RFP #2025-RFP-24 Website Design

Addendum 6: Sept. 23, 2025

Questions and Answers

1. Q: Are there any addendums of Q&A documents published as of yet that we should be aware of? A: Yes. This is addendum #6.
2. Q: Does the city have a good collection of photos and/or videos that can be used in the redesign? A: Please see addendum #1 question 15.
3. Q: Does the city have formal brand guidelines/standards published? (The current site looks very generic, and having been to Joplin, we know the city is a lot more interesting than that: A: Please see addendum #7 – "Brand Standards"
4. Q: How soon will the new branding for the Momentum Bike Park Microsite be available? A: The brand standards should be complete by November 1, 2025.
5. Q: Further to the above, The Bike Park site is a perfect candidate for our Microsite Module, by the way. Is there any specialized functionality needed for that site that might not be in the current City website gameplan? A: The anticipated needs for the Bike Park website can be found on page 5 of the RFP which states in part: 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.
6. Q: Of all the domains listed in the RFP, do any of those need their own microsites/special functionalities/third party integrations, or are they just pages of the main site that happen to have vanity urls pointing to them? A: Please see addendum #5 question 3. In short, I anticipate all are vanity urls except for the Bike Park.
7. Q: If we can provide a better Park and Rec solution to the one you are using now (and the new platform one you are considering), would the City be interested? Y: Yes, the City intends to issue an RFP in the coming months for Parks & Rec management software with point of sale capabilities. You could recommend parks & rec management software in your website proposal, but would also need to respond to the RFP to be issued by the Parks Department.
8. Q: What are some of the major pain points or limitations you feel with the current website/CMS? A: We have listed various specific points within our scope of work priorities which, if addressed, would sooth pain points we are currently experiencing and limitations of our current CMS.
9. Q: What are some specific things your departments are asking for as far as enhanced website functionality, workflows or digital service delivery? A: Please review the scope of work priorities listed in the RFP.
10. Q: Please tell us a little about the process for publishing agendas, meetings and minutes for Council and your various committees. A: Please review addendum #4 with screenshots of the Agenda Center module, and addendum #3 question 10 which explains the process. An explanation of the process is also outlined in the RFP section 3.3.1.67.
11. Q: Are you planning to continue using any of the optional CivicPlus modules going forward? If so please provide an outline of what each does as well as its associated cost.

A: Please review RFP section 1.2.2.3. All modules of the CivicEngage platform are included in our current subscription and I assume would not be available to us if transitioning to a different CMS. The other CivicPlus softwares we subscribe to separately include CivicRec, See.Click.Fix, Social Media Archiving (previously branded as ArchiveSocial), and Municode. We may potentially keep these subscriptions even if changing to a non-CivicPlus website CMS. The Parks Department will be going out to bid for Parks & Rec management software with point of sale capabilities because they are not fully satisfied with the current CivicRec software.

12. Q: How do you feel about the current search functionality on the site and how would you improve it if you could. A: We are not satisfied with the current search functionality. We want only current content to be returned as results, we want the most relevant result to be within the top 3 results, and we want to be able to filter searches by a variety of factors.
13. Q: Who on City staff is responsible for checking web analytics and making content or navigation changes/recommendations based on those finindings? A: The City's Webmaster position is assigned this responsibility. This is a new position which was just created last year, and our first task as a new department has been to launch a redesigned website, so the Webmaster has not spent much time in their first year on the job making navigational changes to the current website. However, after the redesigned website has been launched, he will be tasked with refinements to navigation and continual improvements for the websites.
14. Q: Do you currently have an electronic communication platform in place for email and/or text messaging to residents? Yes, we use Constant Contact for monthly email newsletters and we use the Notify Me module included in the CivicPlus Engage CMS platform to send email and text alerts to subscribers of alert categories. If we leave CivicPlus, we assume we will need to replace this solution.
15. Q: How many active web site administrators do you have today and will that change going forward? Today, we have 90 profiles with access to the CMS, with various permissions and levels of access. We anticipate the number will be dramatically reduced to between 15-30 on the new website, with only 3-5 superuser administrators with access to all CMS capabilities.
16. Q: Is there a budget or budget range established for the project? Please see addendum #1, question 1.
17. Q: Can you tell us what the City spent on the current website and how much it pays for hosting/maintenance currently? Please see RFP section 1.2.2.3