RFP #2025-RFP-24 Website Design

Addendum 7: Sept. 26, 2025

Questions and Answers

1. Q: Are you open to a fully custom website build (which the city would own outright), or are you specifically looking for a replacement SaaS/PaaS subscription product (a la Civic Plus, Granicus, etc)? A: We are open to all proposals which address the full scope of work.

2. Q: If you are open to a custom build: do we have to specify the CMS/tech stack in the proposal? Or would you be open to letting our discovery process/findings guide that ultimate decision during the first phase of the project? A: Please recommend a CMS and pieces of the tech stack. You may also provide multiple alternate options. The discovery process could potentially result in changes to the plan per the recommended best solution advised by the consultant hired.

3. Q: Regarding Section 1.1: Easily check the status of their own personal or business accounts, help with the City and change their own preference settings:

Can you provide some additional details about which accounts you want people to login to? Will they be accessing information on third-party websites, or do you want them to be able to log in to the new City website we're creating for you? Are the preference settings their preferences for communication (e.g., notification about news alerts, text and/or email alerts, manage subscriptions, etc.), or are you referring to the ability to do other things? A: Yes, we want the user to log in to manage their website notification and subscription settings, but also want to streamline the process for logging into the various customer portals offered by our other software providers. We'd love to see a single-sign-on solution or a landing page where you can choose which account you need to access. We currently have separate portals for parks, utility bills, building permits, and will soon have another for business licenses.

4. Q: Regarding Section 1.1.2.4.2 CentralSquare naviline ERP Integration:
Are you planning to have us integrate that site using an API to exchange data, or are you merely needing us to link to that site? A: We are interested in integrations to allow purchases made throught the site to be reflected in the City's financial software without requiring manual data re-entry. We are also interested in pulling data from the City's financial software to display certain data appropriate for public viewing as a dashboard.

5. Q: Regarding Section 1.1.2.4.3 Parks & Recreation Management Software Integration
Are you planning to have us integrate the site using an API to exchange data, or do you just need us to link to it? A: At a minimum, we would link to it, but depending on which software Parks ends up selecting, we may want a true integration with the website.

Especially because we would prefer to eliminate the need to log-in to yet another portal and have a separate account to register for a parks program or purchase something from the parks department as opposed to the system for setting your notification preferences and maybe purchasing something from City Hall such as tickets to our State of the Community Event. There's also an affordability and use-case discussion which needs to be had in making this decision.

6. Q: Regarding Section 1.2.2.3.1.21 Real Estate Locator
Would you like us to import this information from a third-party source (if so, which one) or are you simply needing to enter and edit this information on the website? A: I am unsure, we will need to discuss with the Planning Department whether they have the staff resources to manually enter and edit the information, or have a data source which could be integrated.

7. Q: Approximately how many phone calls and emails do you receive each month from the public with questions or service requests? What are the most common things they are asking for? (This helps us identify what can be addressed directly on the new website.) A: Thousands of questions – we don't count or track this. There is a broad variety of questions depending on the department. I think we could have discussions about this during discovery if needed, however, I believe we have a good sense of what content topics need to be addressed on the website, and can get insight from each City department regarding most-frequently asked questions, so we can be sure such information can be accessed quickly from their department page or the Home page.

8. Q: Regarding Section 1.1.2.4.5, could the City confirm whether this task entails a comprehensive technology review of your entire environment? If so, we would appreciate clarification on the types of reports, assessments, or recommendations you expect to receive from the exercise. A: No, a comprehensive technology review of our environment is not a mandatory part of this project. More like, as we're working on the website, and we come across an issue, and if you know of a better software solution than what we currently have, we want you to make such recommendations for us to research and consider. Also, we need your expertise to recommend solutions to help execute the website scope of work, not depend on us to research and find solutions for every capability we have prioritized.
Related Question: Given the potential scale and cost of such a review, would the City be open to vendors submitting a separate quote for this component? To help us scope and price this appropriately, could you provide more detail on your current technology environment, including any specific systems, platforms, or infrastructure areas you expect to be covered? A: Yes we are open to you submitting an option which includes the cost of a comprehensive technology review – however this is not mandatory for this RFP. Please see section 1.2.2 for a summary of our current technology environment as I understand it. If selected, more information could be gathered from our In-House IT department during discovery.

9. Q: Regarding Section 1.2.3.8 indicates that each program should have its own dedicated page. Will these program pages be built directly within the selected CMS, or

will they be embedded or pulled in from the new Parks and Rec software (once acquired)? A. I envision these being pages built directly in the CMS, with buttons linking to the Parks & Rec software to make a purchase or reservation etc. But ideally, you'd be able to take those actions within the City website and not have to make the jump into the other portal which would have a different look, feel, and logic. Ideally, we want to create a consistent user experience across departments by integrating their softwares with the website, but this may be cost-prohibitive, leaving us with the necessity of linking to various customer portals. One for parks. Another for building permits. Another for business licenses. Another for utility bills. And so on. I think it would get frustrating for the user to memorize all these usernames and passwords. Their perception is "I'm working with the City, why can't I log in to one portal and do business with each city department using tabs".

10. Regarding Requirement 3.5.2.6 – Transit Bus Live Locations: Could you please provide more detail on the source of the transit data for schedules and routes? Specifically, does the City maintain this data in GTFS (General Transit Feed Specification) format? A: Yes. We recently made the transition to GTFS. We have a Modaxo portal and use TripSpark software which allows the transit supervisor to see live location of busses.
Related question: Additionally, are the buses equipped with live GPS tracking capabilities to support real-time location updates? A: I believe so. And if not, this will be possible soon, due to our onboarding of an asset management system which includes GPS pucks which are being installed in more of our fleet vehicles.

11. Q: Is there any Go Live date you are targeting for CMS and Website Redesign? A: Please refer to RFP document section 2.1

12. Q: Are you comfortable using a Drupal CMS for your website? Do you have any preferred CMS in mind? A: Please refer to RFP document section 3.1.7. and section 3.3. Section 3.3 states we are open to considering a Drupal solution. We are open-minded and want to be convinced as to why your recommended CMS is the best solution. We did conduct a product demonstration with StoryBlok and liked what we saw, and we have also seen a product demonstration with the CivicPlus Evolve platform, which was promising but seemed to potentially have some of the same limitations as our current CivicPlus CMS platform.

13. Q: Do you have any **current integration pain points** we should address? A: The City needs to invest in creating integrations, the City has not done enough of this to this point in time. However, we do not have the expertise to be able to appropriately anticipate or budget for these development costs if the necessary integration is not already deployable. Budget limitations mean we may only be able to prioritize the most critical integrations in Phase 1.

14. Q: Are you using any tool for ADA and WCAG compliance? If yes kindly share tool name. A: No. We currently only have access to use the limited tools which are included in our CivicPlus CMS platform.

15. Q: Based on our understanding, the following websites are part of the redesign scope — please confirm:

1. Joplinmo.org A: Yes
2. Joplin Bike Park (new site) A: Yes
3. FlyJoplin.com A: Content should be part of Joplinmo.org but the url will direct to a new landing page.
4. JoplinCDBG.com A: We will retain this url to direct to the landing page on Joplinmo.org where this content has been migrated.
5. Joplin-Museum.org A: Content should be a part of Joplinmo.org, but the URL will direct to a new landing page.
6. JoplinGolf.org A: Unsure. Further analysis is needed during discovery to determine whether the new CMS can replace the current capabilities of JoplinGolf.org. The Golf Course currently uses a golf course management software which integrates with their website. Ideally, we would migrate their content and features over to the new CMS and simply have the URL direct to the department landing page.

16. Q: Please confirm which of the following websites and departmental subsites should be included under the new CMS for migration and subsite management:

1. Police (JoplinPolice.org + recruitment subsite)
2. Fire (JoplinMOfire.org)
3. Health (JoplinHealthDepartment.org)
4. Municipal Court (proposed domain JoplinMunicipalCourt.com)
5. Parks & Rec (JoplinParks.org)
6. Transit (Maps-transit.com)
7. Airport (JLNairport.com)

A: All of the above should have their content on the new CMS.

17. Q: Do you expect the vendor to fully manage and maintain the cloud hosting environment on your behalf, or do you prefer that hosting be procured and owned by the City, with vendor support for setup and configuration? A: We are open to both options. However, we prefer the consultant hired assist us with procurement, set up and configuration.

18. Q: Are you going to provide us brand guideline for redesign support? A. Yes, and we have posted the latest version of our brand standards as an addendum for you to download and review. Our Webmaster has also already begun building out a website design system which he will share with the consultant and which may be evolved as needed between your web designers and the City's Webmaster.

19. Q: What is the total size of all websites which are part of redesign scope? A: I don't have a good answer for this question. We have provided as much context as possible in the RFP to try to help you get a sense for the size of the project. There are stats included for the amount of documents which need to be migrated, and the amount of pages on the current website. However, since we need to build most of our content

from scratch rather than a simple migration, it is difficult to anticipate the number of images, videos, and pages of text or other content widgets.

20. Q: What uptime SLA (e.g., 99.9%, 99.99%) do you expect from the hosting vendor? A: I don't know. Which would you recommend? What is the cost difference? What are the options, which do you recommend and why?

21. Q: For redundancy and disaster recovery – do you require geo-redundant hosting, or will local redundancy suffice? A: I don't know. Which would you recommend and why? What is the cost difference? We are a City government, our data needs to be resilient if there were a major disaster wherever the servers are located, we want a backup in another location.

22. Q: Should hosting costs include CDN (Content Delivery Network) for performance optimization? A: If you recommend use of a CDN, then yes, the hosting costs should include your proposed solution costs. If this is optional, please provide explanation for your recommendation along with the cost options.

23. Q: Is DNS management expected to remain with GoDaddy, or would you consider the hosting provider managing DNS? A: We are open to considering all options, please provide your recommendation and explanation.

24. Q: Will sub-domains (e.g., departments, microsites) require separate SSL certificates, or should a wildcard SSL be used? A: I'm not familiar with what a wildcard SSL is. I also do not know whether the sub-sites should have separate SSL certificates. Please provide your recommendation and explanation. If there are cost and benefit differences, please outline them.

25. Q: How many domains/sub-domains should be provisioned under the hosting plan at go-live? A: I do not know what it means to provision a domain. What would you recommend based on your understanding of the RFP?

26. Q: The RFP requires SSL (128/256-bit), FedRAMP, SSO/MFA with Microsoft Authenticator. Do you also require following:
    - SOC 2 or ISO 27001 certified hosting?
    - Static/dynamic code scanning (SAST/DAST) for CMS?

A: I don't know. I am not a cyber-security expert. Those terms were not included in the RFP as requirements; however, we did state that we want to use all current best practices for data safety. If these standards are recommended to increase data safety and protection of our City website, then yes, we would support their inclusion. What are the options, pros and cons, and price differences? We would likely defer to our internal IT department's recommendation after considering the options.

27. Q: Should daily offsite backups be immutable (ransomware-protected)? A. See same answer for question 26.

28. Q: Will WAF (Web Application Firewall) be required as part of the hosting solution? A. See same answer for question 26.

29: Q: Should DDoS protection be included at the network level, or is read-only data transmission sufficient? A. See same answer for question 26.

30. Q: For user accounts – should all CMS users be required to use MFA, or only admin roles? A: Probably all CMS users I would imagine.

31. Q: Should access to CMS login be hidden/obscured (as requested) with IP restrictions or just non-public URLs? A. See same answer for question 26.

32. Q: For payments – do you require PCI-DSS compliance for integrated workflows (Naviline ERP, ticketing, permits)? A. See same answer for question 26. However, I have heard of how important PCI-DSS compliance is, and I would say we probably will prioritize this for integrations where sensitive data is being transmitted between systems.

33. Q: What's the current size of website database? What is expected growth year on year for next 3 years? A: I don't know how to retrieve this data from CivicPlus, but I imagine that could be found during discovery.

34: Q: What data backup retention policy is in place? A: I do not know. We can learn more about this during discovery. We do have certain record retention requirements set for the City by the Sunshine Law, which we could get from our City Clerk during discovery. In addition to that, what would your recommendation be?

35. Q: What is your current infrastructure size? e.g. no. of server on website hosting? Storage? A: I do not know. Perhaps CivicPlus can tell us during discovery.

36. Q: What is the current platform? Is this platform owned by the City? A. Please see RFP section 1.2.2.3 which explains our use of the CivicPlus Engage "Website Central" platform.

37. Q: Could you kindly provide a comprehensive and detailed enumeration of the functionalities that necessitate implementation in both the primary website and the new bike park website? A: Please refer to RFP section 3, project scope, for full description of functionalities we desire for the main City website. We want the same capabilities for the Bike Park website, but page 5 of the RFP also explains what we need for the Bike Park website: Any marketing materials developed for the park should be featured on

this website, along with the capability to reserve certain facilities, purchase items, and see information about the park and events hosted in the park. The website should also tie in to volunteer communities on social media and we may want to allow certain community volunteers or contracted marketing firms to have access to update content for this website, without impacting or accessing content in the CMS for the main City website.

38. Q: How many websites, microsites, and mobile apps are expected to be managed under the headless CMS? A: No mobile apps initially at go-live for the websites – though we may want to add those in the future, using content within the CMS. Please refer to questions 15 and 16 above for information about the websites and subsites.

39. Q: In Section 3.1.8 (Additional Websites to Be Replaced), can you clarify whether the listed websites will require full redesign, new implementation from scratch, or only CMS migration? A: Please see the answers to questions 15 and 16 above.

40. Q: For IoT experiences, can you clarify the intended use cases? A: Please see the answer provided to a similar question on addendum #3, question 7.

41: Q: Additionally, the microsite and the additional websites mentioned in the 3.1.8 section are served using the same domain, subdomain, or a different domain? A: I think we want the subsites/department landing pages to all use the same domain, currently joplinmo.org (but we want to transition to a .gov), where certain landing pages also have a vanity URL which directs to them.

42. Q: Can you confirm the types of fields required (text fields, dropdowns, checkboxes, radio buttons with “Other” + text entry, file uploads, e-signatures, etc.)? A: I’m not sure which section of the RFP this question is referring to, but yes, fillable forms would need to be able to include such fields.

43: Q: Should forms support conditional logic / branching (e.g., show/hide questions based on user responses)? A. Yes, absolutely.

44. Q: Which payment gateways must be supported (e.g., PayPal, Stripe, Authorize.net, Gov-approved processors)? A: The City currently uses Authorize.net. We may be open to recommendations, but the City’s Finance Director will have final say on any change to payment gateways.

45. Q: Should forms support recurring payments / subscriptions or only one-time transactions? A: Good question. I don’t think it’s necessary, but it’s possible there is a use case for that we could ask each City department about during discovery.

46. Q: Will the Finance Department need the ability to reconcile payments directly inside the CMS, or should data export to existing financial systems (like Munis, Beams, etc.) be

supported? A: I believe the Finance Department will need the ability to reconcile payments directly inside the CMS if possible, and if not possible, data export to another system which you would recommend and need to budget for from the total project budget.

47. Q: What types of dashboards are needed (submission counts, financial summaries, category-level reporting)? A: Yes – this sounds like you've listed internal dashboards within the CMS for our staff users to reference. We also want public-facing data dashboards for City departments, so Finance could show finance data, Police can show crime stats, Parks can show enrollment numbers, etc.

48. Q: Do you require a standalone mobile application in the current scope? A: No.

49. Q: What platforms do you prefer for mobile app development (Flutter, React Native, or fully native iOS/Android)? A: We are not app developers, we have no preference. We just want apps to be built in the future to be able to use content from the same CMS our website is built on.

50: Q: What is your search engine preference for the site:

Native CMS search (indexing pages, PDFs, forms)?

External service (e.g., Algolia, ElasticSearch, Solr, Azure Cognitive Search)?

Do you expect the CMS to provide structured content formats (e.g., JSON-LD, schema.org) that AI tools like ChatGPT, Perplexity, or Google Gemini can reference for trusted content extraction?

A: I don't know. What is your recommendation and why? We do want AI tools to be able to extract content from our website to enhance the accuracy of their responses to queries about the City of Joplin.

51. Q: Should the CMS provide SEO analytics dashboards or integrate with tools like Google Search Console for tracking impressions, CTR, rankings? A: It would be nice to have a native analytics dashboard within the CMS, but we're also open to using Google Search Console.

52. Q: We assume beyond traditional SEO, the RFP highlights the need for content to be consumable by AI-powered search and discovery tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Perplexity, Bing Copilot)? A: Exactly, yes.

53: Q: What types of SEO are necessary to deliver On-Page SEO, Off-Page SEO, and Technical SEO? A: I don't know. The consultant would be expected to make a recommendation.

54. Q: Approximately how many maps do you expect to be embedded or created across the web sites? A: Dozens of maps. Probably less than 100.

56: Q: In section 3.4.2.1 of the Waste Wizard (software by Routeware), please elaborate on the specific use case. A: This was recommended by a Recycling consultant, I am not personally very familiar with the use case and capabilities of the Waste Wizard. The consultant may need to conduct additional research during discovery.

57. Q: In Directory of Partner Organizations - Should the directory integrate with external systems (e.g., Chamber of Commerce database, School District APIs) to auto-update information? A. No. Possibly an internal integration with business licensing software to display a list of currently licensed businesses, but no such database exists for our partner organizations. We would probably enter this list manually.

58: Q: Should there be automatic notifications or reminders when partner info has not been updated in X months? A: Unsure. I don't think this would be a requirement, but I can see how it could be helpful.

59: Q: Should the CMS support ticket sales directly on the website, bypassing external portals (e.g., Parks & Rec)? A: Yes, preferably, City Hall could sell State of the City event tickets without forcing the customer to visit the Parks Department portal.

60. Q: In section 3.5.2.4 Data Dashboards - Should dashboards pull data from existing departmental systems (e.g., Police CAD, Finance GL systems, Public Works project databases)? A: Yes, so that staff don't have to manually re-enter data on a periodic basis to get the dashboards to be current.

61. Q: Are there APIs, feeds, or export formats available for these systems? A: I don't know much about the APIs, feeds or export formats available for each system. This would need to be part of the discovery and planning process.

62. Q: Should dashboards provide charts, graphs, tables, and maps? A: Yes, that's what I envision.

63. Q: Should dashboards support alerts or notifications when key metrics exceed thresholds (e.g., spikes in crime, budget overspending)? A. Yeah that would be nice, but it's not necessarily a must-have.

64: Q: Please confirm the chatbot's knowledge base coverage: Will it be limited to the CMS-managed pages, or should it also include archived PDFs and additional data sources such as business filings, campaign finance systems, and other integrated applications? A: At minimum, the chatbot should pull from CMS content, but ideally it would also be able to read PDFs and certain additional integrated data sources, with limitations to be determined by relevant city departments in order to protect sensitive

data about accounts, personal information, protecting investigations and legal actions, and health department HIPPA-protected data. In some cases, real-time data or daily data syncing may be desired.

65. Q: Should the chatbot rely solely on CMS-managed content, or also connect to external databases and third-party tools? Additionally, is real-time synchronization with CMS/DB updates expected? A: See answer to question 64 above.

66. Q: Is the chatbot expected to support advanced use cases such as handling document uploads (PDFs, forms) and providing contextual responses? A: I hadn't thought of it handling document uploads (tell me more), but I do expect it to provide contextual responses. So, if you ask the hours on a holiday when we are closed, the chatbot would be able to read the news item or calendar event for City office closure and inform the human that "today we happen to be closed due to a holiday."

67. Q: Is the chatbot required to operate in English only, or should it provide multilingual support? A: English is a minimum requirement, but multilingual support would be excellent – especially because it may help supplement the fact we don't have many multi-lingual staff.

68. Q: Is the use of OpenAI (GPT-5/ GPT-4 models) acceptable/preferred? A. Sure. We're open to your recommendations.

69. Q: Are there any restrictions on the type of LLM to be used? Specifically, is the use of open-source models (e.g., Llama 3, Falcon) mandated over proprietary options (e.g., GPT, Claude), or has the agency already identified or approved a preferred model for this project? A. We do not have a stance on this yet. We are open to recommendations from the consultant to be hired. Please make a recommendation and explain.

70. Q: Can we leverage Cloud component Search for indexing and retrieval, or should we build a custom RAG pipeline? A. I don't know. Please make a recommendation and explain.

71. Q: For analytics/monitoring, can AI tools leverage existing Power BI integration, or do you expect a separate dashboard for chatbot analytics? A: We have no existing Power BI for the system to integrate with.

72. Q: Tentatively, how many user roles / levels should be implemented for RBAC in the chatbot (e.g., general public, business users, internal staff, admin)? A: I don't know. We are open to recommendations from the consultant.

73. Q: Should RBAC extend to chatbot query limitations (e.g., certain election/business data only visible to internal users)? A: I don't understand the question. We would need further discussion to understand the options before making a decision about whether

we want the chatbot to provide any additional information to internal users. I suspect we want a single, consistent experience for the public and staff, so staff don't assume that since they are able to get a certain answer, that the public would get the same answer.

74. Q: Do you expect chatbot voice interface (speech-to-text/text-to-speech) in future phases, or only text-based interaction? A: Text -based is what we expect for go-live, but I can certainly see how voice interface capability could be useful for future phases.

75. Q: Should the chatbot have escalation workflows (e.g., if it cannot answer, direct to contact forms/human helpdesk)? A: I don't know yet. We need to discuss and figure that out. It probably needs to at least refer someone to a phone number or email address based on the subject matter, however, we don't want to further overwhelm our staff with more phone calls and emails.

76. Q: Do you require an AI Ethics/Explainability framework (logging why an answer was generated)? A: Yes.

77. Q: Does the City have a preferred AI translation tool or service for integration into the portal, or should vendors propose the most suitable option? A: Please make a recommendation.

78. Q: Could you please specify the list of languages that should be supported for AI-driven translation, in addition to Spanish? A: Please refer to Addendum #2 – Research, and see the page regarding most common languages used by website visitors. This is the only data we have which provides clues as to which languages may need to be prioritized.

79. Q: What are the most common user tasks or questions that the site should support? A: I don't know. This may require research by asking other cities what types of questions their citizens tend to ask their chatbots most frequently.

80. Q: Are there known pain points in the current site structure (e.g., buried content, duplicate pages)? A: Yes. Lots of buried content. Some duplicate pages. Unpublished pages. Incomplete pages. Pages with out-of-date content. Broken links. Lots of 404 errors. This is why we want to develop the new site map from scratch and build the content from scratch rather than blindly migrating.

81. Q: Given the large volume of existing pages, would you prefer us to define a set of standardized templates or layouts for common page types—such as service pages, department overviews, and contact pages—rather than designing each page individually? A: Yes, we will want to have certain standardized page templates, and still

have the ability to develop new page templates as needed, or have certain unique pages on the website which wouldn't really conform to any of the most common templates.

82. Q: Are there any specific page types you envision needing unique layouts beyond these standard templates? A: I anticipate we will work through creating this list of needed templates and unique page types during discovery. We also want our Webmaster to have the ability to create new page templates as needed.