RFP #2025-RFP-24 Website Design

Addendum 8: Oct. 2, 2025

Questions and Answers

1. Q: In the RFP it is mentioned the along with main city website, we need manage 4-5 additional sites, sub-sites and micro site. Which of these require unique branding (logos, colors, typography) versus shared city-wide design elements? A: Please see section 3.1.9, which indicates which sub-sites, additional sites and landing pages will require unique branding. Only the Bike Park page will have unique colors and typography distinct from the other site and pages. Please see our brand standards documents which have been posted as addenda.
2. Q: Which of the listed websites, microsites, subsites should become full microsites versus landing pages or standard content sections? A. Unsure, we are open to discussion and recommendations. The ones which may lend themselves to being microsites could be the Museum, Golf Course (if we end up including this in the scope of this project), JATSO, Municipal Court, and Airport.
3. Q: How should visual differentiation be handled within a unified design system—through templates, themes, or component variations? A. Unsure, we are open to discussion with our Webmaster and lead brand designer. He has begun work on a design system.
4. Q: How will users access these subsites—via global navigation, footer links, search, or direct domains? A. This is up for discussion and we are open to recommendations.
5. Q: Should each microsite have its own domain (e.g., FlyJoplin.com) or redirect to a subpath (e.g., joplinmo.org/flyjoplin)? A. This is up for discussion and we are open to recommendations. At minimum, we will have vanity URLs for the landing pages, but we may choose to have all content URLs on the same domain – so subpaths? The one exception might be JATSO, which I could see having its own domain throughout their content possibly.
6. Q: Which department landing pages require unique navigation or branding? A: Please refer to section 3.1.9 which indicates which have their own unique brand. I anticipate those with unique branding may need their own unique navigation and branding. My initial thought is to retain a common top menu above all the landing pages, so you can jump from one department to another easily, with department-specific navigation menu below that or on the left side of the page.

7. Q: What content and functionality should be standardized across all department pages? A: I don't know how to begin to answer this in a brief manner. I imagine we will need some discussion during the discovery process to determine this.
8. Q: What level of editorial access should be granted to external contributors (e.g., museum volunteers, airport marketing firm)? A: We may want to allow a museum volunteer to draft content about museum displays, but require review and approval by the department head and Webmaster prior to publishing. We may also want to allow a museum volunteer to access form submissions for the Museum or manage events hosted at the museum, but not build forms or delete submissions, and not add or delete events from their calendar, as we need the Webmaster to review and approve these additions. The Airport Marketing firm would be trusted with drafting and publishing content only to the airport pages of the website. The Bike Park Marketing firm would only be trusted with drafting and publishing content only to the Bike Park website, but not managing financial transactions. However, the bike park marketing firm should be able to view reports about how much merchandise has been sold, so they could plan to restock.
9. Q: How will the CMS enforce content governance while allowing decentralized updates? A: I envision low-level users basically filling out forms with a title, headers and subheaders, and body text, or text for specifically labeled fields depending on the type of content component they have been tasked with completing. But the placement of images in relation to text, colors, highlights, font size, etc. should be controlled – determined by our Webmaster, and not up to the whims of each department. We would also want to set triggers to remind the staff assigned content responsibilities to prompt them when they need to review a page or content element to ensure it is still up-to-date. The Webmaster should also have some kind of dashboard to assist in policing how many pages are overdue for review and updates.
10. Q: Should each microsite have its own dashboard or share a unified backend? A: It would be nice to have a dashboard or some way to view metrics for each landing page or microsite, but I also want to maintain a unified backend for the Webmaster. That being said, I don't want a user who only has permissions to add content to the Fire Department content to be messing around with data about the Police Department content and so on and so forth.
11. Q: How will the CMS accommodate external systems like the golf course management software? A: I don't know if the CMS could integrate with the golf course management software or not, or possibly replace the functionalities of the golf course software, which is why we said we will need to conduct discovery and discuss options before deciding whether the golf course site should be included in the scope of this project or not.

1. Q: What types of content will the Bike Park website need to support (e.g., trail maps, event listings, facility details, merchandise)? A: Yes, all those you've listed. Page 5 of the RFP states: 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.

12. Q: What facilities will users be able to reserve online, and what information needs to be collected during booking? A: Our parks website shows a list of facilities which can be reserved. You could complete a current form to see what information we take currently. I don't yet know which facilities may be reservable at the Bike Park, but we can easily get that information from the Parks Director during discovery. See this page for examples of facilities reservations: https://secure.rec1.com/MO/joplin-missouri/catalog
13. Q: What types of items will be available for purchase—tickets, merchandise, memberships? A: Yes, all of the above may need to be offered.
14. Q: Should the reservation and purchase systems integrate with any existing platforms or payment gateways? A: We currently use Authorize.net. For parks-related stuff, we will want to integrate and/or link to the Parks & Recreation management software. We are currently using CivicRec but an RFP is scheduled to go out to bid on Oct. 6, 2025 and we may be replacing CivicRec depending on the results of that bidding process.
15. Q: What is the tentative user count for concurrent users, active users, and daily user activity for now and in the future? A: We believe an average high-end spike for concurrent users (website visitors) may be below 20,000. Please see RFP section 1.2.4 and "Addendum 2 – Research" for some metrics we were able to pull. Keep in mind, local government websites tend to experience huge spikes in traffic during crisis – so we need our site to be able to handle huge spikes, maybe even hundreds of thousands of more concurrent users than would be the norm. We do not want our website to go down in the wake of a crisis when our community and people around the nation may be wanting to access public information we are making available which could include instructions for how to respond during an ongoing emergency.
16. Q: Are there specific load time or speed performance benchmarks the site should achieve? A: Very fast. I don't know exactly; this is not my area of expertise. What would you recommend for a city website?

17. Q: What security measures are currently in place? Are there any specific compliance requirements for the new portal that need to be met? A: Yes, there are some security measures in place. More can be discussed during discovery, we may need to get specific information from CivicPlus about how the current site is protected.
18. Q: What is the required frequency for data backups (e.g., real-time, daily, weekly or monthly)? A: Real-time.
19. Q: What is the expected data retention policy (e.g., how long should backups be stored)? A: I'm not sure. We need to discuss this during discovery, including our IT Department.
20. Q: Are there specific load time/speed performance, and application uptime benchmarks the site should achieve? A: We are open to your recommendations regarding the benchmarks the site should achieve.
21. Q: What is the scope of post-launch support and maintenance (e,g application support, infra support etc.)? A: Please see RFP section 3.9. Our team will manage content, but we will need support available for all other aspects of the site, CMS, and other technologies integrated into the site. We will want a bank of hours available for additional integrations, application development and other website improvements in our yearly agreement.
22. Q: What are the expected support hours and days for system maintenance and assistance (e.g., 24/7 support, business hours, or specific timeframes). A: Please see section 3.9.1.2. City Hall's normal business hours are 8am-5pm CST Monday-Friday except certain holidays. We would expect support during these times for even low-level requests. Whereas high-urgency support if the website goes down or is not functioning as it should, must be available 24/7/365.
23. Q: Please specify the SLA for maintenance and support. A: We are open to discussion, and would like to understand our options and your recommendations.
24. Q: How many staff members will require training? Are you fine with online training for the staff? A: I expect our superusers (3-5 people) to be trained by the consultant. Online training is acceptable through virtual meetings. The City's Webmaster is the primary trainee for all systems, and he must be trained to be able to train all other staff according to their roles and permissions. If the City should experience turnover in the Webmaster position, we will need the consultant to provide all necessary training to any new Webmaster as needed.
25. Q: We see the City is currently on CivicPlus. Does the City wish to remain with a proprietary CMS, or would you prefer to transition to an open-source platform such as Drupal or WordPress with a web development partner? A: Please see section 3.3 which states: A headless (MACH) architecture is preferred and will score highest. We are also open to proposals for hybrid, de-coupled architecture or Drupal. However, we have been advised to

avoid Wordpress based on security concerns. We have not been completely satisfied with the CivicPlus Website Central monolithic CMS which we are currently using.

26. Q: The RFP notes a preference for a headless CMS. Can you clarify whether this is a requirement, or if the City is open to proposals from a web development partner for a traditional CMS with strong integration capabilities? A: Please see the answer to question 25 above.
27. Q: The RFP specifies March 2026 for the Bike Park website and July 2026 for JoplinMo.org. Are these firm deadlines, or is there flexibility if scope, integrations, or additional subsites increase effort? A: There can be flexibility based on your proposed timeline and what seems reasonable and achievable based on your firm's prior experience. We expect for a timeline to be agreed upon following project kickoff and discovery.
28. Q: The RFP mentions the Bike Park could open as early as November/December 2025. Should the website be prepared to launch in phases if the park opens earlier? A: If possible, yes. It would be nice to at least have a solid single landing or splash page for the bike park at the time the park opens, with additional site pages, features and content being added in phases into 2026.
29. Q: The RFP mentions ~800 pages on the current site, but only ~442 published, with many draft/hidden/archived pages. Can you provide an estimated number of assets (pages, documents, images, forms) that you expect a web development partner to migrate to the new system? A: Please see section 3.6 regarding content migration.
30. Q: Will the City provide content audit and rewriting support, or should the web development partner include content strategy and rewriting in the scope? A: The City Marketing & Communications Department staff will provide content audit and rewriting support.
31. Q: Are there departments responsible for maintaining their own subsites who will require content governance workflows and training? A: The City's Webmaster will be responsible for all content governance, workflows and training of other City staff from all departments who are assigned content roles.
32. Q: The RFP notes several subsites (Police, Fire, Court, Health, Airport, Museum, Golf, etc.). Can you confirm the expected number of unique microsite/front-end experiences requiring distinct branding/navigation? A: Please see answers to questions 5 and 6 above.
33. Q: Should these subsites all be launched at the same time as JoplinMo.org, or is a phased launch acceptable? A: The only subsite which may launch after Joplinmo.org would be the museum. However, we'd prefer to at least have a skinny version of their content live at the time the website launches.

34. Q: Can the City confirm the budget range allocated for this project? A: Please see addendum #1, question 1.
35. Q: Regarding section 3.4, can the City provide a list of incumbent or preferred vendors for the required secure forms, mass alert/messaging, public engagement, and digital asset management systems? A: The incumbent is CivicPlus. We have no preferred vendors, we are open to considering all recommendations.
36. Q: Does the City have existing budget estimates for the four required third-party software systems mentioned in section 3.4, separate from the website development and implementation services? A: No. We need you to provide cost estimates for these solutions. These costs are considered part of the entire project budget.
37. Q: Will the City consider procuring these third-party systems under separate contracts, allowing the selected website developer to focus on CMS implementation and integration rather than software procurement? A: Please see the RFP scope of work as written. However, it is possible we could procure third-party systems separately as a reduction of the entire project budget, or pending City Council approval for a budget amendment allowing us to essentially increase the project budget in order to acquire a necessary third-party system. We would prefer to fit all needs within the single project budget, and to acquire only solutions recommended by the consultant – however, open bidding processes may be required. If the website developer and consultant is able to procure the systems for us, this allows us to work faster and avoid separate bidding processes for each component of the system.
38. Q: Can you provide technical documentation for required integrations with CentralSquare, including available APIs, data formats, authentication methods, and specific data fields requiring synchronization? A: We will work with the consultant to achieve this during discovery.
39. Q: What are the specific technical requirements for Microsoft Authenticator integration, including any existing Azure AD/Office 365 environment details and SSO protocols in use? A: We can provide this information during discovery, in collaboration with our IT department.
40. Q: Please clarify the FedRAMP authorization level required (Low/Moderate/High) and whether existing CivicPlus hosting currently meets FedRAMP requirements? A: I do not know whether CivicPlus hosting currently meets FedRAMP requirements. We can look into this during discovery. I am not sure which level of authorization is appropriate for our City website, again, I'm not a cyber security expert, I'm coming at this from the marketing side.

We are open to recommendations from the consultant, and we would discuss with our IT department prior to making any decision about this.

41. Q: What is the timeline for the CivicRec replacement mentioned in Addendum 1 - will this impact payment system architecture decisions for the website project? A: The Parks & Rec Department is tentatively scheduled to publish the RFP for their Parks & Rec Management Software with Point-of-Sale capabilities on Oct. 6. Architecture decisions will be impacted whether we decide to stay with CivicRec or transition to a different software.
42. Q: Can you provide an estimate of the number of unique page templates needed based on your current site analysis and planned content structure? A: Please see Addendum #7 question 82.
43. Q: What specific accessibility testing methodologies, audit schedules, and remediation processes do you require to ensure ongoing WCAG 2.0 AA/AAA compliance? A: We are open to recommendations from the consultant.
44. Q: Please define the functional requirements for the mobile apps and IoT experiences mentioned in the CMS requirements - what specific capabilities are needed? A: Please see Addendum #3, question 7.
45. Q: What are your specific data retention, privacy, and deletion requirements for user data, form submissions, and analytics information? A: We will need to work through this during discovery. The Municipal Government must comply with Missouri records retention laws.
46. Q: Please define the required backup and disaster recovery service level objectives (RPO/RTO) and any specific geographic requirements for data residency? A: This is outside my area of expertise, we are open to recommendations from the consultant, and decisions would be made following discussion with our IT Department.
47. Q: Can you provide the existing research and discovery documentation referenced in section 3.2 to inform our content migration and site architecture planning? A: See addendum #2 – Research.
48. Q: What specific languages should the AI translation tools support, and do you require professional translation review capabilities for specific language pairs? A: See addendum #3, question 6.
49. Q: Please provide the current document library inventory including file types, quantities, and organizational structure requiring migration? A: See RFP section 3.6 regarding Content Migration.
50. Q: Given the $250,000 budget allocation versus the originally estimated $500,000, please clarify which Tier 1 priorities are most critical if budget constraints require scope adjustments? A: All Tier 1 priorities are considered most critical. We intend to award the

contract to a firm proposing to fulfill all Tier 1 priorities within budget, with preference towards proposals which can also provide as many of our Tier 2 and Tier 3 priorities as possible.

51. Q: What are your preferred terms for pass-through billing of third-party services, including payment schedules, markup policies, and invoice consolidation requirements? A: We can have a discussion with the City's Finance Director to answer these questions at project kickoff. We expect no markup on pass-through billing of third-party services. However, the consultant may bill us for services rendered in assisting the City with the procurement of third-party services.
52. Q: Please provide guidance on expected annual hours and scope for ongoing maintenance and future development work to inform our recurring cost proposals? A: I don't have a sense of how many hours may be reasonable minimum expectation. You could provide an hourly rate and an estimate of how many hours would be required on average for a few examples of development projects such as custom software integrations or building of mobile apps or IoT digital experiences. We could use this to determine what an appropriate budget would be for an annual ongoing basis.
53. Q: Can you provide the complete scoring methodology including all evaluation criteria and point allocations beyond the budget (25 points) and experience (10 points) currently specified? A: RFP section 4.2 outlines our complete scoring methodology.
54. Q: Please clarify the specific point value or percentage advantage given to Joplin-based vendors in the cost scoring calculation? A: If a local vendor is within 3% of the lowest bid, we can score their cost the same as the low bidder.
55. Q: Will the bike park website have a unique domain name? A: Yes. See Addendum #5, question 3.
56. Q: Please provide more info regarding the expectations for facilities reservations on the bike park website. What types of facilities? Will there be a charge for reserving? A: I don't have more information at this time, we can work through this during discovery, and in discussion with our Parks & Rec department.
57. Q: Please provide more information on the e-commerce needs of the bike park website. What will you be selling? A: T-shirts, bumper stickers, etc. Possibly event tickets, sponsorships and facility reservations as well.
58. Q: How will you handle fulfillment? Are these physical goods or digital goods? A: The City is seeking to bring on a marketing agency for the bike park which would work with the Park & Rec Department staff on stocking and fulfilling orders. We anticipate physical goods but there may also be some digital goods.

59. Q: Please specify what facilities need to be reservable via the website. A: Please see question 12 above.
60. Q: Please provide more information on the book appointments feature. A: We will work through this during the discovery phase in discussion with the Health Department's medical division. I could also envision it being nice to be able to offer office hours for certain city officials to allow citizens to book appointments with them online – in which case, an integration with Outlook calendars may be required.
61. Q: Is the text and email alerts feature part of the website, or a separate product from Civicplus that you may continue to use? A: It is currently a part of CivicPlus, so if we are no longer on CivicPlus for the CMS, we will need to replace the email and text alerts feature.
62. Q: What is the vendor's role in reviewing content for relevance on the new site? A: The vendor will not be reviewing content for relevance; City staff will do this work and only populate content we have approved.
63. Q: Will the city provide local photography for the site? A: Yes.
64. Q: Please provide a list of all API integrations expected in the site when it goes live. A: This depends on some variables, for example, we don't yet know whether we'll absolutely need an integration with the Parks & Rec management software, or whether links or embeds will suffice. We also may only link to other portals such as the Click2Gov portals, but may require integrations with CentralSquare's Naviline to ensure the process for Finance Department staff in reconciling transactions, and the CentralSquare Asset Management system for showing data about current locations of busses or snow plows or other fleet vehicles we may want to be able to show live data about to the public. We are not sure the degree to which ESRI ArcGIS needs to be integrated versus linked and embedded. We absolutely need the forms solution, document archives, and email/text alert systems to be live at launch.
65. Q: FedRAMP is mentioned in the RFP. Is FedRAMP certified hosting a requirement or a nice to have? A: I believe FedRAMP should be a tier 1 priority. Apologies if this was not clear in the RFP.
66. Q: Please describe any CDN or WAF requirements. A: I'm not a cybersecurity expert, so we are open to recommendations from the consultant, and decisions will be made in discussion with our IT Department. We may also seek guidance from the City's CyberSecurity contractor.
67. Q: What are the data storage requirements for CMS dB and other site files. A: We are open to recommendations and discussion during discovery. Our record retention policies will

impact the amount of storage needed, and we will review this during discovery after project kickoff.

68. Q: What is your current annual spend on hosting and support for the site? A: The most exact answer to this question is $0 for use of the CivicPlus Engage Website Central CMS product. Under a contractual arrangement with Civicplus that was entered into in 2012, the City pays NOTHING for hosting or support for JoplinMO.org and 7 Department subsites. These costs below are for ADD-ONS
    - $19,881.93 CivicREC subscription fee 2026
    - $7,788.00 Social Media Archiving module fee
    - $1,134.12 CDBG-DR fees (sub-site)
    - $3,009.80 CDBG-DR fees (sub-site)
    - $5,585.58 MUNICODE subscription fee
    - $15,745.00 DNS hosting and various module subscription fees
    - $34,697.15 SeeClickFix Unlimited Seats subscription support
    - $241.41 Drive4Joplin setup (one-time fee)

    $95,870.99 total expenditures in FY2025

69. Q: Is there an organizational preference for open source vs. a proprietary CMS? A: No, we are open to all proposals and want to be convinced of which is the best solution for Joplin.
70. Q: What third-party tools, if any, are used to manage accessibility? A: None currently.
71. Q: We are a US company with employees outside the US. Is there any limitation on their ability to work on the project? A: Please see RFP section 3.9.1.2. This should not be construed to mean that everyone contributing to the project must be located within the US.
72. Q: Will City staff be responsible for **writing and revising** website content? If yes, how many staff will be involved in content creation for the new website? A: Yes, the Marketing & Communications Department will be reviewing, editing and approving content for the new website, with staff from various city departments providing early drafts and fact-checking. Our MarCom department is a team of 5.
73. Q: Can the City provide examples of comparable websites that you particularly like? This can give us an idea of the scope and style you seek. A: Please see the competitive analysis portion of “Addendum #2 – Research”. We also have looked at some of the recent winners of the best government website awards (the Pinnacle Awards) from the National Association of Government Web Professionals (NAGW). We aspire for our website redesign to be worthy of winning this award.

74. Q: Does the City of Joplin have a preference between a templated design (used by other municipalities/organizations) versus a custom design (unique to the City of Joplin)? A: We prefer a custom design, and don't want our home page to be boxed in by overused and overly restrictive templates. The templates we are most familiar with and seem to be used by most local government websites are not satisfactory.
75. Q: Would the City of Joplin like to engage the public for community feedback (e.g., through community surveys or user testing sessions)? A: Yes, following the launch – for refinement. During design, we may seek feedback and testing with a smaller group. We have provided results of surveys and user interviews which were conducted by our team in 2024. Please see addendum #2.
76. Q: Are there any other projects connected to this one that are already in the works or recently completed, such as an IA initiative or new branding? *We recognize from the City's RFP that there is a branding firm already assigned to the Bike Park construction project, which is developing the park identity.* A: Please see the addenda with the brand standards for the City and the Bike Park. There is no AI initiative. We have tried to be as descriptive about our current technology environment including notes about new softwares we are open to, and softwares which we are in the process of adding. See RFP section 1.2.2.
77. Q: Regarding the SeeClickFix replacement, the RFP states: "Integration with SeeClickFix or recommended replacement solution for citizens to take a picture of a pothole, pin it on the map where they saw it, and submit it to the appropriate department". Is the City wanting a link-away solution to SeeClickFix, an API-level integration, or a new tool such as a webform? A: We are open to all proposals. We may choose to keep See.Click.Fix, even if CivicPlus is not selected for our CMS and website design.
78. Q: Regarding the ESRI ArcGIS integration, would the City like a link-away, or an API-level integration? If the latter, would the City like the vendor to develop the maps, and if yes how many? A: Unknown yet as to whether a link or embed will suffice, or whether API-level integration is needed. City GIS team will develop databases and core maps, but we may need additional assistance with creating desired map experiences based on the databases maintained by our internal GIS team.
79. Q: Regarding the CentralSquare integration with the website, we assume that a link-away will be sufficient. If not, please elaborate on the desired usage and website integration. A: The main concern I have is ensuring purchases conducted through the website are reflected accurately in the city's financial software (and eliminating the need for manual re-entry of data by Finance Department staff from one system to another), and allowing the

Finance team to perform audits and transaction reconciliation according to their needs. Another potential CentralSquare integration could involve asset management.

80. Q: Regarding hosting, how many website visits does your website currently experience in an average month? A: Less than 600,000.
81. Q: Regarding hosting, what resource levels (RAM, CPUs, disk) are on your current hosting server? A: I do not know. We may be able to seek this information from CivicPlus during discovery.
82. Q: Regarding hosting, do you require any of the following (if so, please provide details): (a) An SLA uptime guarantee, (b) Business Continuity compliance, (c) Redundancy for automatic server failovers, (d) Penetration testing, (e) Stress testing? A: We are open to recommendations of the consultant, and decisions will be made following discussion with our IT department.
83. Q: Does the City have an established budget range for this project (one-time implementation + annual recurring costs)? A: Please see Addendum #1, question 1.
84. Q: Should the budget breakdowns be provided separately for:
    • Website design & development
    • CMS licensing/hosting
    • Third-party integrations (e.g., Waste Wizard, chatbot, Smart911)
    • Ongoing support/maintenance
    A: Yes, and the year-1 total of these is considered the project budget. We also want to know what the year-2 total would be so we can plan for the 2027 fiscal year and subsequent budget years.
85. Q: Are funds already allocated for Tier 2 items (e.g., Waste Wizard, chatbot, agenda/minutes management), or should we treat these as optional menu items? A: All tier 2 and tier 3 priorities should be treated as optional menu items. We do not have a separate budget allocated for tiers 2 or 3.
86. Q: The RFP notes high Arabic engagement, with Spanish also in use. Does the City want multilingual website support (particularly Arabic and Spanish) included in the base proposal? A: No. City staff managing the website content only require support in English.
87. Q: Should proposals also account for translation workflows (AI + human review) for key services and pages? A: Yes.
88. Q: Can you confirm which third-party systems must be included in the initial scope (e.g., CentralSquare ERP, Parks & Rec software, SeeClickFix replacement, Constant Contact)? A: Proposals do not have to recommend replacements for any of these listed, however, if you wish to propose alternate solutions, we are open-minded about seeing your proposed

solutions and their costs. We are not likely to change the CentralSquare ERP. We are going out to bid soon for Parks & Rec software. We do not necessarily have to replace SeeClickFix, but we are open to alternate solutions. We do not necessarily need to replace Constant Contact, but are open to alternate solutions.

89. Q: For Parks & Recreation, is Rec.US the intended replacement, or should we budget for multiple options? A: We do not have an intended replacement, the Parks Department has not yet let their software project out to bid and we remain neutral until we are able to begin review of all proposals and will score all proposals fairly. However, I can say we did find the product demo from Rec.US appealing. The Parks & Rec software has a separate line in the City budget from the website project budget.
90. Q: Will the selected marketing agency of record for the Bike Park be responsible for developing content, with the web vendor focused on build/implementation? A: Yes, exactly.
91. Q: Is the expectation that the Bike Park website must launch before the main City site (potentially November/December 2025), even if the larger city site is still in development? A: Yes, at minimum, we need a single landing page for the Bike Park as soon as possible. Additional content and functionalities may be added to the bike park page in phases into 2026. Our main concern is that both sites be built on the same CMS.
92. Q: Are there categories of content/documents that will be prioritized for migration versus archival (e.g., agendas, bid postings, HR applications)? A: Yes, we can work through these decisions during the project. I imagine public meeting agendas, open bids, job listings, program/service descriptions, and city project descriptions to be among top priority for inclusion prior to launch. We will need to make determinations regarding how much of this content should be migrated and searchable for the public, versus what should become archived for staff review only. We will need to comply with all open records laws.
93. Q: Will City staff provide content owners/reviewers for all departments to support this process? A: Yes. Some departments have multiple staff with content roles, some departments have none, and will use Marketing & Communications staff on their behalf. MarCom staff will provide review, edits, and approval to all content to appear on the new website at launch for voice, design, and readability, while relevant department staff (subject matter experts) will provide fact-checking.
94. Q: The RFP specifies mailed hard copies + USB. Given the complexity of this RFP and large file sizes, would the City accept electronic/email submissions as a backup, or is physical delivery strictly required? A: Physical delivery is strictly required. We are not allowed to accept email submissions per instructions from our Finance Department.

95. Q: The RFP lists aspirational launch dates (Bike Park March 2026, joplinmo.org July 2026). Is the City open to phased launches if certain features or subsites require additional development time? A: Yes. We can discuss what may be reasonable and achievable. We will also consider proposed timelines as part of the proposal review and scoring process.