



OFFICE OF THE PURCHASING AGENT
TOWN OF ARLINGTON
730 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE
ARLINGTON, MA 02476

Telephone (781) 316-3003
Fax (781) 316-3019

DATE: January 11, 2013

TO ALL BIDDERS

BID NO. 12-52
SUBJECT: Town Website

ADDENDUM NO. 1

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

With reference to the bid request relative to the above subject, please note the following:

Questions from prospective proposers and answers from the Town of Arlington are included here. The Questions are generally assembled by the vendor submissions, except where similar questions have been asked. Those questions have been compiled together. It is incumbent on all prospective Proposers to review the entire addendum for additional details and clarifications to the RFP that these questions have brought up. We look forward to your proposal, which are due no later than 4PM on Tuesday, January 22nd. Please see Submission Requirements (Section IV) of RFP 12-52 for submission details.

BIDDER MUST ACKNOWLEDGE ADDENDUM WITH SUBMISSION

All other terms, conditions and specifications remain unchanged.

Very truly yours,

Town of Arlington

Domenic R. Lanzillotti

Purchasing Officer

Addendum 12-52, Town of Arlington Website

Q: Is there a budget for this project?

Q: Please confirm the cost of project needs proposed need to be based only on the "Core components" or also considering the "Components for New/Consolidated Services" and "Future Development/Opportunities"

Q: What is the amount budgeted for initial site strategy, IA, design, development and launch? (The FY2013 budget has a \$20,000 "CMS upgrade" line item. What beyond this is budgeted/available?)

Q: Is there a specific budget set aside for this project? How much is it?

Q: What is the amount budgeted for 2013-14 hosting and support?

A: Currently, there is \$20,000 budgeted for design, development, and migration (one-time cost). Our current budget for annual hosting/security/support is \$6,695. We recognize that this RFP includes a lot of requirements in our core components. However, there are many ways these services can be obtained (off the shelf, customized off the shelf, and fully custom solutions – proprietary and open-source). Because of this, we anticipate a range of cost proposals and rely on the Proposer to provide accurate estimates for the work they propose for the core components, and if Proposer so chooses, future features, detailed in their Plan of Service/Technical Proposal (non-price proposal/Appendix D). Any price break outs from the core components, should be kept separate and detailed in the Price Submission Form (Appendix C).

The Website Evaluation Committee is focused on identifying the best solution that meets the goals outlined in this RFP and if additional funds are necessary, features compelling, and costs justified, the Town will seek to invest additional funds.

Q: Can we submit our proposal via email or are hardcopies only accepted? Please advise.

Q: If hardcopies are accepted how many copies did you need?

A: Hard copies, no email. Please see Section IV, point 8 (p. 12 of the RFP)

Q: What does "CD" mean in the context of this sentence: "When submitting a proposal, the Proposer shall submit one signed original and three copies of the technical as well as a CD."

A: Compact Disc, though DVD, or thumb drive is acceptable. Electronic submissions and similar over network delivery (email) are not acceptable as they are not considered "closed bids."

Q: Will vendor questions and answers be posted online or will you be replying back directly to each vendor? Please advise.

A: Yes, answers to vendor questions will be compiled and answered as a single addendum on January 11, 2013.

Referring to the section Design & Build: Site Requirements

In an effort to understand the statement "**Multi-language options**".

Q: Which languages need to be supported?

Q: Who would create the translated text content?

Q: You mention "multi-language options". What do you have in mind? Which languages need to be supported? Is it full website localization or a subset of the content?

Q: Would an auto translate by Google be an acceptable option?

A: Google Translate would be an acceptable solution as it is free, ubiquitous, supports 60 languages, and is a simple implementation. If vendor had an alternative solution, we would be open to hearing it. This would be for pages of arlingtonma.gov.

Q: In an effort to clarify the statement "**Seamless integration with existing online properties such as online payments, online GIS maps (iFrames), and other Town content partners (see Appendix A).**" our understanding is that this refers to the new redesign changes in form of colors/fonts also need to be applied to the third party pages. It does not involve re-implementing these services anew. Please confirm.

A: Correct. Proposer would not be responsible for any implementation with our 3rd party vendors, though depending on the Town's new website design, Proposer may offer updated banners/graphics color palette updates the Town would update and/or implement with our 3rd party vendors. Regarding GIS Mapping, it is our 3rd party vendor who recommends iFrames as a method of applying our design (look and feel) to the maps. This is more a consideration and not a requirement. Ultimately, we need to understand how this might look and behave. You can view our current online GIS map here: <http://www.mapsonline.net/arlingtonma/>

Referring to the section Content Management System (CMS) requirements

Q: In an effort to understand the statement "**Ability to collaborate, offline, in WYSIWG environment within department and across departments.**" Please elaborate what is the expected behavior.

A: When a staff member goes to update the website, the content editor they are presented with is a "What You See Is What You Get" (WYSIWG) – or at least very close. Currently Town staff view a text box when updating the website and have to refer to live website to view how the content elements display online, and adjust as necessary. We'd like this process to be more intuitive. We feel a live page preview WYSIWG environment will get us there, but we are open to any improvement. Additional CMS features such as versioning and rollback or content workflows, would also be welcome.

Q: In an effort to understand the statement "**Integrate with dynamic link content (boards and committee home pages or Community Group) to automatically auto-fill links back to relevant entity.**" Please elaborate the expected behavior.

A: An example may be: Staff (user) enters a calendar event for Committee A. It might be they select Committee A from a list of Committees and when Committee A is selected the page "auto-fills" general information about Committee A like "For more information on Committee A, including agendas and minutes, please visit arlingtonma.gov/committeeA." Currently, staff manually enter this content and add the link. They also add date/time/location. It would be preferred if this repetitive task could be more automated. Note: user would need the ability to easily overwrite this content to accommodate a time or location change.

Q: In an effort to understand the statement "**Vendor will work with Town to update domain(s)**" please specify which domains apart from www.arlingtonma.gov is being referred to here.

A: This is an error. This should read "redirects" not "domains." We have many redirects (around 40). This would be part of the migration and we need a way to manage redirects this on our own (update and add) as sections are added and perhaps moved around.

Referring to the section Email Broadcast

Q: Referring to the statement "Our expectation is that emails will not be delayed", what is the maximum expected email delay that the Committee considers acceptable? Was it ever an issue while using mailman?

A: Under 5 minutes is acceptable, but we currently see delivery as instant (under a minute). We have had minimal delivery issues with mailman. On the one or two times we did have something "stuck" our current vendor was prompt to assess and address the problem (less than 20 minutes). We would expect same with new service.

Referring to the section Operational Objectives

Q: In an effort to understand the statement "**Better organize our online content to support and manage day-to-day, project based, and emergency communications for all departments and provide off-line access for collaboration and archiving of content**", Please explain what does "**off-line access for collaboration**" means.

A: Off-line collaboration was intended to mean staff can view, and collaborate on, content prior to publishing (via the Internet OK). Live page preview/WYSIWYG environment as previously mentioned.

Referring to Appendix A

Q: The diagram does not show the **Intranet** as a Future Development though the statement on Page 7 "**Future option to extend this site to create an Intranet for internal communications**" seems to imply this. Please clarify.

A: Intranet is a possible future development. All items in yellow on Appendix A are possible future features, though I see how this appears inconsistent.

Q: The diagram does not show the **Munis** Integration as a Future Development though the statement on Page 7 "**Future ability to integrate and interoperate with our MUNIS financial software for the purpose of providing online budget and expenditure reports to the public in a customizable and automatic way.**" seems to imply this. Please clarify.

A: Again all items in yellow on Appendix A are "components for new/consolidate services" in this case **new**. The box around items suggests if an appropriate solution is found this type of process it may allow us to consolidate ("opportunities for efficiency"). I can see how this can be confusing. In the case of an Online Checkbook, it *may* integrate with MUNIS (directly or working with MUNIS exported spreadsheets) to allow the Town to provide an Open Check book like feature. It is not a core component, but if Proposer can provide this feature, we would like to know about it (same with other features in yellow).

Q: The diagram does not show the **GIS/QED** integration as a Future Development though the statement on Page 7 "**Future ability to extend system to create a Customer Relationship Management (CRM) solution that integrates and interoperate with existing specialize content management systems such as our GIS database (ESRI v10) and community safety crime database (QED).**" seems to imply this. Please clarify.

A: See previous answer. In the case of CRM, if Proposer proposes a CRM solution they would have to include these considerations in addition to standard CRM features and many others. Again, this is not a core component for this project, but if Proposer has these capabilities, we would like to know about it.

General

Q: Is there some past analytics data regarding number of visitors/clicks on the site.

A: Included at the end of this addendum is visitors/pageviews for 2012. Please note it does not include graphics or PDF downloads. In the new website we would have to have the ability to track those elements using Analytics (See Design & Build, c.).

Q: This is a complex project, requiring discovery, strategy, design, development, migrating 10,000 pages and QA – including a requested 4-6 week review period before launch. With the 4-6 week review period, and a March 1 start, there would only be about 10 weeks to do everything else. In our experience this will take longer than the four months scheduled to do well. What is your schedule flexibility for site launch?

A: We may have flexibility in the 4-6 week review period. It all depends on how much content the vendor can migrate over. This period is not meant to mean the vendor should be done with the site and the Town

alone reviews a finished site for 4-6 weeks. It is intended that the site should be in a form where the Town can start reviewing, adding/modifying content 4-6 weeks prior to launch (we are available earlier). This is expected to be in tandem with any development on the vendor's end to optimize this schedule time and can be done, in sections, in a coordinated effort. The Town will provide a project manager (PIO) to work with the vendor to coordinate. We just don't want to be presented with a site for the first time days prior to launch.

If vendor is asking if the site can launch after July 1, 2013, it is a strong desire of the Town to launch the site by this date. If Proposer makes a case for a later launch date, for example to accommodate a more comprehensive site, the Town will consider it, but our preference is for July 1, 2013. Proposer is free to include multiple scenarios in the Plan of Service/Technical Proposal as well as the Price Submission form to delineate alternate release dates, but please keep price information out of the Plan of Service/Technical Proposal.

Q: What is the minimum viable website functionality by launch? Is there a prioritization of features for launch? Can this be phased?

A: All email broadcast lists and most of the content of arlingtonma.gov must be complete by July 1, 2013. We want all our departments, boards and committees, Town Governance sections, Communication Center, and calendars operational in their new dynamic form at that time. It is our expectation that when the framework/templates for these sections are done and basic content populated our staff can perform extra content modification (fine-tune) prior to launch (the aforementioned 4-6 weeks).

We have not prioritized content and plan to do that February/early March in anticipation of contract award. As we conduct this audit of our site and policy review, it is our expectation to identify content that is out of date and not migrate it. Examples would be Agendas (approx 1,500 documents) and items we identify as unnecessary (unknown).

Q: Will email lists be kept exclusively in the email system, or should the system connect to a database?

A: There is no preference here other than the features mentioned in the RFP.

Q: By "accessible" do you mean Section 508 compliant, or that the site should have a more intuitive IA and user experience?

A: On page 5 and 7 I mean more intuitive IA and user experience.

Q: Does Arlington require strict adherence to Section 508 accessibility guidelines? Or W3C standards? (They are different.) Or some other level of accessibility?

A: Either is fine, just identify what is being proposed.

Q: Given that an open source CMS is "strongly desired", should we assume that you are leaning toward Drupal? (We have considerable experience with Drupal.) Or do you want to consider other CMS options, open source and licensed?

A: We are very interested in open-source as the promise of it is scalability, flexibility, cost, and other factors we find desirable. Drupal is a leader in this space and is of great interest. However, we are most concerned with a system that delivers on the goals stated in the RFP. If at the end of our evaluations it is determined that a licensed platform will deliver best on these goals, then a licensed platform will be chosen. This is why vendors are encouraged to include their ability to deliver core components now and, if applicable, additional features (items in yellow in Appendix A or others) in the future.

Q: Does Arlington have a social media policy and practices in place now? Is creating the policy part of this project?

A: No, creating policy is not part of this engagement.

Q: Are citizen engagement platforms and tools already in use? Surveys, polls, Facebook and etc.? Is this an integration requirement or custom development [should we consider SOPAC modules for Drupal?]

A: Not really an integration requirement, but we want to know how you might integrate with citizen engagement platforms (if you have them, so yes include information here if you provide these services). Currently we use Survey Monkey and a couple departments use Facebook, but it is done ala carte. Meaning user updates FB, then the Website, then may send an email alert. If we can remove steps/automate, then we want to hear about it. If you look at Appendix B, you will note an example of how we may integrate a Facebook or Twitter status (look at Committee Home, right column "News, Email SM" SM = Social Media).

Q: What is the vision for CMS content upgrades via a mobile device? What kind of content might be updated and how often?

A: We just want our users to be able to update the site using their mobile device and not curse while doing it. The types of updates might be a quick Facebook message, an email alert, or correction to a previous post. We do not envision this to be a tool our staff would use on a regular basis, but it could be utilized in an emergency so it should be simple and reliable. If both the public side and administrative side comply with responsive web design, it is our understanding that will get us most of the way there.

Q: Describe the level and nature of server security that is required of the server and development systems.

A: Primarily, we expect the vendor to keep security patches up-to-date for both operating systems and applications, maintain up-to-date antivirus protection on the servers, and other general, industry-standard practices to harden websites against malicious action. Please detail what you offer in this regard.

Q: What is the name of the Content Management System you are currently using?

A: First Class Client via Virtual Town Hall
<http://www.vt-s.net/Pages/index>








Audience Overview

100.00% of visits

Overview



300,853 people visited this site

-  **Visits: 573,288**
-  **Unique Visitors: 300,853**
-  **Pageviews: 1,399,333**
-  **Pages / Visit: 2.44**
-  **Avg. Visit Duration: 00:01:53**
-  **Bounce Rate: 52.20%**
-  **% New Visits: 48.54%**



- 51.44% Returning Visitor**
294,913 Visits
- 48.56% New Visitor**
278,375 Visits

Language	Visits	% Visits
1. en-us	545,887	95.22%
2. en	19,614	3.42%
3. en-gb	1,046	0.18%
4. ja	1,019	0.18%
5. en_us	814	0.14%
6. de-de	461	0.08%
7. fr-fr	393	0.07%
8. ja-jp	387	0.07%
9. fr	379	0.07%
10. zh-cn	378	0.07%

[view full report](#)