ADDENDUM NO. 2
Website Provider Request for Proposals (RFP)

1. Section 1.0 says the District will request project-specific proposals from a pre-qualified list. Sections 2.4 and 2.5 describe a single implementation with a five-year managed-service term. Will this solicitation result in one award for the full website implementation, or a pre-qualified list from which later task proposals will be requested?

   A. One award but please include the five-year managed service as a separate line item.

2. Does the District have an established budget or budget range for implementation and annual managed services?

   A. Not currently.

3. Will the new website launch on bcmudtx.gov? Will the District manage DNS for that domain, or should proposers include domain and DNS management? A. We will launch on bcmudtx.gov.

   A. The new website will launch on bcmudtx.gov. Brushy Creek would manage DNS.

4. Will the District-approved migration and document-remediation inventory be released with the October 30 addendum? If not, please provide current estimates so proposers can price on a common basis: number of active webpages, number of PDFs and other documents, and the subset the District considers priority documents.

   A. The District will not publish a fixed inventory. Proposers shall estimate the total quantities to be migrated and made WCAG 2.1 AA compliant, based on their own review of bcmud.org. Each proposal shall state estimated totals for web pages and structured content, PDFs and other documents (with page counts by the proposer's complexity bands), images and media, forms, news and event records, and Board and public records. Base pricing shall cover these quantities for both migration and accessibility remediation, with unit rates for additional pages and documents in each band. The District will use the stated quantities and unit rates to compare proposals on a common basis.

5. Please define the document complexity bands the District will use or confirm that proposers should propose their own bands and unit rates.

A. The District will not define complexity bands. Proposers may propose their own bands, with a clear definition and per-page unit rate for each.

6. Section 2.4 G refers to a "required public records archive" in the base scope. What content does this archive include (for example, Board agendas, minutes, and packets), how many years of records are in scope, and is it currently hosted on the website or in a separate system?

   A. The required public records archive (base scope) covers Board and committee agendas, minutes and meeting packets, together with related governance records currently published under District Business (e.g., Current Agendas, Historic Minutes, policies and financial information). These records are currently published through the website with document management in FileHold. The provider shall deliver a searchable, accessible archive experience on the new website; whether source records remain in the existing document system (with integration) or are migrated into the CMS will be stated in the addendum. Retention schedule is permanent and will remain in the existing document system (FileHold).

7. Will the District provide administrative access or a full content export from the current CMS during discovery? When does the current website hosting agreement end?

   A. The current website runs on the QScend CMS. The District will request a full content export from the current provider for discovery; availability and format depend on that provider. State the export formats you can use and your approach if a full export is not available. The current hosting agreement ends April 2027 for annual service.

8. Section 2.4 D refers to a base integration register. Will the District publish it before proposals are due? Please identify the current systems for utility billing and payment, recreation registration, Board agendas and records, GIS and mapping, events, and emergency or resident notifications.

   A. Systems identified in the District's current-state analysis are: (1) utility bill view/payment – third-party payment portal; (2) recreation program, class, camp and facility-rental registration – third-party registration system(s); (3) Board agendas, minutes and records – FileHold document management; (4) GIS and mapping – ArcGIS; (5) e-mail (SMTP) and resident notifications, including Reverse 911 information; and (6) links to county/state resources. Recommended base behavior: secure payment and registration as clear, accessible links with pre-transition messaging (no handling of payment data on the website); ArcGIS as an embedded, accessible map view supporting a 'Find Locations' hub; agendas and

records as a searchable embedded view or data feed. Integrations beyond the register are a Section 2.4 G option. Events are currently managed within the website CMS (News & Events feed) and will migrate to the new CMS.

9. Does the District require multilingual content (for example, Spanish) or translation tools at launch?

   A. Language/translation needs will be determined by upcoming requirements of WCAG 2.1 AA (April 2028 ADA requirements for municipalities under 50,000 population).

10. Please provide approximate annual website sessions or pageviews and peak-traffic events. Section 3.4 H asks proposers to disclose traffic assumptions, and a common baseline would keep pricing comparable.

    A. The annual sessions/pageviews are approximately 700,000. Peak-day figures are between 1,000 and 5,000. The days of peak use are within the first weeks of January and June. Average monthly users are between 10,000 and 20,000. Peak day use for the year are within the first weeks of January and June according to Google Analytics 4. Peak demand is expected during water/utility emergencies, or service notices, and major community events. If figures are not published, proposers shall state their sizing assumptions (traffic, storage, staff users and support volume) as required by Section 3.4 H and quote the unit cost of exceeding them; the District will normalize assumptions during evaluation.

11. Approximately how many staff will author or approve content, and across how many departments?

    A. Content is managed by staff across several District functional areas. Proposers shall state the number of authoring, approving and administrative users their pricing includes, and the cost of adding more users. The solution must support a draft → review → approve → publish workflow with role-based permissions

12. Has the District identified its independent accessibility verifier? How much time should proposers allow in the schedule for independent pre-launch testing and District review?

    A. The District intends to arrange independent pre-launch accessibility verification separately from the website implementation team. The verifier and scheduling arrangements will be confirmed by the District. Include your own implementation accessibility testing, reasonable access and cooperation for independent review, and correction and retesting of vendor-caused defects in base pricing. Recommend schedule

allowances for the independent assessment, corrective work and retesting. Required verification must be completed before launch authorization.

13. Are there page limits, formatting requirements, or required tabs for the proposal? Should the cost proposal (Section 3.4 H) be sealed separately from the technical proposal?

    A. No to both questions.

14. Which forms or certifications must be included with the proposal (for example, Conflict of Interest Questionnaire, Form 1295, or Texas Government Code verifications)? Will the District provide them?

    A. None.

15. Is a sample agreement, insurance requirements, or standard terms and conditions available for review before submission?

    A. No.

16. Is there a file size limit for the electronic copy sent to procurement@bcmudtx.gov?

    A. 15 Megabytes.

17. Will interviews during December 14 to 18 be in person or virtual?

    A. In-person is the plan.

18. May a prime contractor include a qualified municipal website partner and that partner's comparable project references?

    A. Yes.

19. Is evidence of insurance required with the proposal, or may the selected contractor obtain coverage before contract execution?

    A. Insurance is not required to be submitted with the proposal.

20. Are there any minimum financial qualifications or bonding requirements?

    A. No.

21. Could you share the baseline content inventory that proposers should use for migration pricing?

    A. See Q 4. The District will not publish a fixed inventory. Proposers shall estimate the total quantities for migration and accessibility remediation from their own review of bcmud.org, and price that estimate with unit rates for additional pages and documents.

22. How many document pages in each complexity band should the base price cover for accessibility remediation or HTML conversion?

    A. See Q 5 for information on complexity bands. All migrated documents must conform to WCAG 2.1 AA, either through remediation or by conversion to accessible HTML.

23. Could you share the base integration register identifying the required behavior for each connection?

    A. See Q 8.

24. Client references and reference sites. The solicitation expresses a preference for Texas public-sector references and live municipal or government reference sites. OFF WiNGS Inc. is entering public-sector work, and its current client base is private-sector; our references would be Texas private-sector clients, and our live reference sites are private-sector client websites. Are references from Texas private-sector projects acceptable for evaluation, and do live private-sector reference sites satisfy the reference-sites section, notwithstanding the stated public-sector preference?

    A. The Texas private-sector references are acceptable for evaluation, but are low priority and do not completely qualify proposers for selection. According to the RFP, we are looking for substantiated success delivering and supporting municipal, governmental, or other U.S. public-sector websites, with live reference sites. Texas MUD or comparable municipal utility experience is relevant, but not a prerequisite.

25. Insurance requirements. Please confirm the exact insurance coverage types and minimum limits the District requires (for example, commercial general liability, professional liability / errors & omissions, and cyber liability), and whether a certificate of insurance evidencing those coverages must be included with the proposal at submission or may instead be

furnished at contract award. Please also confirm whether the District must be named as an additional insured and/or certificate holder, and whether a waiver of subrogation or a notice-of-cancellation endorsement is required.

A. See Qs 15 and 19.

26. Section 2.4G optional items. Please confirm the complete list of optional items the District wishes proposers to price separately under Section 2.4G, so that our cost schedule matches the District's list exactly.

A. Separately price the options listed in Section 2.4 G: resident request/case management, the AI assistant, integrations or content/document work beyond the base scope, and a new open-records request portal if offered. State implementation and recurring charges and relevant dependencies. Other enhancements may be suggested separately. The required public records archive remains base scope. Under the issued RFP, options do not affect responsiveness or scored evaluation and are excluded from evaluated base price unless the District changes that treatment by a pre-deadline addendum. Other items may include add-ons such as email notifications.

27. Section 2.4 B, migration baseline. Base pricing is to cover the same District-issued quantities for all proposers. Can the District share the migration and document-remediation inventory: the number of webpages and structured items to migrate, the number of PDFs and other documents, and the priority-document quantities (with any complexity bands) that the base price should include?

A. See Q 4 for migration information. See Q 26 for pricing. Base pricing shall cover these quantities for both migration and accessibility remediation, with unit rates for additional pages and documents in each band. The District will use the stated quantities and unit rates to compare proposals on a common basis.

28. Can the District share the base integration register? For each connection (for example utility bill payment, recreation registration and memberships, Board agendas and minutes, job applications and the e-newsletter), is the expected behavior a clear link with pre-transition messaging, an embedded view, or a data feed shown on the website?

A. See Q 8. Systems identified in the District's current-state analysis are: (1) utility bill view/payment – third-party payment portal; (2) recreation program, class, camp and facility-rental registration – third-party registration system(s); (3) Board agendas, minutes

and records – FileHold document management; (4) GIS and mapping – ArcGIS; (5) e-mail (SMTP) and resident notifications, including Reverse 911 information; and (6) links to county/state resources. Recommended base behavior: secure payment and registration as clear, accessible links with pre-transition messaging (no handling of payment data on the website); ArcGIS as an embedded, accessible map view; agendas and records as a searchable embedded view or data feed. Integrations beyond the register are a Section 2.4 G option. [District to confirm product names and the behavior for each connection.] Job applications and the e-newsletter: recommended as an accessible link to the application system and an embedded newsletter sign-up, respectively.

29. Should Board agendas and minutes stay in the District's current agenda portal with the website linking to it, or should the historic minutes and agendas archive move into the new website?

    A. Board agendas, minutes and related records are currently managed in FileHold. The new website must give residents a searchable, accessible archive of these records. Proposers may recommend either integrating with the current system or migrating the records into the new website, and shall price their recommended approach.

30. How many District staff will author, approve or administer content, and what were average monthly visits over the past year and the busiest day?

    A. For staff numbers, see Q 11. For Google Analytics information, see question 10. Peak demand is expected during water/utility emergencies, or service notices, and major community events. If figures are not published, proposers shall state their sizing assumptions (traffic, storage, staff users and support volume) as required by Section 3.4 H and quote the unit cost of exceeding them; the District will normalize assumptions during evaluation.

31. About how many online forms should be carried over or built for launch, and do any collect payments or sensitive personal information?

    A. The forms baseline is more than 3,000. The current site includes Forms & Permits, service requests, sponsorship and contact forms. Utility payments are made through the District's third-party payment portal and are not to be collected through website forms. Any form collecting personal information must apply the data privacy, encryption, access-control and retention requirements in Section 2.4.

32. For planning, should proposers expect one District-directed independent verification before launch plus one retest of corrected items?

    A. See Q12.

33. Does the District have a budget range for implementation and for the annual managed services that proposals should be designed against?

    A. See Q 2.

34. If insurance certificates are required, can they be provided after award, at contracting, and are the coverages and limits in the District's Professional Services Agreement template (October 16, 2025) the ones that would apply to this agreement?

    A. See Q 15.

35. What is the deadline for submitting questions, and will written responses be distributed through an addendum? Could you also confirm the proposal deadline time zone and the acceptable medium for the required electronic copy?

    A. See RFP, section 3.0. Timezone is Central Standard Time in the U.S. The electronic copy should be submitted via email to procurement@bcmudtx.gov. USB submissions as the electronic copy will NOT be accepted. See Q 16 for submission questions.

36. May a prime contractor satisfy the experience requirements using completed projects from disclosed subcontractors or teaming partners?

    A. See Q 24.

37. May experience gained by proposed personnel at previous employers count when their individual responsibilities are documented?

    A. See Q 24.

38. Must all three website examples and references be public-sector projects, or may comparable commercial projects supplement the public-sector experience?

A. See Q 24.

39. Section 2.4B references a District-approved migration and document-remediation inventory to be finalized through an addendum. Could you provide this inventory, including approximate webpage and document quantities, priority remediation requirements, and document complexity classifications? We would also appreciate confirmation of the current CMS and expected availability of content exports. When is the corresponding addendum expected?

A. See Qs 4, 21, and 22.

40. Section 2.4D references a base integration register. Could the District provide that document, identifying the systems requiring integration, the expected connection methods, and any existing third-party dependencies? Could you also confirm the approximate number of forms that must be implemented or migrated?

A. See Qs 8 and 31.

41. Section 2.4C requires post-launch accessibility testing, while Section 3.4D requests separate pricing for available monitoring, manual reviews, and remediation services. Could you clarify the minimum post-launch accessibility testing frequency and coverage that must be included in the base managed-service price versus services that may be offered as optional additions?

A. See Qs 2 and 26.

42. To develop realistic infrastructure and support pricing, could the District share available estimates for monthly website traffic, storage requirements, CMS users, and anticipated support volume? Additionally, has a budget range been established for the initial implementation and annual managed services that could be shared with prospective proposers?

A. For information on analytics, see Q 10. Peak demand is expected during water/utility emergencies, or service notices, and major community events. If figures are not published, proposers shall state their sizing assumptions (traffic, storage, staff users and support

volume) as required by Section 3.4 H and quote the unit cost of exceeding them; the District will normalize assumptions during evaluation.

43. Will the District accept as comparable references live websites and complex systems delivered for U.S. private-sector clients and for public and private organizations outside the United States, or must references be U.S. public-sector websites?

    A. See Q 24.

44. IQ Source is a Florida limited liability company not currently registered in Texas. Is that sufficient to propose and contract with the District, and which documents does the District expect as evidence of eligibility and good standing?

    A. A vendor is not required to be registered in Texas to submit a proposal. The RFP does not prescribe specific documentation that must be submitted as evidence of a proposer's eligibility or good standing.

45. Hosting and data would remain in U.S.-based cloud infrastructure. Does the District restrict design, development, or support work performed by team members located outside the United States?

    A. No.

46. When will the District issue the migration and document-remediation inventory (page counts, priority document quantities and complexity bands) and the base integration register? Could the District also identify the current platform behind bcmud.org and the systems used for utility payments and recreation registration?

    A. See QsThe current website runs on the QScend CMS. The District will not publish a fixed migration inventory; proposers shall estimate quantities from their own review of bcmud.org, as described in the inventory response. The base integration register will be issued by addendum. Utility bill payments run through a third-party payment portal, and recreation programs, classes, camps and facility rentals use third-party registration systems. All of these integrations are part of the base scope.

47. What medium does the District prefer for the electronic copy (USB drive in the sealed package or email), and are hard copies delivered by courier acceptable if received by the due date and time?
    A. See Qs 16 and 35.

48. Is a provider based outside the US, working fully remotely, eligible to respond, or does the District require a US or Texas business presence?

    A. Yes, they are eligible.

49. Is prior US public-sector website experience a pass/fail requirement, or is comparable experience with other organizations evaluated on merit?

    A. See Q 24.

50. Sections 2.1 and 2.2 ask proposers to demonstrate experience with U.S. public-sector or municipal websites, and Section 3.4 G asks for at least three comparable live websites and three client references. Will the District accept comparable websites and references from non-government organizations, where the scope included CMS implementation, content migration, WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility and managed hosting?

    A. See Q 24.

51. Section 2.2 permits disclosed subcontractors and platform partners. If a proposer works with a disclosed implementation or platform partner, may live public-sector websites and client references delivered by that partner be used toward Section 3.4 G, provided the partner's role on those projects and on this engagement is clearly identified?

    A. Yes.

52. Does the mandatory-responsiveness screen in Section 4.0 apply only to the submission requirements in Section 3, or are the qualifications in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 also treated as pass/fail?

A. The mandatory-responsiveness screen applies to the Section 3 submission requirements: timely receipt, the required Section 3.4 content, a minimum of three client references, and a fully priced base cost proposal under Section 3.4 H. The qualifications in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 are not pass/fail. They are scored under the Organizational Qualifications and Experience category in Section 4.0. However, every proposal must offer a complete solution through a single accountable provider, and an optional item cannot substitute for a mandatory requirement.

53. Section 2.4 B refers to a District-issued migration and document-remediation inventory with priority quantities. Will the District publish that inventory (page counts, document counts and complexity bands) by addendum before proposals are due, so that all proposers price the same baseline?

    A. See Qs 4, 5, 21, 22, and 26.

54. Could you confirm whether overseas vendors without a US-registered business entity are eligible, and whether there are mandatory US incorporation, Form W-9, insurance, or location requirements?

    A. See Qs 35 and 48.

55. Is registration as a U.S. or Texas business mandatory at the proposal submission stage, or can an international company participate with U.S.-based technical partners or subcontractors?

    A. See Q 48.

56. Can relevant public-sector experience from disclosed project partners or subcontractors contribute toward the experience qualifications?

    A. See Q 24.

57. The RFP specifies two hard copies and one electronic copy in a sealed package. Is physical submission mandatory, or are electronic submissions by email also accepted?

    A. See Qs 16 and 35.

58. Are there any mandatory vendor registration or pre-qualification requirements?

    A. See Qs 15, 16, and 35.

59. Is there an established budget range for implementation and ongoing support?

    A. See Q 2.

60. Section 2.4 B says base pricing should cover the District-issued migration and document-remediation inventory (page counts, PDF quantities and complexity bands), and Section 2.4 D refers to a base integration register. Neither is in the RFP or Addendum No. 1. Will the District publish them before proposals are due? If not, what page and document counts should proposers assume for base pricing?

    A. See Qs 4, 8, 21, 22, and 26.

61. Which systems will the integration register include for utility payments, recreation registration and records requests (vendor or product names), and are any of them expected to be embedded on the site rather than linked?

    A. See Q 8.

62. Inventory baseline (Sections 2.4 B and 3.4 E). Section 2.4 B states the District will confirm the migration and document-remediation baseline by addendum. Please provide the number of active webpages, the number of PDFs and other documents, and the priority-document quantities by complexity band that proposers should include in base pricing. If the inventory will not be issued before November 13, may proposers price on stated assumptions with unit rates?

A. See Qs 2, 4, 21, and 22.

63. Please identify the current CMS or website platform, the current hosting provider, the approximate number of pages and documents, the domain registrar and DNS host, and whether historical analytics (for example, Google Analytics) will be made available to the selected provider.

    A. See Qs 4, 10, 21, 22, and 46. We will provide specific information requested, depending on the request, but will not provide access to view it.

64. Integration register (Section 2.4 D). Will the District publish the base integration register before the due date? Please identify the utility billing and payment vendor, the recreation registration vendor, and any agenda, records or GIS systems in scope, and confirm whether a link or embed handoff with pre-transition messaging satisfies the base requirement for each.

    A. See Qs 8 and 28.

65. Qualifying experience (Sections 2.2 and 3.4 G). Will the District consider, toward the public-sector experience and illustrative-website requirements, a public-program application delivered for a Houston program serving people with disabilities and public websites delivered for nonprofit civic organizations, together with disclosed platform and accessibility partners? May a disclosed partner's public-sector work be cited if the partner's role is clearly identified?

    A. See Q 24.

66. Independent accessibility verification (Section 2.4 C). Section 2.4 C requires independent pre-launch verification and also states the District will arrange and fund its own independent verifier. Should the base price include a proposer-engaged independent accessibility audit in addition to cooperation with the District's verifier, or does the District's verifier satisfy the independent-verification requirement?

    A. See Q 13.

67. Inventory baseline (Section 2.4 B). Section 2.4 B says the District will confirm a common inventory by addendum. Please provide the number of active web pages, the number of PDFs and other documents (with the priority-document quantity to include in base pricing and the complexity bands), and the approximate volume of images and media, so all proposers price the same baseline.

    A. See Qs 2, 4, 21 and 22.

68. Current website. Which CMS and hosting does bcmud.org use today, and will the provider receive an export or administrative access for migration?

    A. See Q 7, and yes.

69. Integration register (Section 2.4 D). Which systems are in the base integration register (for example, utility billing and payments, recreation registration, agendas and Board records, public records requests, events, maps/GIS), and which vendor products are they?

    A. See Q 8.

70. Major pain points. What are the most important problems the District wants the new website to solve for residents and staff (for example, tasks residents can't find, content that is hard to keep current, accessibility findings, or call volume)?

    A. See RFP section 3.

71. Application-like features. Beyond content pages, are there interactive features the District expects at launch beyond those listed in Section 2.4 D (for example, outage or service alerts, service-request intake, reservations, or resident notifications)?

    A. See Q. 26.

72. References and live sites (Sections 2.2 and 3.4 G). Is "substantiated success delivering U.S. public-sector websites, with live reference sites" a pass/fail requirement in the responsiveness screen, or scored under Illustrative Websites and References? Will the District consider live public-facing web applications and websites delivered for healthcare

and government-contractor clients, together with a working prototype built for the District, as comparable evidence?

A. See Q. 24.

73. Independent accessibility verification (Section 2.4 C). Does the District intend to commission the independent pre-launch verification itself (Section 2.4 C says the District funds its verifier), or should proposers include a third-party accessibility audit in the base price?

A. The District has no plans to commission an independent pre-launch verification.

74. AI assistant option (Section 2.4 G). Is the District interested in the optional AI assistant answering residents from published District content with source links and human handoff, and should it be priced for launch or as a later phase?

A. This will happen at a later phase

75. Please confirm the time zone for that cutoff and the November 13, 2p.m. proposal deadline. The cover requires two hard copies plus one electronic copy in a sealed package, while ESBD also lists a Bid Response Email. Must the electronic copy accompany the sealed package, and is email an additional requirement or a permitted substitute?

A. The time zone is CST for the Nov. 13 deadline. See Qs 16 and 35 for submission requirements.

76. Section 2.4B promises a common migration/document inventory, and 2.4D refers to a base integration register. Please provide the current versions or their addendum publication date, including webpage/document quantities, complexity bands, included connections and access/licensing assumptions. Are proposers to await those common quantities before fixing the complete base cost?

A. See Qs 4, 8, 21, and 22.

77. Sections 1.0 and 2.5 describe both an as-needed prequalification arrangement and a complete six-month implementation with managed services. Is this one selected complete

implementation/managed-service provider or a panel without a guaranteed implementation? Please confirm the intended pricing and award structure.

A. See Qs 1, 2, and 26.

78. Sections 2.2 and 3.4G require public-sector evidence and three comparable live websites/client references. If a disclosed platform partner or subcontractor performs the relevant work under the accountable prime, may its actual project references be submitted with each entity's role clearly distinguished? We would not describe partner or individual experience as Work Mates corporate history.

A. See Q 24.

79. We count about 425 pages and 127 linked PDFs on bcmudtx.gov. Does that match the District's inventory, and how many of the PDFs are in the priority group for remediation? Are the Board records on CivicWeb part of the migration, or do they stay on CivicWeb?

A. See Qs 4, 21, and 22 for inventory information. Board records will stay on CivicWeb.

80. Is a WordPress website on managed, U.S.-based hosting (such as WP Engine) acceptable, as long as it meets every requirement in Section 2.4?

A. As long as requirements in 2.4 are satisfied, WordPress is acceptable.

81. Which systems need to connect at launch (utility payments, VSCloud recreation registration, CivicWeb Board records, ApplicantPro jobs)? Do any of these need a live API integration that exchanges data with the website, or are links and embedded widgets from each provider enough?

A. All static links. No API.

82. Our public-sector work includes the City of Coppell and the City of Canyon. Would public-sector references for branding and communications work count toward Section 3.4 G, along with our website references from other industries?

A. See Q 24.

83. What was the annual spend under the previous contract for these services?

A. $ 6076.85 Maintenance & Support & Training $2226.00 Hosting & DDoS protection, multi-layer

84. If this is a new contract, what is the estimated annual budget?

A. See Q 2.

85. Is the agency open to a hybrid delivery model utilizing a combination of onshore and offshore resources?

A. Yes.

86. Will the work be performed onsite, remotely, or through a hybrid arrangement?

A. This will depend on the decisions made during the selection process.

87. Would it be possible to consider a 1–2 week extension to the proposal submission deadline?

A. No.

88. Is there a projected contract award date and anticipated start date?

A. The anticipated start award and start dates will be established during the selection process.

89. Current platform. What CMS or platform runs the current website, and will a content export be available to the selected provider?

A. See Q 7. We are hopeful but cannot confirm at this time if a content export will be available to the selected provider.

90. Independent accessibility verification (Section 2.4 C). The RFP says the District will arrange and fund any independent verifier. Should proposers exclude third-party independent audit costs from the base price and include only provider testing and correction of provider-responsible defects?

A. Include as a separate line item, as optional.

91. Could Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District share the current website platform, version, and available export formats?

A. We will share what is available to the selected vendor.

92. Could Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District clarify what incumbent-transition assistance will be available during migration?

A. A District representative will need to work with the chosen provider to consult on the proper methods and taxonomy required for the District's needs with regard to migration. At times, we will also seek the expertise of the chosen provider.

93. Could Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District confirm whether resident authentication is required for any base-scope forms?

A. We do not have this now. We will require if it is required by coming ADA requirements.

94. Could Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District share any numerical page-performance criteria used for acceptance testing?

A. Page-performance criteria should be in compliance with industry standards.

95. Could Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District confirm whether content-management staff must authenticate through a District identity provider?

A. That would be the ideal safeguard.

96. Could Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District confirm whether any restrictions apply to personnel location or remote data access from outside the United States?

    A. Yes, we block users from accessing our website from outside the US

97. For the independent pre-launch accessibility verification, will the testing vendor be contracted directly by the District, and how much time will be allocated for independent testing within the six-month schedule?

    A. The district does not have a vendor in mind. If you include an independent vendor for this, please add a separate line item as additional. We are unsure how much time will be allocated.

98. Is the upload-time accessibility check with pre-publication blocking of critical issues expected to be an automated gate within the CMS editor and document uploader?

    A. Yes. There should be certain automated guardrails in place at prepublishing gates.

99. For the 10 evaluation points allocated to Migration, Records, and MUD Content Fit, which Texas public records or retention schedules (e.g., TSLAC schedules) must the CMS records archive directly enforce?

    A. They must fall into compliance with Texas public record retention schedule government requirement criteria.

100. Is a fully managed open-source CMS (e.g., managed Drupal or WordPress on secure U.S. cloud infrastructure) acceptable, provided it meets all workflow, versioning, and security requirements?

    A. Yes.

101. For staff multifactor authentication, does the District use a centralized identity provider (e.g., Microsoft Entra ID or Okta) that the CMS must federate with via SAML 2.0 or OIDC?

A. Preferred is SAML 2.0 but we may consider other options during the selection process.

102. For the map-based parks, facilities, and service finder, does the District maintain existing GIS data layers or an ArcGIS REST service, or will facility geospatial data need to be newly compiled?

A. The District has an in-house GIS.

103. Does the District require dedicated hosting infrastructure, or is a logically isolated, multi-tenant FedRAMP/StateRAMP-aligned public cloud acceptable, provided all data is encrypted and stored in the United States?

A. We do not require dedicated infrastructure. Marking it green also to ask 10/29 just in case.

104. For the optional AI assistant, does the District have a preferred hosted AI model provider, or should proposers include an end-to-end managed solution with District-governed retrieval-augmented generation (RAG) and human-handoff controls?

A. No preferred hosted AI

105. Is there a current incumbent website services provider for the District? If so, would the District be willing to identify the incumbent and indicate whether the current contract is available for review?

A. See Q 7. We are a public entity these are available through the open records request.

106. Will the District consider capping provider liability for third-party software, upstream ISP/cloud outages, or District-authored content non-compliance at the total annual fees paid under the contract?

A. This has not been considered at this time.

107. Which domain will be production going forward (bcmud.org or bcmudtx.gov), and should content from both sites be included in the migration?

A. Bcmudtx.gov. Yes.

108. Does the District apply any local or regional vendor preference? If so, how is that preference evaluated? We noted that Section 2.3 allows remote assistance and would like to understand whether any onsite participation is expected.

A. The District does not apply any local or regional vendor preference. Onsite participation is not expected.

109. What CMS and hosting platform support the current website? We understand that proprietary, SaaS, and managed open-source solutions are eligible. Does the District have any additional platform preferences or restrictions that respondents should consider?

A. See Q 7. Platform preferences and restrictions will be assessed during the selection process.

110. Can the District identify the systems the new website must connect with and indicate which require API integration rather than links or embeds? Are existing documentation and vendor contacts available for those connections?

A. No, all are static links, no API.

111. What are the security requirements for the site?

A. HTTPS encryption, MFA for admin accounts, Web Application Firewall, documented backup procedures, DDoS protection, CAPTCHA for web forms.

112. Section 2.4 D (Resident Experience and Functionality), Is this a new website? Does the site need to support multiple languages? (probably Spanish)

A. The website exists already. See Q 9 for language requirements.

113. Where is the current website hosted and please confirm that hosting is in scope.

A. Azure and AWS/Oracle. Hosting is in scope.

114. Can you please clarify if the packet should be delivered/received to "Lori Brown, Brushy Creek MUD, 16318 Great Oaks Drive, Round Rock, TX 78681" by 2:00 p.m. on 11/13, 2026.

A. Yes.

115. Which specific items make up the mandatory-responsiveness screen?

A. See Section 3 of the RFP.

116. Can the District share the price formula that will be applied to Cost of Services and the definitions of the 0–5 scoring anchors?

A. See Qs 2 and 26.

117. What is the District's intended treatment of content currently labeled or stored as archived? Is all archived content subject to WCAG 2.1 AA remediation, or has the District established criteria for its treatment?

A. All archived content must be subject to WCAG 2.1 AA remediation.

118. Please provide the current website URL, CMS platform, and hosting arrangement; the number of domains, subdomains, or microsites in scope; who currently manages the domain registrar and DNS; and the end date of the current website vendor contract.

A. bcmudtx.gov is URL. CMS is QSCEND/Catalis. Gravity manages registrar and DNS.

119. How many forms are currently published on the website? Should each be migrated as-is, rebuilt, or retired? Do any collect payments or sensitive personal data?

A. See Qs 4, 21, and 22 for first question. Yes, we collect payments and sensitive personal data.

120. What structure and functionality does the District expect for the public records archive (e.g., an organized document library versus a searchable, indexed repository)? Does the District use an agenda management system, and are there specific Texas posting requirements the site must support?

A. FileHold is our document management system. Yes, we use CivicWeb for agendas, and yes there are specific Texas posting requirements.

121. Has the District identified its independent accessibility verifier? What timing should proposers assume for that review and any retesting relative to the six-month implementation schedule?

A. We have not.

122. How does the District define "material changes" to templates, navigation, or major functionality that would trigger District-directed accessibility testing after launch?

A. This would be determined during the implementation process based on many different factors that are not yet established. All changes made should satisfy the requirements in the Scope of Services section of the RFP.

123. Beyond correction of provider-caused defects, what level of support does the District expect during the 60-day hypercare period (e.g., dedicated on-call availability, scheduled check-ins, or reactive support only)?

A. Provide what support is available, and it is unknown as to what support is expected. One support period of 60-90-days is a minimum requirement.

124. Does the District require or prefer a specific certification or framework as evidence of security controls (e.g., SOC 2 Type II, TX-RAMP, or NIST alignment)?

A. The selected provider will provide a minimum of ISO certifications, in addition to SOC 2 Type II. The provider may also add suggestions that best suit the District's needs.

125. What District staff time is anticipated for content review, user acceptance testing, and training? What review turnaround should proposers plan for, and who holds sign-off authority for content such as rate schedules, legal notices, and Board records? Do change requests during implementation require General Manager approval or Board action? Are the District's branding assets (logo, colors, typography, style guide) final and available at project Initiation?

A. Board approval is needed for changes ordered that impact time or cost. General Manager approval is needed for the rest.

126. Is the District exempt from sales tax, and will an exemption certificate be provided? Yes