REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

FOR

Website Provider Services

The Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District invites individuals, or firms, to respond to this Request with a proposal for providing website services to the District.

Please submit two (2) hard copies and one (1) electronic copy of your proposal in a sealed package by **2:00 p.m. on 11/13, 2026** to the attention of:

Lori Brown
Brushy Creek MUD
16318 Great Oaks Drive
Round Rock, TX 78681
procurement@bcmud.org

Brushy Creek MUD

Website Provider Services:
Municipal Public Affairs, Information & Resident Engagement

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Background and Purpose ---------- 3

2.0 Qualifications & Scope of Services ---------- 3-10

3.0 Proposal Process and Submission Requirements ---------- 10-13

4.0 Evaluation Process and Selection Criteria ---------- 13

5.0 Nature of this Document ---------- 13-14

1.0 BACKGROUND & PURPOSE

The Brushy Creek MUD (the District) Board of Directors periodically implements administrative, financial, structural, and operational changes that impact our customers and residents. Certain changes, such as new regulations, may require professional support. When it is necessary to commence services, the District will request proposals from a pre-qualified list under this Request for Proposals (RFP) determined to be most qualified for said project.

The Board of Directors desires to engage a website provider to serve as the main face of BCMUD's online platforming. These efforts aim to support the organization's mission of fostering community engagement and providing the most up-to-date District-related information to the public.

The purpose of this Request for Proposal (RFP) is to solicit pricing and service proposals from qualified applicants for website provider services which may be provided on an ad hoc, periodic, or as-needed basis. Specific tasks will be defined at the time of engagement. When it is necessary to commence services, the District will request proposals from a pre-qualified list under this Request for Proposals (RFP) determined to be most qualified for said project. The selected applicant will collaborate with BCMUD, its leadership team, or designated staff to develop and implement strategies that align with the organization's goals, values, and performance standards.

ORGANIZATIONAL OVERVIEW

Brushy Creek Municipal Utility District (BCMUD) is a local government entity originally established as Williamson County MUD No. 2 on October 27, 1977. The name was changed to Brushy Creek MUD on August 31, 1990. The District is governed by a five-member Board of Directors elected by residents of the District. BCMUD's primary functions include providing retail water, wastewater, waste disposal services, and drainage services, as well as managing parks, recreation facilities, and community programs.

The District operates with an annual budget of approximately **$28.8** million, maintaining a strong commitment to fiscal responsibility while providing competitive compensation to employees. Revenue sources primarily include property taxes, water and wastewater service fees, and recreation program fees. The District serves approximately 18,300 residents and employs approximately **80** full-time, **60** part-time, and **120** seasonal staff members.

2.0 QUALIFICATIONS & SCOPE OF SERVICES

2.1 General Qualifications:

Proposers must demonstrate substantial experience designing, implementing, hosting, and supporting modern, accessible websites for U.S.-based public sector and/or municipal organizations. The proposer must be able to offer an integrated, end-to-end solution encompassing CMS/platform configuration and any required development, information architecture, responsive design, content migration, accessibility, security, hosting, training, and ongoing support.

2.2 Organizational Qualifications and Experience:

The selected proposer must demonstrate the following qualifications:

- 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 is not a prerequisite;
- Proven experience delivering and maintaining WCAG 2.1 Level AA-conformant websites, supported by available Accessibility Conformance Reports (ACRs), completed Voluntary Product Accessibility Templates (VPATs), or equivalent evidence, with dedicated accessibility expertise on the project team. Product documentation does not replace project-specific verification;
- Ability to provide a complete solution through a single accountable provider, including CMS/platform, implementation, content migration, accessibility validation, hosting, training, launch support, and ongoing maintenance;
- Demonstrated expertise in information architecture, responsive design, task-based navigation, search, forms, interactive tools, and other features designed to improve resident and staff usability;
- Proven ability to conduct comprehensive content migrations, including content restructuring, redirect mapping, link validation, sitemap preservation, and search engine continuity;
- Experience providing secure, U.S.-based, managed cloud hosting with appropriate uptime commitments, backups, recovery procedures, monitoring, encryption, role-based access, multifactor authentication, and cybersecurity protections meeting the controls specified in Section 2.4 E;
- Ability to provide a maintainable and extensible platform with documented, standards-based integration capabilities supporting the identified District systems and future extensibility;
- Demonstrated ability to train non-technical government staff to independently manage website content and provide defined post-launch/hyper-care and ongoing technical support;
- Ability to monitor website availability, performance, and security and to provide scheduled accessibility testing, actionable alerts, and plain-language reporting under Sections 2.4 C and 2.4 E;
- Demonstrated eligibility and good standing to conduct business with Texas public-sector entities, including ability to meet the applicable legal requirements and the security, accessibility, and operational requirements expressly identified in this RFP.
- Provide company history, relevant public-sector project examples, proposed personnel and responsibilities, delivery capacity, and disclosed subcontractors or platform partners. Identify how the prime provider will remain accountable for all contracted services. Comparable experience may be demonstrated by a managed open-source implementer as well as a proprietary platform provider.

2.3 Work Location:

The selected Proposer will need to be available to assist applicable District staff via email, phone, or other remote channel when necessary.

2.4 Scope of Work:

The following requirements define the base scope for comparable proposals. All capabilities are required at launch or as an ongoing managed service unless expressly identified as an option in Section 2.4 G. Proposers shall include every component needed to meet a base requirement in the base price and identify exceptions expressly.

The selected provider will deliver a complete, modernized municipal website solution through an integrated delivery model in which a single prime provider is accountable for platform, implementation, content migration, accessibility validation, hosting, training, and support. The provider shall work with the Public Information Specialist and designated District staff throughout delivery. Disclosed subcontractors and platform partners are permitted, but the prime remains responsible for their performance.

A: CMS Operations and Content Governance

- Provide an accessible CMS that non-technical District staff can use to create, preview, review, approve, schedule, publish, update, archive, and restore content through governed workflows and reusable templates. Proprietary, software-as-a-service, and managed open-source solutions are eligible. A separated or headless architecture is not required;
- Provide desktop/mobile preview, reusable components, protected layouts, shared content and media, and structured metadata. Include configurable role-based approvals, governed navigation changes, named content owners, scheduled publication and expiration with notifications, version history and restoration, and an auditable publishing history;

B. Migration, Records, and MUD Content Fit

Perform a complete, verified migration of the content, including extraction, restructuring, metadata, documents and media, redirect mapping, link validation, and reconciliation before launch. Preserve utility-service information, recreation content, Board records, notices, and required public disclosures. No content may be retired or deleted without District approval.

The provider shall remediate the active webpages and structured web content selected for migration so that the migrated content conforms to WCAG 2.1 Level AA at launch. This responsibility includes page structure, headings, links, tables, images, forms, metadata and other elements migrated or configured by the provider.

Existing PDFs and other electronic documents shall be treated according to the District-approved migration and document-remediation inventory. The base implementation price shall include remediation or accessible HTML conversion of the priority quantities identified in the inventory. The provider shall identify assumptions, exclusions and unit rates for additional documents and for documents within each defined complexity band.

Content that cannot reasonably be remediated within the agreed migration approach shall be identified for District review. The provider shall recommend whether the content should be converted to HTML, separately remediated, replaced, removed or evaluated by the District for treatment under an applicable exception. The provider shall not retire content or assume that an exception applies without District approval.

Base pricing shall cover the same District-issued quantities and treatment assumptions for all proposers. Proposers shall state District responsibilities and unit prices for excess quantities, including document complexity bands. The District will confirm the final baseline and any material corrections through an addendum before proposals are due.

Preserve plain-language URLs where practicable, search metadata, and a maintained sitemap. Validate all internal links and redirects against the District-approved inventory; all shall resolve except approved

retirements. Report failures at external destinations separately and identify any provider-controlled handoff defects.

C. Accessibility and Sustainability

Deliver and sustain WCAG 2.1 Level AA conformance for the implemented website, including in-scope pages, forms, components, and documents. Conformance is required at launch and must not be deferred to the applicable ADA Title II compliance deadline. Independent pre-launch verification and post-launch testing are required; vendor self-declaration alone is insufficient. The following are minimum requirements, not a substitute for the full standard:

- Full keyboard operability with visible focus and no keyboard traps;
- Skip links, landmark regions, and a logical heading structure enforced by the authoring tool;
- Enforced alternative-text entry or explicit decorative-image designation, as appropriate, and programmatically associated form labels at authoring time;
- Applicable WCAG contrast requirements, including at least 4.5:1 for normal text, 3:1 for large text, and 3:1 for relevant non-text interface components and graphical objects;
- Remediation of high-traffic and transaction-critical PDFs/documents to WCAG 2.1 AA, or converting them to accessible web pages based on a prioritized inventory assessment;
- Manage accessible document archiving, expiration, and redirects to preserve link integrity;
- Enforced accessibility checks and required metadata at upload;
- A pre-publication gate that prevents publication with unresolved critical issues detectable by the configured authoring checks, together with a staff-facing dashboard or equivalent report showing post-launch findings and remediation status; and
- A maintained public accessibility statement with an issue-reporting mechanism.

The provider shall submit a completed WCAG 2.1 Level AA conformance checklist mapping each applicable success criterion to how the delivered website satisfies it, identifying the testing method and any exceptions with remediation plans. The checklist supplements, and does not replace, independent pre-launch verification.

The provider may offer an accessibility interface or widget (for example, user-adjustable contrast, text sizing, or navigation aids). Any such tool shall not be represented as, or relied upon as, a substitute for native WCAG 2.1 AA conformance of the underlying site, and shall itself be keyboard- and screen-reader-accessible.

The provider shall conduct automated and manual accessibility testing throughout implementation. Testing shall cover representative templates, navigation, critical resident journeys, forms, provider-migrated content, priority documents, keyboard operation, screen-reader interaction and relevant mobile use. The provider shall submit its test plan, findings, remediation records and retest results as acceptance evidence.

The District may conduct or commission independent accessibility testing before acceptance. The provider shall provide reasonable access, test environments, documentation and cooperation for such testing. The provider shall correct and retest, without additional charge, accessibility defects attributable to the platform, templates, components, configuration, integrations, provider-created content, provider-performed migration or provider updates. The District shall arrange and separately fund its independent verifier unless otherwise stated in the final agreement.

After launch, the provider shall describe the automated monitoring, manual review, assistive-technology testing, reporting and remediation services available through the proposed platform or its partners. The response shall identify the frequency, coverage, exclusions, responsibilities and one-time or recurring charges. The provider shall support

District-directed testing following material changes to templates, navigation or major functionality and shall correct provider-caused defects without additional charge.

The provider shall include severity-based response and remediation commitments and clearly allocate responsibility among provider-controlled functionality, provider-migrated content, provider-created content, District-authored content and third-party systems. The District is responsible for the accessibility of content and documents created or uploaded by District personnel, except to the extent that review or remediation is included in a contracted allowance or managed service. The provider shall state any included allowance and unit rates for reviewing or remediating newly added District content and documents. Any proposed treatment of legacy or archived content shall be identified for District review and shall not be assumed to qualify for an exception solely because the content is labeled or stored as archived.

D. Resident Experience and Functionality

Deliver the following base resident-facing capabilities as usable outcomes rather than prescribed technologies:

- Task-based navigation reaching District-identified key services within three steps of the homepage;
- Hybrid navigation combining task-based and department-based entry points in one structure;
- Prominent quick-actions hub for the most frequently sought-after user tasks;
- An accessible map-based location finder for parks, facilities, and service points, with equivalent text/list access to location information;
- A fully responsive design that supports the same essential tasks across phones, tablets, and desktop computers;
- A live, filterable community events calendar with automatic listing and expiration capabilities;
- Intelligent site search with real-time suggestions, plain language handling, and results by content type;
- Structured metadata tagging driving relevance-ranked search results;
- Helpful no-results experience offering related topics and contact pathways;
- Accessible forms with conditional fields, inline validation, and auto-save appropriate to the data being collected, with disclosed privacy and retention controls;
- Immediate submission confirmation and administrator-configurable departmental routing;
- Clear entry points and pre-transition messaging for existing utility payments, recreation registration, and records services; replacement of those business systems is excluded unless expressly listed in the integration register;
- Documented, standards-based integration capabilities for connections, with a version-managed integration approach and disclosed authentication, maintenance, and third-party dependencies; and
- Resident interaction analytics available to staff through a non-technical reporting interface.

For each connection, the District shall identify the required behavior, existing access/licensing, data involved, and responsible third party before release. Proposers shall describe the proposed method, testing, ongoing maintenance, security, and all one-time and recurring costs. For future integrations not identified in the base integration register, proposers shall describe the platform's integration capabilities and any applicable implementation approach, assumptions, and pricing.

E. Reliability, Security, and Support

Meet the following operational requirements and provide measurable service commitments and supporting evidence:

- Provide a maintainable, extensible platform with documented configuration and integrations, controlled upgrades, and disclosed licensing, plugin/module, hosting, and third-party support dependencies;
- Provide site-wide encryption in transit, encryption of stored sensitive District data, standard web protections, role-based access, multifactor staff authentication, and a secure, auditable activity log with access controls and detection of unauthorized alteration;
- Provide managed cloud hosting with all District data, including backups, resident in the United States; capacity to absorb peak-demand traffic; and planned low-disruption updates;
- Provide contractual uptime and incident-response commitments, defined recovery time and recovery point objectives, and scheduled, tested backup restoration. Specify measurement, exclusions, escalation, reporting, and remedies;
- Fast, resilient page delivery validated against real-world benchmarks, with automatic absorption of peak-demand traffic;
- Provide continuous availability and security monitoring, performance monitoring, actionable alerts, and monthly plain-language reporting. Accessibility testing and reporting shall follow Section 2.4 C;
- Provide a named support contact, standard support hours, an emergency escalation path for critical outages/security events, severity definitions, acknowledgment and restoration targets, incident notification commitments, and included support limits. Disclose exclusions and overage charges. Maintain responsibility for coordination with all hosting, platform, and subcontracted providers.

Service Measure	Proposed District Minimum for Confirmation
Hosting availability	99.9% per calendar month; disclose measurement and planned-maintenance exclusions
Critical support	24/7 critical-incident reporting; initial response within 1 hour
Routine support	8 a.m.–5 p.m. Central Time on District business days; initial response within 1 business day
Backup and recovery	Daily backups; recovery point within 24 hours; recovery time within 8 hours; quarterly restore test
Security notification	Notify District without undue delay and within 24 hours of confirmed compromise affecting District systems/data
Accessibility remediation	Critical barrier: response within 1 business day; workaround within 2; correction within 10. Other defects: severity-based plan and completion targets

Proposers shall confirm each minimum or identify a specific exception, propose any stronger commitment, and explain the monitoring and remedies. Final service levels will be incorporated in the agreement. An approved temporary workaround does not remove the obligation to correct a defect.

F. Implementation, Training, and Acceptance

Deliver the following through a structured implementation methodology on a schedule confirmed at contract award. The District anticipates approximately six months from initiation to launch, subject to the proposed methodology and identified District dependencies:

- Confirmed scope, sitemap, design direction, and implementation schedule;
- Responsive, accessible website built on the provider platform with District branding;

- Verified transfer of resident-accessible content with redirects and link validation;
- Provider accessibility test results and successful completion of any District-directed independent accessibility verification required before going live;
- Role-based training, recordings or reusable training materials, and administrator documentation enabling non-technical staff to manage the site independently;
- Production launch following written District authorization, a 60-day post-launch hypercare period, correction of provider-caused defects without additional charge, and transition to ongoing managed support.

Each major deliverable requires written acceptance by the District's designated project owner, with specialist review as needed. Within 10 business days after a complete submission, the District will accept the deliverable or identify deficiencies against agreed requirements. The provider shall supply a correction plan within five business days, correct provider-caused deficiencies at no additional charge, and resubmit for review and retesting. Silence or production use does not constitute acceptance.

Milestone	Required Acceptance Evidence
Planning and design	Approved requirements, sitemap, inventory, designs, schedule, and responsibility matrix
Configuration and migration	Requirements demonstration, inventory reconciliation, redirect report, and link results
Accessibility and hosting	Provider test results; any District-directed independent report; evidence of correction and retesting of provider-responsible defects; security controls and backup/restore evidence
Training and launch	Training/materials, user acceptance results, open-issue register, cutover and rollback plan
Hypercare completion	Launch-defect resolution, remaining approved issues, and managed-support handover

Production launch requires written District authorization. Unresolved critical defects preventing essential resident tasks, failure to complete required accessibility verification, or failed recovery testing shall block launch. The provider is responsible for correcting provider-caused defects; the District shall determine the treatment and timing of District-authored content issues. The District must approve any remaining issue and its correction date in writing; an approved issue does not waive the underlying requirement. Proposers shall align milestone invoices with accepted deliverables. Hypercare ends only after agreed launch defects are resolved and the District approves the support handover.

Proposers may recommend alternatives or enhancements, but shall submit a fully priced base response to the published requirements and identify every exception separately. An alternative must not obscure the cost or compliance of the base solution.

G. Separately Priced Options

The following are options, not mandatory base launch requirements: (1) a structured resident request/case-management channel with reference numbers, routing, acknowledgments, and status tracking; (2) an accessible AI assistant using published District content with source links and human handoff; and (3) additional integrations or content/document work beyond the published baselines. A new open-records case-management portal, if offered, is also an option; the required public records archive remains in the base scope.

Price each option separately with implementation cost, annual charges, usage limits, dependencies, accessibility, data handling, maintenance, and staff responsibilities. For an AI option, describe controls for inaccurate responses,

approved content sources, resident-data retention, and use of data for model training. Optional capabilities do not affect responsiveness or scored evaluation and are excluded from the evaluated base price unless the District changes that treatment by a pre-deadline addendum.

H. Ownership, Portability, and Transition

The District retains ownership of its content, documents, images, metadata, submissions, and other District-provided or District-generated data, and control of its domains and District-specific analytics accounts. Identify separately the ownership and license terms for provider platform software, templates, configurations, custom code, and third-party components. Disclose any proprietary dependency that limits reuse or migration.

During the term and at expiration or termination, provide a complete export of District content and data in documented, commonly usable formats, including relevant relationships, metadata, media, redirects, form data, and configuration documentation. This does not require transfer of a provider's underlying proprietary platform intellectual property. Disclose export limits and all export and transition charges in the proposal.

Include the required end-of-term export, export verification, documentation, and District-controlled credential/account handover in the base price. Separately price optional extended assistance with a successor provider's migration and any continued hosting/access beyond the paid service term. Do not delete District data until the District authorizes deletion after confirmed transfer, subject to applicable retention obligations and legal holds. Identify backup-deletion timing and provide written confirmation of completed deletion.

The District welcomes creative suggestions to meet the District's website needs. Submittals may include additional suggestions to the scope of work.

The selected firm will collaborate with the BCMUD Board, its leadership team, and/or designated staff to develop and implement strategies that align with the organization's goals, values, and performance standards.

2.5 Implementation Schedule and Service Term:

The District anticipates approximately six months for implementation after contract execution, followed by an initial three-year managed-service term beginning at production launch, with two one-year renewal options exercisable by the District. Proposers shall identify staffing availability, milestones, District dependencies, cutover/rollback, and schedule risks. Pricing shall cover implementation plus 60 months of post-launch managed services as specified in Section 3.4 H; the five-year comparison does not guarantee exercise of renewal options.

3.0 PROPOSAL PROCESS AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

3.1 Proposal must address the requirements set out in this RFP.

3.2 The current schedule is as follows:

(a)	Advertise RFP	10/13, 2026
(b)	**Proposal Due Date**	11/13, 2026 @ 2:00 pm
(c)	Review of Proposals	11/25, 2026
(d)	Interviews (if needed)	12/14-18, 2026

(e) Approval of Agreement 2/11, 2027

The District reserves the right in its sole discretion to alter or modify the current schedule set out above as necessary and will notify known Proposers of any changes.

3.3 It is the Proposer's sole responsibility to ensure that its Proposal is received by the District by the Due Date. Proposals received after the Due Date will be rejected and returned unopened.

3.4 Proposal Contents

Cover letter identifying the Proposer(s), the size of the firm, and location of the office from which the work will be conducted.

Use the eight detailed response headings below. Sections 3.4 B through E are the four separately scored subcriteria within the 40-point Ability to Support the Scope of Work category. The other headings map to the remaining four primary evaluation categories. Cross-reference the cited requirements and identify included base capabilities, configuration/custom development, options, exceptions, supporting evidence, dependencies, and responsible providers. An option cannot substitute for an unfulfilled mandatory requirement.

A. Organizational Qualifications and Experience

Respond to Sections 2.1 and 2.2. Describe firm qualifications, relevant experience, company credibility and delivery capacity, proposed team, and prime/subcontractor responsibilities. Include the delivery methodology, staffing availability, schedule, dependencies, and risk management for Sections 2.4 F and 2.5.

Provide relevant public-sector clients and comparable projects in progress, or which have been completed or supported during the past five years, including scope, scale, dates, platform, and your actual role.

Provide a list of each team member who may provide services under this request, along with their anticipated role and a description of responsibilities.

Disclose any potential conflicts of interest that may arise in the performance of these services by you or any member of your team.

B. Resident Experience and Functionality

Respond to Section 2.4 D with an explanation and evidence for navigation, mobile use, maps, events, search, forms, service handoffs, integration methods, and analytics. Describe how key resident tasks will be tested. Identify the base integration approach and all dependencies.

C. CMS Operations and Content Governance

Respond to Section 2.4 A with staff authoring/preview examples, templates, workflow and permission configuration, scheduling/expiration, version restoration, shared content/media, records publishing, and administrator usability. Explain ownership, export, and transition capabilities under Section 2.4 H.

D. Accessibility and Sustainability

Respond to Section 2.4 C with product documentation or equivalent evidence, the provider's implementation testing plan, testing coverage and tools, defect correction and retesting procedures, and the proposed allocation of responsibility for platform features, migrated content, provider-created content, District-authored content and third-party systems.

Describe and separately price available post-launch automated monitoring, manual review, assistive-technology testing, reporting and remediation services. Identify all included and optional accessibility costs in Section 3.4 H.

E. Migration, Records, and MUD Content Fit

Respond to Section 2.4 B with a migration plan tied to the common inventory. Distinguish the treatment of active webpages, structured content, PDFs and other electronic documents. Confirm responsibility for accessibility remediation of provider-migrated webpages and identify the priority-document quantities included in the base price.

Describe document-treatment assumptions, complexity bands, redirects, link validation, reconciliation, District responsibilities and unit rates for excess quantities or additional document remediation. Explain continuity for utility and recreation information.

F. Reliability, Security, and Support

Respond to Section 2.4 E with hosting/data locations, control evidence, uptime measurement, backups/restore tests, recovery objectives, incident notification, monitoring/reporting, support coverage, escalation, remedies, limits, and exceptions. Provide the hypercare and operational handover approach required by Section 2.4 F.

G. Illustrative Websites and References

Provide at least three comparable live websites and three client references, identifying your role and the features relevant to BCMUD. Provide reference contact details and project dates. Describe evidence of delivered usability, staff maintainability, migration quality, accessibility practices, support, and delivery performance. Visual appearance alone is insufficient; distinguish this delivered-performance evidence from company/team qualifications.

H. Cost of Services

Provide a complete cost matrix showing one-time implementation and annual recurring charges for each of Years 1–5, where Year 1 begins at production launch. The evaluated total is implementation plus 60 months of base managed services and the required end-of-term export. Every component needed to meet a mandatory requirement belongs in this base price. State prices in U.S. dollars, identify all fees and any applicable taxes, and avoid double counting bundled items.

Base Cost Component	One-time	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Discovery, design, CMS/configuration	[$]	—	—	—	—	—
Migration and included connections	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]
Implementation accessibility testing and correction of provider-responsible defects	[$]	—	—	—	—	—
Priority existing-document remediation or HTML conversion	[$]	—	—	—	—	—
Licenses, hosting, security and monitoring	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]
Training, launch, hypercare and support	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]
Required end-of-term export and handover	—	—	—	—	—	[$]
Other mandatory costs and fees	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]	[$]
Total by column	**[$]**	**[$]**	**[$]**	**[$]**	**[$]**	**[$]**

State the evaluated five-year base total as the sum of the table totals. Use $0 or “included in [line]” where appropriate. Disclose assumed users, traffic, storage, submissions, support hours, third-party charges, and overage unit rates.

Include contractual annual increases in the year-by-year totals and identify any proposed cap/index; do not leave escalation unpriced.

Provide separate schedules for each option in Section 2.4 G, excess migration/document units, authorized additional-work rates, optional redesign/content development, and transition assistance or early-termination charges. Base prices shall include required training, support, security, domain setup, hosting, implementation, migration, maintenance, provider implementation accessibility testing, correction of provider-responsible defects and the defined priority-document remediation quantities. Any travel or other expenses must be expressly stated. Provide the complete cost matrix for each alternative plan, identifying one compliant base offer for evaluation.

4.0 EVALUATION PROCESS AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Responsive proposals will be evaluated under five primary categories totaling 100 points. Ability to Support the Scope of Work is a 40-point subtotal made up of four separately scored 10-point subcriteria, not an additional or holistic 40-point score. For this category, scope means the resident, CMS, accessibility, and migration requirements identified below; reliability, security, and support are scored separately. The same published criteria and weights apply to all proposers.

Evaluation Category or Subcriterion	Points	Response and Requirements
Organizational Qualifications and Experience	20	3.4 A; 2.1–2.2, 2.4 F, 2.5
Ability to Support the Scope of Work	**40 subtotal**	Sum of the four 10-point subcriteria below
Resident Experience and Functionality	10 of 40	3.4 B; 2.4 D
CMS Operations and Content Governance	10 of 40	3.4 C; 2.4 A and H
Accessibility and Sustainability	10 of 40	3.4 D; 2.4 C
Migration, Records, and MUD Content Fit	10 of 40	3.4 E; 2.4 B
Reliability, Security, and Support	15	3.4 F; 2.4 E and operational handover in F
Illustrative Websites and References	15	3.4 G; verified delivered performance
Cost of Services	10	3.4 H; evaluated five-year base total
Total	**100**	Count the 40-point subtotal once

Proposals must first pass a mandatory-responsiveness screen. Evaluators will score each category using common 0–5 anchors, average evaluator scores, and apply a transparent price formula for Cost of Services. Proposers may be invited to an interview or demonstration with the selection committee. The final selection will be based on the District's determination of the proposer most advantageous to the District.

> If the District selects a Proposal, it may enter into negotiations for a website provider services agreement. Such negotiations may include changes to the requirements and basis on which the proposals are evaluated. The District will communicate such changes promptly in writing to the proposer and will provide reasonable time accommodation in accordance with the scope of changes proposed. Material pre-deadline changes will be issued by addendum, and the published evaluation basis will be preserved after receipt of proposals. If the District and proposer do not reach an agreement, the District will select the next most advantageous proposer.

5.0 NATURE OF THIS DOCUMENT

5.1 This RFP is solely a request for proposals. It is not an invitation for tenders, an offer of contract, or an invitation for offers capable of acceptance to create a contract. No contractual or other legal obligations or relations between the District or any other person can or will be created except by a written contract executed by the General Manager or Board of Directors.

5.2 Proposers are cautioned that a Proposal or part of a Proposal may be made public or otherwise disclosed by the District if the District elects to do so or is required to do so by law.

5.3 The District reserves the right to accept or reject any submitted Proposals and to waive any informalities or irregularities in said submittals. The RFP does not bind the District to accept a submittal when, in the District's sole discretion, the District determines not to do so. Additionally, the District reserves the right to modify the schedule as necessary and will notify those participating in the RFP of any changes.

5.4 The District reserves the right in its sole discretion to alter those criteria or requirements in the course of negotiations with any Proposer.

5.5 The District operates under the public disclosure laws, as part of normal procedures. Proprietary information must be identified. The District will advise proposers in the event of receipt of a request for any such proprietary information.

5.6 Failure to conform to the requirements of this RFP may lead to the rejection of a Proposal.

- THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY BLANK -