify Appendix C?

City Response: The requirements stated in the RFP remain unchanged. The experience and reference requirements are requirements of the proposing firm. Section 6 requires demonstrated experience with California municipal government websites, including at least five comparable projects completed within the past five years, and Appendix C requires California municipal government client references.

Proposers may identify the experience and qualifications of proposed subcontractors and other key team members as supplemental information; however, such experience does not replace the experience and reference requirements applicable to the prime proposer. Appendix C should identify qualifying projects and references of the proposing firm.

The RFP specifically requires California municipal experience and at least five comparable projects, while Appendix C asks for municipal client references.

127. Content baseline: Please provide, or confirm the method for determining, the current inventory to be migrated, including webpages, PDFs/documents, news posts, calendar items, forms, images/media, and redirects. What content preparation, rewriting, cleanup, archival decisions, and legacy-PDF remediation will the City perform, and what must the vendor include in its price?

City Response: The City has not completed a comprehensive inventory establishing the total number of webpages, documents, images, forms, news posts, calendar items, or other content to be migrated. Proposers should review the existing City website when preparing their proposals and clearly identify any assumptions, quantities, limitations, or thresholds used for content migration pricing.

The City does not necessarily expect all existing content to be migrated. The City anticipates working with the selected proposer to determine which content should be migrated, updated, consolidated, archived, removed, or reorganized. The City will generally provide and approve substantive City-specific content, while the selected proposer should include migration, formatting, organization, and recommendations regarding content structure and presentation.

The City is not requesting remediation of the entire existing legacy document library as part of the base proposal. Proposers may separately identify and price optional legacy-document remediation services.

128. Integrations and forms: What platforms or sources currently support agendas/meetings, calendars, staff directory, emergency alerts, analytics, search, social feeds, and online forms? Please identify required integrations/APIs/feeds, any SSO/payment/e-signature needs, sensitive-data constraints, and the approximate number and complexity of forms.

City Response: The City has not identified mandatory integrations with specific third-party platforms beyond the functionality described in the RFP. Proposers should review the existing City website and describe the functionality and integration capabilities available through their proposed solution for agendas and meetings, calendars, staff directories, emergency alerts, analytics, search, social media, and online forms.

The City has not established a specific number or complexity level of online forms to be implemented at launch, nor has it prescribed specific SSO, payment, electronic-signature, API, or feed requirements. Proposers should describe available functionality, including security and privacy features for forms that may collect sensitive information, and clearly identify any assumptions, limitations, third-party dependencies, or additional costs.

129. Translation and accessibility: Does “Spanish translation capability” require automated translation, a CMS editorial workflow for City-supplied translations, or professional human translation? For PDF accessibility tools and ongoing WCAG 2.1 AA services, what deliverables, monitoring cadence, and division of remediation responsibility will constitute acceptance?

City Response: The City is seeking site-wide Spanish-language translation capability but has not prescribed a specific translation method. Proposers should describe whether their solution utilizes automated/machine translation, professional translation, City-managed translations, or another method and identify associated costs and limitations.

For accessibility, proposers should describe the PDF accessibility tools and ongoing WCAG 2.1 AA monitoring services included with their solution, including automated scanning, manual review, reporting, remediation assistance, frequency of monitoring, issue-resolution processes, and responsibilities of the vendor and City staff. Proposers should clearly distinguish services included in the base and recurring costs from services available at additional cost.

130. Insurance: Under Agreement Section XII.D, will the City Risk Manager approve hired/non-owned auto coverage where the firm owns no business automobiles, and a lawful workers' compensation exemption or other modification where the firm has no employees subject to California workers' compensation? Also, will a \$2 million Technology Professional Liability policy with Privacy Expansion, sharing a \$2 million per-claim/aggregate limit, satisfy the \$2 million cyber requirement, or is separate cyber coverage or a separately declared limit required?

City Response: The insurance requirements stated in the RFP and Professional Services Agreement remain applicable.

131. Pricing and contract: Appendix B separates one-time implementation and annual recurring fees, while Section III of the attached Agreement uses a monthly not-to-exceed sum. How should proposers represent one-time implementation milestones, annual services, renewals, and the "One-Time Website Design & Implementation" line without double counting? May the hourly-rate line refer to an attached role-based rate schedule?

City Response: Proposers should complete Appendix B as provided and separately identify one-time website design and implementation costs, annual recurring costs, optional services, and applicable hourly rates. Costs should not be duplicated between the one-time and annual categories.

Proposers may identify their proposed implementation billing milestones or payment schedule and should clearly identify renewal pricing and any anticipated annual escalation for recurring services. The final invoicing and payment structure will be incorporated into the agreement based upon the accepted proposal.

A proposer may include an attached role-based hourly rate schedule for additional services, provided the applicable information requested in Appendix B is also completed and the relationship between the Appendix B rate information and any attached rate schedule is clearly explained.

132. Hosting and operations: Please confirm any requirements for hosting region/data residency, traffic/storage, backup retention, RPO/RTO, disaster recovery, uptime measurement/exclusions/remedy, and support hours. In addition to the general document/data and termination provisions in Agreement Sections V.C.3 and XI, what control, ownership, and export requirements apply specifically to the CMS, website content, analytics, domain/DNS, and credentials?

City Response: Proposers must meet the hosting, security, backup, uptime, accessibility, and support requirements identified in the RFP. The City has not established additional mandatory requirements for hosting region/data residency, traffic or storage levels, backup retention periods, RPO/RTO, disaster-recovery metrics, uptime exclusions/remedies, or specific support hours beyond those stated in the RFP. Proposers should describe their proposed standards and service levels for each of these areas and identify any assumptions, limitations, or additional costs.

The City expects to maintain appropriate ownership, access, and administrative control over City-specific website content, data, accounts, and credentials necessary for continued City operations and transition of services. Proposers should clearly describe their CMS ownership and licensing model, any proprietary components, portability and export capabilities, and the process for transferring or providing City content, data, analytics information, domain/DNS access, and credentials upon transition or termination.

133. Will the City accept comparable public-sector website redesign, CMS, hosting, and WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility engagements performed for municipalities, special districts, or public authorities outside California, and/or comparable private-sector engagements of similar scope and complexity, in place of the three California municipal references specified in Appendix C? If so, may a proposer submit those engagements on the Appendix C form?

City Response: The requirements stated in the RFP remain unchanged. Appendix C requires at least three California municipal government client references for comparable website redesign, CMS, hosting, or accessibility services.

Proposers may include additional non-California municipal, public-sector, special district, public authority, or private-sector experience as supplemental information for the City's consideration; however, such experience does not replace the California municipal government reference requirement stated in Appendix C. Appendix C should be completed using qualifying California municipal government references.

134. Can the City provide the current total website installation size (GB)? For WordPress websites, this information can typically be found under Tools > Site Health > Info > Directories & Sizes > Total Installation Size.

City Response: The City does not currently have a verified total website installation size available for purposes of this RFP. Proposers should review the existing website, identify any assumptions

used to size the proposed hosting environment, and describe available storage capacity, limitations, scalability, and any costs associated with increased storage.

135. The RFP references “PDF accessibility tools.” Does the City expect past and ongoing PDF accessibility remediation or just want the software/tools to do it themselves?

City Response: The City is not requesting remediation of the entire existing document library as part of the base proposal. Proposals should include the tools, functionality, training, and/or services available to assist the City with accessibility of documents published going forward.

Proposers may separately identify and price optional services for remediation of existing documents. Proposers should also clearly identify any ongoing PDF accessibility services included in annual recurring costs and any remediation services that would be subject to additional charges.

136. Are any custom-developed plugins or third-party integrations currently being used regularly on the site? If so, are they external links to that third-party app or directly integrated into the code?

City Response: The City has not completed a comprehensive inventory identifying all custom-developed plugins or distinguishing each third-party service as an external link versus a direct code integration.

Proposers should review the existing website as part of preparing their proposals and identify any assumptions regarding existing plugins or third-party functionality. Specific integration and migration requirements will be further identified with the selected proposer during discovery and implementation.

137. Is draw.cityofexeter.ca.gov or any other City subdomain included in the scope of this project?

City Response: The primary scope of this RFP is the redesign and replacement of the City’s main website at cityofexeter.ca.gov. The City has not identified draw.cityofexeter.ca.gov or other separately maintained City subdomains as requiring redesign or migration under the base scope of this RFP.

Proposers should identify any assumptions regarding subdomains and may describe options or additional costs associated with incorporating or supporting City subdomains where applicable.

138. What are the City's expectations for warranty and ongoing support? Does the City anticipate scheduled monthly updates or as-needed/on-call support?

City Response: The RFP does not prescribe a specific warranty period or require a predetermined schedule of monthly vendor-performed updates. Proposers should identify the warranty period and scope included with their proposed solution and describe their ongoing support and maintenance model, including support hours, methods for requesting assistance, response and resolution targets, software/security updates, routine maintenance, and any scheduled or as-needed services included in the annual recurring cost.

Routine website content management is anticipated to be primarily performed by trained City staff. Proposers should clearly identify any limitations, additional support options, or services subject to additional charges.

139. Does the City have an anticipated budget range for this project that proposers should consider when preparing their scope of work and fee proposal?

City Response: The City has budgeted approximately \$30,000 for the website redesign project. The City has not established a separate not-to-exceed annual budget for recurring hosting, maintenance, support, and accessibility monitoring costs. Proposers should submit their best proposed pricing based on the scope and requirements identified in the RFP and clearly identify all one-time and annual recurring costs using the Cost Proposal Form in Appendix B.