

**Council of San Benito County Governments and San Benito County
Local Transportation Authority Website Redesign**

Request for Proposals #2027-02

Addendum No. 2

Issue Date: August 21, 2026

Any information contained herein will be considered part of the Request for Proposals #2027-02 (RFP) and as such will be used in the evaluation of the responses. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged. In the event of a conflict between any provision of this Addendum and the RFP, this Addendum shall prevail.

This Addendum is intended to provide answers to questions received regarding the RFP, additional information, and/or to change the requirements as stated in the RFP.

ADDENDUM NO. 2 TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. CHANGES TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS SCHEDULE
- II. VOLUNTARY Q&A SESSION RECORDING LINK
- III. SBCOG/LTA RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY POTENTIAL PROPOSERS

I. CHANGES TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS SCHEDULE

The RFP schedule is hereby amended to the following:

Activity	Date
Release RFP online at: www.sanbenitocog.org	July 24, 2026
Deadline for Written Questions	August 10, 2026
Responses to Questions Posted	August 14, 2026
Deadline for Proposals	August 31, 2026 at 1:00pm, PDT
Proposal Evaluation	September 1-7, 2026
Interviews & Demo (if needed)	September 14, 2026
Notice of Intent to Award	September 18, 2026
Approximate Contract Execution	September 25, 2026
Project Kickoff	October 2026

All proposals must be submitted no later than the revised deadline of **August 31, 2026, at 1:00 PM Pacific Time**. Proposals received after the revised deadline will be considered late and will be handled in accordance with the requirements of the RFP.

II. VOLUNTARY Q&A SESSION RECORDING LINK

The recording of the virtual Q&A session is also available [here](#).

III. SBCOG/LTA RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY POTENTIAL PROPOSERS

Theme 1: Scope, Purpose, and Architecture

- **Multi-Domain Redesign vs. Evaluation Scope:** Vendors asked if all five domains are actively in scope for full design overhauls or just high-level consulting.

Answer: The ultimate goal is to have 2 separate, independent, and standalone websites. Sanbenitocog.org for the COG and a separate website (SanBenitoLTA-currently not in existence) for LTA.

Information contained in all five domains (sanbenitocog.org, sanbenitocountyexpress.org, gocountyexpress.org, hwy25.org, and sanbenitorideshare.org) are explicitly in the scope for discovery.

The consultant is tasked with evaluating the current structure and recommends the most effective way on architecture, consolidation, and administrative efficiency to achieve the goal.

- **Relationship and Navigation Between Agencies:** Vendors asked how separate or interconnected SBCOG and LTA should appear to the public.

Answer: SBCOG (Regional Transportation Planning Agency/Council of Governments) and LTA (Transit Agency) serve distinct audiences and functions. However, proposers are expected to

provide recommendations to better connect the websites through shared design templates, unified information architecture.

To ensure cross-site intuition and brand cohesion, both websites must share an identical structural organization, page layout logic, main navigation system, and user flow patterns. Once a user becomes familiar with the layout and navigation of one site, they should be able to intuitively navigate the other.

However, from a technical and branding perspective they might remain completely independent and stand alone. The two sites should be cross-linked for easy navigation between the two sites. The vendor must deliver independent content management, distinct branding, including logos and imagery tailored to its respective audience, and isolated databases and environments.

- **Out-of-Scope Modules & Future Phases:** The RFP notes a desire for a "scalable platform that can accommodate future needs" but fails to define what features are explicitly considered "Phase 2" or out-of-scope for this initial launch (e.g., citizen portals, online application processing, real-time interactive mapping tools).

Answer: For the immediate Phase 1 launch, advanced transaction portals or customized internal agency intranets are out of scope. Scoring is 100% restricted to the Base Scope.

What is evaluated (Base Scope):

- Proposal on delivering the two (2) modern and clean websites as specified above.
- Integration of robust security and privacy features.
- ADA compliance
- Approach on how technical architecture inherently supports future add-on integration. It must prove capable of supporting future integrations such as online public application forms, interactive GIS map overlays, public meeting agenda-management software, GTFS feeds, and digital payment gateways—without requiring a core framework overhaul.

Cost Proposal: All costs for optional add-ons must be listed on a separate line-item. They must not be bundled into core base price.

Theme 2: CMS, Technology, and Technical Integrations

- **On-Site Training Requirements:** Vendors asked if training could be conducted virtually to reduce travel costs.

Answer: Yes, training can be virtual.

- **CMS and Tech Stack Preferences:** The RFP lists high-level goals like "simplify content management" but does not indicate if the IT department prefers a specific environment (e.g., Linux/PHP-based open-source systems like WordPress/Drupal versus Windows/.NET frameworks like Umbraco/Sitefinity).

Answer: SBCOG and LTA do not mandate a specific brand of CMS and are open to considering both open-source platforms (e.g., WordPress, Drupal) and commercial enterprise solutions. The platform selection will be evaluated based on its ease of administrative use for non-technical staff, native security standards, long-term stability, and total cost of ownership.

- **Specialized Transit and Agenda Integrations:** The RFP mentions that the sites provide different tools but omits listing exactly what third-party public transit tools, GTFS (General Transit Feed Specification) data streams, real-time bus tracking maps, interactive GIS maps, or municipal agenda-management platforms (e.g., Granicus, PrimeGov) must be integrated.

Answer: Currently there are no third-party transit tools being used. However, for the purposes of scoring, review the **Out-of-Scope Modules & Future Phases** section above.

- **User Roles & Permissions:** The RFP requests simplified administration but fails to provide the number of staff content managers or details if complex, multi-tiered editorial approval workflows are required.

Answer: Proposers should design the system architecture to comfortably support approximately 3-5 administrative staff users. The CMS must feature customizable user roles, allowing the agency to establish distinct permission tiers (e.g., Super Administrators, content Editors, and basic Authors) with clean content-approval workflows.

Theme 3: Discovery and User Experience (UX)

- **Target Audiences and Public Usability:** Vendors asked who they are primarily designing the new website for.

Answer: Section 1 explicitly divides the primary target audiences into two main camps based on the agency missions: SBCOG focuses on regional transportation planning, policy, and funding stakeholders, while the LTA serves daily transit riders, commuters, and the general public seeking route schedules and transit information.

- **Stakeholder Engagement Efforts.** The RFP asks for a detailed discovery approach but gives no indication of how many agency staff members or external stakeholders must be accommodated in workshops, interviews, and sign-off cycles.

Answer: Proposers should scale their discovery phase to include interactive workshops and structured interviews with approximately 3-5 stakeholders, including agency management staff and other website stakeholders. Proposers are expected to outline a clear process for gathering and synthesizing this input within their response framework.

- **Availability of Historical Research & Analytics:** The RFP does not specify if the agency possesses current user research, public survey data, community feedback reports, or comprehensive web analytics (device usage, top exit pages, site search queries) to hand over to the vendor.

Answer: We have very limited data. However, the vendor is expected to conduct independent baseline usability audits and public journey mapping exercises as a core component of the discovery phase.

- **Current Pain Points:** The RFP lists high-level operational goals but does not pinpoint the exact structural issues, common complaints, or navigation bottlenecks reported by agency staff or the public who rely on the website information for SBCOG and LTA.

Answer: The goals in the RFP do include website issues that need to be corrected or improved. Moreover, the RFP explains that the selected consultant will be required to uncover these specific issues by a four-step process: review existing content, conduct stakeholder interviews, evaluate user experience, and evaluate the existing domain structure.

Theme 4: Content Strategy and Migration

- **Public Meeting Agendas & Materials:** Vendors asked if meeting materials are a focus area.

Answer: Yes. Section 2.4 mandates that the proposal includes a comprehensive approach to handling core public transparency documents, specifically listing board agendas, meeting minutes, public reports, transit studies, and regional transportation plans within the scope of

work. Meeting materials and handling board agenda need to be part of both COG and LTA websites.

- **Content Inventory & Migration Volume:** The RFP provides no page counts, digital asset counts, or metric on the size of the legacy PDF document libraries.

Answer: While a final page-by-page content inventory will be a primary deliverable of the discovery audit, proposers should provide a per unit cost for migration of documents. SBCOG will identify content inventory to be migrated.

- **Migration Boundaries & Copywriting Split:** The RFP does not clarify who does the heavy lifting for content updates.

Answer: The selected consultant will be responsible for designing the migration framework, mapping the old URLs to the new architecture, and migrating all core programmatic pages. SBCOG and LTA staff will assist in identifying files that need to be migrated, archiving outdated legacy files and will take primary responsibility for copy editing and writing new content within the vendor's new templates.

- **Multilingual Content Workflows:** The RFP mentions serving diverse audiences and completely omits specific technical requirements for Spanish-language localization, manual translation interfaces, or multi-language publishing workflows.

Answer: Providing accessible information to San Benito County's Spanish-speaking demographic is a critical priority. The proposed CMS must natively support multilingual content management. Proposers should detail their recommended approach—whether via manual multi-language text entry, dedicated translation modules, or high-fidelity hybrid automated translation services—including any impacts on the long-term administrative workflow.

Theme 5: Compliance, Design, and Post-Launch Services

- **Accessibility Requirements:** Vendors asked what legal benchmarks they must build toward.

Answer: The project mandates strict compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and current web accessibility standards (Section 1). Section 2.4 reinforces this by requiring a robust quality-assurance process, including manual WCAG-focused checks and comprehensive testing across navigation, forms, search features, and public-information journeys.

- **Post-Launch Maintenance and Support:** Vendors asked if ongoing support should be factored into the main build cost.

Answer: Yes. Section 2.4 explicitly notes that the cost proposal must account for both the one-time development costs and the ongoing, post-launch website maintenance, hosting infrastructure, and support services.

- **Explicit WCAG Target Tiers:** The RFP mentions "current web accessibility standards" but does not explicitly name the specific legal target tier (e.g., WCAG 2.1 Level AA versus the newer WCAG 2.2 Level AA).

Answer: The redesigned web properties must be designed, developed, and verified to meet **WCAG 2.1 Level AA** compliance standards at a minimum. Proposers must outline their automated and manual accessibility testing protocols within their technical response.

- **Document Archive Remediation:** The RFP does not clarify if the vendor is expected to manually remediate thousands of legacy, non-compliant PDFs currently living in the agenda archives, or if the accessibility mandate applies strictly to new web pages and newly uploaded files.

Answer: The vendor is expected to provide recommendations on managing legacy file compliance. The scope of work requires that all new web templates, core programmatic pages, and newly published documents be fully accessible. Based on the recommendation, SBCOG and LTA Staff will decide on the approach and if it will be a possible consideration as an on-add to the vendors scope of work.

- **Branding & Visual Identity Guidelines:** The RFP states a desire for "modernized visual design" but does not specify if rigid brand guidelines, strict color codes, and preset logo configurations currently exist, or if the agency welcomes a complete creative visual identity refresh.

Answer: The agency possesses baseline logo assets and foundational color palettes. While the selected consultant must respect core agency identity marks, the agency is entirely open to modern, creative branding and visual design recommendations that improve digital readability, layout structure, and overall mobile user experience.

Theme 6: Vendor Qualifications, Logistics, and Budget

- **Permissibility of Subcontractors:** Vendors asked if independent specialists or niche agencies can join a prime contractor's team.

Answer: Yes. Section 2.4 explicitly permits the use of subcontractors, stating that a responsive proposal must include a complete list of all subcontractors to be utilized along with an overview of their specific technical expertise.

- **Proposal Formatting, Font, and Page Limits:** Bidders asked about strict response layout constraints.

Answer: Section 2.4 sets rigid parameters: proposals are limited to a maximum length of **30 pages** using a minimum **12-point font size**. This page ceiling strictly excludes the cost proposal sheet, formal certification forms, or clear appendices. Pages submitted beyond this limit will not be evaluated.

- **Insurance Requirements:** Bidders asked which vehicle insurance coverage requirement applies: \$500,000, as stated on page 11 of the RFP, or \$1,000,000, as stated on page 16.

Answer: The correct amount is \$1,000,000.

- **Mandatory Proposal Response Components:** Bidders asked for a checklist of mandatory items.

Answer: Per Section 2.4, a responsive submittal must include: a cover letter, a firm description, team experience summaries, an organizational chart with individual qualifications, a detailed Section 3 Scope of Work approach, a subcontractor list, client references with contacts, a milestone schedule, an itemized cost proposal (inclusive of on-site training), and sample images of comparable past web builds.

- **Procurement Points of Contact & Communication Rules:** Bidders asked who they can call or email for clarifications.

Answer: Sections 2.4 and 2.5 establish **Norma Aceves** (projects@sanbenitocog.org) as the exclusive Point of Contact. Directing questions to any other agency employee or board member is strictly prohibited and can result in the immediate disqualification of the vendor.

- **Key Project Milestones & Procurement Schedule:** Bidders asked for critical target dates.

Answer: Please see above section I. CHANGES TO THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS SCHEDULE

- **Geographic Bidding Restrictions & Local Weighting:** The submitted questions note that the RFP highlights "local representation as desirable" but the RFP does not detail exactly how local

presence is weighted during scoring, or if national/international remote firms are at a systematic scoring disadvantage.

Answer: When all other factors are determined to be equal, preference shall be given to individuals or firms having a bona-fide place of business within the County of San Benito. Any responsive, responsible bid, proposal or quote for materials and supplies from a local business which is within the percent (10%) of the lowest responsive, responsible bid, proposal or quote for materials and supplies shall be considered equal to the amount of the lowest responsive, responsible bid, proposal or quote. If the business has additional places of business located outside of the County of San Benito, the designated point of sale for all resulting purchases shall be the bona-fide place of business located within the County of San Benito.

- **Anticipated Project Budget Range:** The RFP requests a comprehensive cost proposal but fails to disclose an estimated budget or funding range, which makes it difficult for vendors to know if they should propose a mid-market open-source build or an enterprise-tier commercial infrastructure.

Answer: Proposers are encouraged to submit cost proposals that reflect realistic, efficient, and market-competitive pricing for a comprehensive public-sector web overhaul of this scale for the services in the above **Out-of-Scope Modules & Future Phases Base Scope**. Funding for the base scope is already budgeted. Add-on tasks will be budgeted on a need basis subject to availability of funding.

- **Networking Channels for Subcontractors:** Subcontractors asked if a public "Interested Vendors List" or networking channel exists to help them partner with larger prime contractors.

Answer: SBCOG does not host an active vendor-matching portal or networking channel for subcontractors for this specific RFP. Subcontractors are encouraged to form their own independent partnerships and submit a unified team response under a designated prime consultant, as detailed in Section 2.

END OF ADDENDUM NO. 2