

ADDENDUM 3

DATE: October 15, 2026

TO: Prospective Firms

FROM: Kara Banks, Assistant to the City Administrator

SUBJECT: City Website Redesign and Codification System Questions and Answers

The City received the following questions about the Request for Proposals. Responses are in red:

1. The RFP notes the current site runs on WordPress. Is WordPress required for the new site, or will the City consider an equivalent modern CMS that City staff can edit, with the City owning the stack?

The City is open to all CMS solutions.

2. Codification delivery. May a proposer meet the codification requirement through an established code publisher? The publisher would be either (a) a subcontractor to the website firm, or (b) a separate subscription the City holds directly, marked "Third Party" on Exhibit B with its fees listed. Would the City also consider separate awards for the website and the codification system, as Section III ("a vendor, or multiple vendors") suggests?

We are not interested in splitting the project, but firms can use a subcontractor for the code publishing requirement.

3. Codification scope. Does the City want the current Municipal Code and UDC (as supplemented by the Clerk) placed online in a searchable, updatable system? Or does it want a full legal review and recodification? Who will prepare future supplements: City staff or the vendor? Should the pending "Emerging Industries" UDC update be loaded before launch?

The current code will be used. A full legal review and recodification is not included in the scope of this project. The UDC update may be completed by the time we launch the new website, so that would need to be integrated; however, timing will dictate this. Staff would like to be able to upload changes, but we're willing to hear other options.

4. Budget. Does the under-\$30,000 base budget include first-year third-party costs (code hosting, hosting, licenses)? Or should one-time costs and annual recurring costs be shown separately?

Yes, the base budget should include ALL first-year costs. Any one-time or annual recurring costs need to be noted separately.

5. Platform and hosting. Is the City open to remaining on WordPress? Who hosts the current site, and who holds the domain and DNS?

We are open to remaining on WordPress. Our site is currently hosted and managed by Strategy New Media.

6. Agendas and retention. What tool does the City use today to build agendas and meeting packets? Should the "configurable retention schedules" follow the Records Retention Schedule in Chapter I, Article 9?

We currently put together our agendas and meeting packets manually, saved into PDFs, and upload the entire file to the website. The retention schedule should follow the City's approved retention schedule, which will be provided to the firm that is selected.

7. Third-party integrations. Which Tyler Technologies product(s) does the City use (for example payments, permitting or utility billing), and what level of integration is expected: links and embedded pages, single sign-on, or data exchange? For CivicRec, is the expectation registration links and embeds or calendar synchronization? Does the City have an active Constant Contact account with API access?

The City currently uses Tyler for our Utilities and Court payment portal and business licenses and Tyler's Energov solution for our building permitting. Linking or embedding is acceptable. For CivicRec, we want calendar synchronization, registration links and embeds would be helpful but not necessary. The City does have an active Constant Contact account with API Access.

8. Insurance. Section V.e asks that "the City and Engineer" be named as additional insureds. Who is the "Engineer" for this project? Exhibit 2 requires workers' compensation covering LLC members regardless of statutory requirement. Will the City accept an owner-operated firm with no employees under an alternative arrangement? Is a certificate showing current limits sufficient at proposal stage, with endorsements due at contract?

The Engineer language is our standard language, but does not apply for this project. An owner-operated firm is acceptable. If workman's comp insurance is not required for your firm, you will be required to sign a workman's comp waiver if selected. A certificate showing current limits is acceptable.

9. Interviews. May the live CMS demonstration (week of November 16) be held by video conference?

Yes, video conference is acceptable.

10. Does the October 22, 4 p.m. proposal deadline mean Edgerton local Central time? What is the latest date and time to submit questions for the October 15 addendum?

The deadline is October 22nd at 4 p.m. CDT. All questions must be received before 8 a.m. CDT on October 15th.

11. May an out-of-state firm deliver the work remotely, including workshops and training, or are any onsite visits required?

No on-site visits are required, and all work/training may be conducted virtually.

12. Are comparable commercial-client website/CMS references acceptable? At proposal stage, may an insurer's written commitment cover the required project endorsements, with final certificates before work begins?

Yes, comparable website and CMS references are acceptable. For insurance coverage, an insurer's written commitment is acceptable provided that final certificates are provided before the Notice to Proceed is given.

13. Must the vendor remediate the existing 3,100 documents for accessibility, or will the City provide accessible documents? If only part of the archive needs remediation, what volume should be included?

Only part of the archive will need remediation, but that number is unknown at this time. For purposes of the proposal, please include a scalable solution for remediation of documents.

14. Are there any geographic restrictions on remote development/support personnel, hosting or access to City data?

All companies that submit must be based in the United States.

15. Should all 3,100 documents be migrated, or only those kept after the collaborative content review with City staff? Should existing agenda and minutes archives move into the new agenda and archiving system?

While many of the documents will likely need to be migrated, some may end up being archived. That number is unknown at this time. Please include a scalable solution and budget in your submission.

16. Ongoing support (Exhibit A, Section I, Support; minimum 60 days post-launch support): After the 60-day support period, does the City want annual hosting and maintenance priced for a set number of years, and if so, how many?

Annual hosting and maintenance should be priced for a minimum of one year. If annual escalators are known, that should be included.

17. Licensing (Section VIII.g and PSA "licensed in accordance with the laws of the State of Kansas"): For a firm based outside Kansas, is the City of Edgerton Business License the only license required before work begins, or does the City expect any other state registration?

The City of Edgerton Business License is required and no additional state registrations are required.

18. Design concept (Addendum 2, 20-page limit excluding required exhibits and insurance references): May we include a complimentary homepage design concept, shared through a private preview link referenced in one line of the proposal, without it counting toward the 20-page limit?

Yes, design concept links may be included in the proposal without counting toward the 20-page limit.

19. Budget boundary. Does the base budget of "less than \$30,000" include the first year of hosting, maintenance and support, or should ongoing hosting and maintenance be presented as a separate annual cost? Does the City have an expectation for the annual cost?

The budget of \$30,000 should include the first year of hosting, maintenance and support and any ongoing costs should be noted separately. We do not have any expectations, but annual recurring fees will be considered as a part of the City's review.

20. For the 20-page limit in Addendum 2, do resumes of key staff count toward the 20 pages, or are they treated as exhibits?

Resumes of key staff are counted in the 20 page limit.

21. Insurer eligibility. Exhibit 2 asks for insurers "authorized to do business in the state of Kansas." Would a policy from a surplus-lines insurer that is eligible in Kansas, rated A-Class VIII or better, be acceptable?

A surplus lines insurer would be acceptable subject to their having at least A.M. Best rating of A-VIII), if they are an eligible non-admitted surplus lines company in Kansas. The Kansas Department of Insurance maintains an active list of eligible non-admitted surplus lines companies.