

TENDER INSIGHT BY TIKSOM

South Platte Renew

Website Redesign and Development Services

RFP No. 26-022, City of Englewood, Colorado

Bid Due: June 16, 2026 at 2:00 PM Mountain Time

Prepared by Tiksom, tiksom.us, Confidential

TENDER INSIGHT

Table of Contents

- Section 1:** Procurement Office Intelligence
- Section 2:** Strategic Read of This Solicitation
- Section 3:** Clause-by-Clause Index
- Section 4:** Legal Framework Intelligence
- Section 5:** Master Compliance Checklist
- Section 6:** Proposed Team Structure
- Section 7:** Phase-by-Phase Timeline
- Section 8:** Detailed Role Involvement
- Section 9:** Gantt Chart Table
- Section 10:** Key Recommendations
- Section 11:** Remote vs On-Site Allocation

Sections 12-14 (cost, budget, pricing) and 17 (resourcing) are omitted from this shared version - available under NDA.

- Section 15:** Evaluation Criteria Analysis
- Section 16:** Bidder Guidance Table

- Section 18:** Submission Requirements
- Section 19:** Risk Register
- Section 20:** IT/Cyber and Digital Strategy

DISCLAIMER:

This document has been prepared by Tiksom as an informational resource to consolidate and summarize project details based on the provided tender materials. It is intended solely to assist bidders in understanding the project scope and requirements. Tiksom assumes no legal responsibility or liability for the content of this document. The information provided herein is for reference purposes only and must not be considered a guarantee, representation, or warranty of any kind, whether expressed or implied. Recipients are required to independently verify all information directly with the awarding body or relevant authority. This document does not constitute a contractual obligation, endorsement, or guarantee from Tiksom to any party. Any decisions, actions, or submissions based on this document are the sole responsibility of the recipient. Tiksom disclaims any liability for errors, omissions, or outcomes arising from reliance on this document. By reviewing this document, the recipient agrees to indemnify and hold Tiksom harmless from all legal consequences, claims, liabilities, or damages that may arise from its use. Submissions must adhere to principles of truthfulness and transparency. Misrepresentation, false statements, or omissions may result in disqualification and legal consequences, including claims under applicable laws for fraud or misrepresentation. Tiksom explicitly advises all users and bidders to independently verify all project requirements and assumptions before proceeding. This document does not constitute an offer, guarantee, or invitation to contract and does not create any legal obligation or relationship between Tiksom and the user or bidder.

Section 1: Procurement Office Intelligence

The City of Englewood's Procurement Division manages this solicitation on behalf of South Platte Renew, a jointly governed water resource recovery facility. The solicitation is structured as a formal RFP with a best-value scoring matrix, which signals a procurement office that has moved past the lowest-price reflex and wants to defend a selection decision on merit. That carries a specific implication: the evaluation committee will need written justification for every point scored, which means your proposal must produce quotable evidence, not impressionistic claims.

The agency has reserved extensive unilateral rights throughout the document: the right to reject any proposal, waive deficiencies, modify the procurement schedule, cancel the RFP entirely, and request clarification or additional information after the submission deadline. That breadth of reserved rights is not unusual for a municipal RFP, but it signals a procurement office experienced enough to protect its process legally. Do not interpret any pre-award communication as a commitment. Nothing short of a duly executed Professional Services Agreement constitutes a contract.

The selection committee includes SPR staff with the option to bring in outside advisors. SPR is jointly owned by Littleton and Englewood and overseen by a Supervisory Committee. The final contract requires approval at multiple authority levels within the City and is subject to Englewood City Council ratification for any renewal beyond the initial one-year term. Analyst assessment: the dual-city governance adds an approval layer that the solicitation treats lightly, but it matters for timeline planning after award. Build a 30-to-45-day contract execution buffer into any project start-date assumption.

The incumbent is not identified in the solicitation. The background section describes 'recent usability findings and internal assessments' that identified significant platform limitations. That language strongly implies the current website was built on a different platform and that internal stakeholders have already formed views about what went wrong. A winning proposal should demonstrate knowledge of common government website failure modes and show how the proposed approach directly addresses them, rather than offering a generic digital transformation narrative.

The questions deadline of May 26, 2026 at 4:00 PM MT is just seven days after the RFP was issued on May 19, 2026. That is a tight window and suggests the agency expects bidders to read the document quickly and submit clarifying questions promptly. The final addendum is scheduled for June 2, 2026, two weeks before the submission deadline. Watch for scope modifications in that addendum; the Affidavit of Authenticity requires acknowledgement of all addenda by number.

Section 2: Strategic Read of This Solicitation

The core tension in this solicitation is between the website's operational purpose and its public identity purpose. SPR is a wastewater treatment utility, not a marketing organization. Yet the RFP calls for 'a visually compelling design that reflects South Platte Renew's brand identity and builds public trust.' That language was inserted deliberately. Someone at SPR wants this website to do more than host documents: they want it to build civic confidence in a facility most residents prefer not to think about. Proposals that treat this as a pure technical exercise will score lower on the 'experience and technical capability' criterion than proposals that show understanding of public utility communication.

The evaluation weighting tells the real story: 40 points for experience, 40 for approach, 20 for price. Price carries only one-fifth of the score. That structure means a firm cannot win on cost alone. The inverse is also true: a firm with superior credentials that submits a poorly structured proposal addressing approach can lose to a less experienced competitor. Both sections are equal at 40 points each. A firm that maximizes experience points but leaves 15 of the 40 approach points on the table has made a serious tactical error.

The WordPress-only mandate in Section 1.6 is the most operationally significant single clause in the document. 'Proprietary or closed platforms will not be considered.' This is not a preference; it is a hard disqualifier. Any proposal that proposes an alternative CMS, even as an option, is non-responsive. Read this as: SPR has been burned by a vendor-locked platform before, or they have had internal stakeholder debates about platform independence, and they resolved it in writing before publishing this RFP. Proposals should acknowledge this requirement explicitly and explain how the proposed WordPress architecture gives SPR permanent ownership and independence.

The accessibility compliance requirements are written with enforcement teeth that go beyond most municipal RFPs. The 90-day documentation failure triggers termination without penalty. The 30-day failure suspends payment. And the indemnification clause in Section 1.1.5 makes the consultant liable for claims arising from accessibility failures. The implication: either SPR has faced an ADA or state accessibility complaint in the past, or their legal counsel reviewed this RFP and hardened the language. Either way, treat WCAG 2.2 AA compliance as a performance obligation with financial consequences, not a checkbox.

The PARC section requirements (Task 4, Section 1.1.4.1) are the most specific functional requirements in the document and the most likely area to differentiate strong proposals. An interactive map of ongoing research projects, enhanced podcast navigation, and 'additional creative, interactive elements' is not a standard government website feature set. It signals that SPR's PARC program is a source of institutional pride and they want it showcased. Proposals that treat PARC as a minor sub-task will miss the narrative the evaluators are looking for.

Section 3: Clause-by-Clause Index

Section	Details	Page / Reference
RFP Section 1.1	Statement of Purpose: procurement of website redesign and development for SPR; best-value selection; deadline June 16, 2026 at 2:00 PM MT	RFP p.4
RFP Section 1.2	RFP Organization: 5 sections and 4 attachments (A: Definition of Terms; B: Draft Agreement; C: Draft SOW; D: Affidavit)	RFP p.5
RFP Section 1.3	Background: SPR is Colorado's third-largest WRRF, 20 MGD, 300,000 residents served, jointly owned Littleton/Englewood; current site has fragmented platforms and usability failures	RFP p.6
RFP Section 1.4	Objectives: user-centered design; WCAG 2.2 AA compliance; WordPress CMS consolidation; improved search; responsive performance; staff training	RFP p.6

Section	Details	Page / Reference
RFP Section 1.5	Project Milestones: RFP posted May 19, 2026; questions due May 26, 2026 at 4:00 PM MT; final addendum June 2, 2026; proposals due June 16, 2026 at 2:00 PM MT	RFP p.7
RFP Section 1.6 / Tasks 1-9	Scope of Work: 9 tasks covering discovery/strategy, design/UX, WordPress development, functional requirements (PARC map, search, migration, events, forms, microsites, interactive features), accessibility compliance, platform consolidation, testing/QA, training, optional ongoing support	RFP pp.7-10
RFP Section 1.1.4.1	PARC Enhancements: interactive project map; podcast improvements; creative interactive storytelling elements	RFP p.8
RFP Section 1.1.5	Accessibility Compliance: WCAG 2.2 A and AA; Colorado C.R.S. 24-85-101 et seq.; VPAT or signed certificate required; 30-day payment suspension and 90-day termination right for non-compliance; indemnification for accessibility failures	RFP p.9
RFP Section 1.1.9	Optional Ongoing Support: post-launch maintenance, content updates, performance monitoring, accessibility updates, technical support by mutual agreement	RFP p.10
RFP Section 1.2	Consultant Responsibilities: designated PM as single point of contact; weekly/bi-weekly status meetings; written notice of delays; sub-consultant disclosure and approval; all deliverables in PDF unless noted	RFP p.10
RFP Section 2.1	Submittal Directions: electronic only; searchable PDF with bookmarks; no physical copies; vendor support (800) 835-4603 option 2; proposals irrevocable for 90 days after opening	RFP p.10-11
RFP Section 2.2	Submittal Format: max 10 pages narrative; excluded: transmittal letter, TOC, cover sheets, dividers, appendices, price proposal; up to 2 pages 11x17 tri-fold; 1-inch margins; 11-pt font minimum; price proposal as separate PDF	RFP p.11
RFP Section 2.3 / Parts 1-6	Submittal Content: transmittal letter; experience and technical capability; project understanding and approach; proposed timeline; price proposal (separate PDF); draft agreement review; SOW review and completion	RFP pp.11-15
RFP Section 2.3.2	Experience Requirements: 2-5 project examples from last 5 years; WordPress/open-source CMS experience; municipal/public-sector website design; accessibility; content migration; microsite management; organizational chart with key personnel and sub-consultants	RFP p.12-13
RFP Section 2.3.7 / Appendix B	Key Personnel Resumes: all key personnel including sub-consultants; relevant qualifications, municipal experience, accessibility, WordPress/CMS expertise	RFP p.15
RFP Section 2.3.11 / Appendix D	Debarment and Default Disclosure: contracts terminated for default in last 5 years; criminal convictions; debarment or consideration for debarment in last 5 years	RFP p.15

Section	Details	Page / Reference
RFP Section 2.3.12 / Price Proposal	Price Proposal: separate PDF; lump sum by task; hourly rates for out-of-scope work; assumptions and exclusions; payment schedule; optional services pricing; no taxes; 11-pt font minimum	RFP p.15
RFP Section 3.3	Responsiveness: City may waive deficiencies at sole discretion; may request clarification	RFP p.16
RFP Section 3.4.1	Evaluation: Experience/Technical (40 pts); Project Understanding/Management (40 pts); Price (20 pts)	RFP p.17
RFP Section 4.2	Conflict of Interest: must disclose any officer/director/partner who is also an SPR, Englewood, or Littleton employee or official	RFP p.17
RFP Section 4.4	Obligation to Keep Project Team Intact: key personnel named in proposal must remain on team; unauthorized changes may result in penalties or termination	RFP p.18
RFP Section 4.5	Additional Conditions: non-collusion; anti-discrimination; firm bears proposal preparation costs; drug-free workplace; OSHA compliance; patent infringement certification	RFP pp.18-19
RFP Section 4.6	Addenda: addenda become part of contract documents; must be acknowledged in Affidavit of Authenticity (Attachment D)	RFP p.19
Draft Agreement Section 8	Term and Termination: 1-year initial term; 30-day renewal notice; renewal subject to City Council approval and TABOR appropriation; 30-day convenience termination; 30-day cure for material breach; immediate termination for bankruptcy	Agreement pp.3-4
Draft Agreement Section 15	Insurance: Workers Comp (statutory); CGL including auto (\$3M/occurrence); Professional Liability/E&O; (\$1M/occurrence); Employee Dishonesty/Computer Fraud (\$1M/occurrence); City of Englewood as additional insured; 30-day cancellation notice	Agreement pp.7-8
Draft Agreement Section 16	IP Rights: work product IP remains with consultant; City receives perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free, non-exclusive license to use all work product	Agreement pp.7-8
Draft Agreement Section 19	Governing Law: Colorado; venue in Arapahoe County state or federal court; prevailing party recovers attorney's fees	Agreement p.9
Draft Agreement Section 34	Immigration / I-9: full IRCA compliance; no unauthorized workers; I-9 retention; sub-consultant I-9 certifications on City request; 10-day notice of federal violation allegations	Agreement pp.10-11

Section 4: Legal Framework Intelligence

4.1 Governing Law and Jurisdiction

Colorado law governs this contract (Draft Agreement Section 19). Disputes go to state or federal court in Arapahoe County. The prevailing party recovers attorney's fees. That fee-shifting clause matters: it makes small disputes expensive to abandon and large disputes expensive to escalate. In

practice, it favors the party with clearer documentation. Maintain contemporaneous written records of all scope discussions, approvals, and change requests.

4.2 Key Clause Analysis

Clause	What It Says	What It Means for the Bidder	Risk if Ignored
Agreement Section 8: Term and Renewal	1-year initial term; renewal requires 30-day advance written notice and City Council approval; TABOR means future-year payments are contingent on appropriation	Do not assume multi-year revenue. Price the initial scope to be financially sound on its own. Renewal is not guaranteed.	Revenue shortfall if team is staffed for a multi-year engagement that does not renew
Agreement Section 8(a): Convenience Termination	City can terminate any SOW with 30 days notice for no reason; pays only for work performed before termination	The City can exit at will. There is no penalty to the City. Do not front-load overhead costs expecting recovery in later phases.	Unrecovered startup costs if terminated early
Agreement Section 15: Insurance	Four coverage types; City named as additional insured; 30-day cancellation notice to City required	Evidence of insurability must accompany the proposal (Appendix C). Policy issuance is a contract condition, not a post-award formality.	Proposal rejection; contract termination for non-compliance
Agreement Section 16: IP / Work Product	IP remains with consultant; City gets a perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free non-exclusive license	The consultant retains ownership but grants SPR permanent use. SPR cannot be locked out. Do not propose licensing arrangements that conflict with this.	Contract breach; potential injunction
Agreement Section 22: Sub-consultants	Sub-consultants require prior written City approval; sub-consultants bound by all Agreement obligations	Name all sub-consultants in the proposal. Seek approval before engaging anyone not listed. Post-award changes require written consent.	Contract breach; sub-consultant work product may be unenforceable
RFP Section 1.1.5: Accessibility Enforcement	30-day VPAT or certificate failure suspends payment; 90-day failure allows termination without penalty; indemnification for accessibility claims	Treat WCAG 2.2 AA compliance as a financial obligation. Build accessibility audits into every development sprint, not just pre-launch.	Payment suspension; contract termination; indemnification liability

Clause	What It Says	What It Means for the Bidder	Risk if Ignored
Draft Agreement Section 34: IRCA / I-9	Full federal employment eligibility verification compliance; 10-day written notice to City if federal agency alleges material violation	All personnel working on this contract must have valid I-9 documentation. This applies to sub-consultants performing on-site labor.	Termination for cause; federal penalties
RFP Section 4.4: Team Integrity	Key personnel named in proposal must remain on team throughout procurement and project; unauthorized changes may result in penalties or termination	Do not name personnel who are not committed to this engagement. A departure after proposal submission must be disclosed in writing immediately.	Disqualification from procurement; contract termination

4.3 Set-Aside Analysis

No set-aside requirements are stated in this solicitation. This is a full and open competition. Any qualified firm may respond regardless of business size or certification status.

4.4 OCI Exposure

RFP Section 4.2 requires disclosure of any officer, director, partner, associate, or agent who is also an employee or official of SPR, the City of Englewood, or the City of Littleton. Any such relationship must be disclosed in the proposal. Failure to disclose is a basis for disqualification. No pre-selected firms or individuals are identified in Section 4.1.

4.5 NDA and Teaming Requirements for Distributed Teams

The solicitation does not include a standalone NDA template, but the Draft Agreement Section 11 defines confidential information broadly and requires both parties to protect it with no less than a reasonable degree of care. For distributed team members accessing SPR data, systems, or content, a compliant NDA must include: definition of confidential information aligned with Agreement Section 11; obligation to notify the US Prime within 24 hours of any unauthorized access or disclosure; prohibition on retaining copies of SPR data after project completion; requirement to comply with Colorado Open Records Act exceptions applicable to the City; and a specific acknowledgement that the Agreement's surviving obligations (Sections 5, 8(f), 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19, 23, 25, 31) apply to the distributed team through the sub-consultant clause.

4.6 Protest Risk

The solicitation grants the City broad discretion to waive deficiencies, reject proposals, and modify the process. Protest risk is low if the process is followed correctly, but a competitor who submits a technically superior proposal at a price significantly lower than yours could trigger a re-evaluation request. Mitigate by documenting the basis for your price clearly in the price proposal and ensuring every scored element is addressed in the narrative.

#	Legal Area	Do	Don't	Risk if Violated	RFQ Section
1	Accessibility Compliance	Provide VPAT or written certificate within 30 days of any City request	Treat accessibility as a post-launch exercise	Payment suspension at 30 days; termination at 90 days	RFP 1.1.5
2	Sub-consultants	Disclose all sub-consultants in the proposal; obtain written City approval before engaging any	Add sub-consultants post-award without City approval	Contract breach; unenforceable work product	Agreement Section 22
3	Team Integrity	Name only personnel committed to this engagement	Swap key personnel without written City approval	Disqualification or contract termination	RFP Section 4.4
4	Conflict of Interest	Disclose any relationship with SPR, Englewood, or Littleton officials	Omit a material relationship	Disqualification	RFP Section 4.2
5	Insurance	Submit evidence of insurability with proposal; obtain policies before contract execution	Wait until after award to arrange coverage	Proposal rejection; contract void	Agreement Section 15
6	Addenda	Acknowledge all addenda by number in the Affidavit of Authenticity	Fail to check for addenda before submission	Proposal may be non-responsive	RFP Section 4.6
7	IP / Work Product	Grant SPR the perpetual non-exclusive license required by Agreement Section 16	Include proprietary licensing terms that restrict SPR's use of the work product	Contract breach; injunction risk	Agreement Section 16
8	I-9 / IRCA	Verify all employees and notify City within 10 days of federal agency violation allegations	Assign unauthorized workers to this contract	Termination for cause; federal penalties	Agreement Section 34
9	Change Orders	Submit all requests for additional work in writing before commencing	Begin additional work on verbal instruction	No payment obligation for City	RFP Section 1.2
10	Non-Collusion	Submit an independent proposal representing the firm's own pricing and approach	Coordinate pricing or approach with competing firms	Disqualification; potential criminal liability	RFP Section 4.5

Section 5: Master Compliance Checklist

Every row below maps to a specific solicitation requirement. Use this table as the final verification pass before submission. Every SHALL and MUST in the source documents is captured here.

#	Exact Requirement	RFQ Section	Pass/Fail or Scored	Proposal Action Required
1	Proposals must be submitted electronically before June 16, 2026 at 2:00 PM MT	RFP 2.1	Pass/Fail	Upload complete proposal package before deadline; begin upload well before 1:50 PM
2	Proposals must be in searchable PDF format with bookmarks	RFP 2.1	Pass/Fail	Convert all proposal documents to searchable PDF with named bookmarks per section
3	No physical copies; electronic only	RFP 2.1	Pass/Fail	Do not submit any physical documents
4	Narrative proposal shall not exceed 10 pages	RFP 2.2	Pass/Fail	Count every narrative page before submission; transmittal letter, TOC, cover sheets, dividers, appendices, and price proposal are excluded from count
5	Minimum 11-point font in all narrative sections and price proposal	RFP 2.2 and 2.3.12	Pass/Fail	Apply Times New Roman 11-pt or larger to all narrative text and price proposal
6	Transmittal letter limited to 2 pages on firm letterhead; signed by authorized officer	RFP 2.3.1	Pass/Fail	Prepare letter on letterhead; obtain signature from officer authorized to bind the firm; include acknowledgement of Draft Agreement review
7	Nonresident corporations must provide Colorado Secretary of State Articles of Incorporation	RFP 2.3.1	Pass/Fail	If the firm is incorporated outside Colorado, attach a certified copy of Articles of Incorporation from Colorado SOS
8	Part 1: Demonstrate WordPress or comparable open-source CMS experience	RFP 2.3.2	Scored (40 pts)	Provide 2-5 project examples from last 5 years with client name, contact info, project description, contract value, timeline, and platform used
9	Part 1: Describe experience with accessibility compliance (WCAG 2.2 AA), content migration, and microsite management	RFP 2.3.2	Scored (40 pts)	Address each capability explicitly with project-specific evidence, not generic claims
10	Part 1: Provide organizational chart identifying all Key Personnel and reporting hierarchy including sub-consultants	RFP 2.3.2	Scored (40 pts)	Include org chart as a named exhibit or within the 2 tri-fold page allowance
11	Part 2: Describe project methodology, feedback cycles, revision management, and City approval process	RFP 2.3.3	Scored (40 pts)	Address revision cycle count per deliverable explicitly; SPR evaluators will note its absence
12	Part 2: Identify all sub-consultants, their roles, and relevant qualifications	RFP 2.3.3	Scored (40 pts)	Name sub-consultants and describe their specific deliverable contributions

#	Exact Requirement	RFQ Section	Pass/Fail or Scored	Proposal Action Required
1 3	Part 3: Provide detailed project timeline from contract execution through post-launch support with all specified milestones	RFP 2.3.4 / Part 3	Scored (40 pts)	Include all 9 named milestones: discovery kickoff, sitemap, homepage concepts, interior templates, development completion, QA/accessibility audit, client acceptance, launch, training
1 4	Part 4 (Price Proposal): Lump-sum pricing per task; hourly rates for out-of-scope work; assumptions; payment schedule; optional services	RFP 2.3.5	Scored (20 pts)	Submit as separate PDF file labeled 'Proposed Fee'; include detailed cost breakdown with resource titles, estimated hours per task, billing rates, and total cost per task
1 5	Part 5: Acknowledge review of Draft Agreement (Attachment B) in the Transmittal Letter	RFP 2.3.6	Pass/Fail	State in transmittal letter that Draft Agreement has been reviewed; selected proposer may submit comments during contract negotiations
1 6	Part 6: Complete Draft Statement of Work (Attachment C) using Track Changes in MS Word	RFP 2.3.7	Evaluated	Complete all labeled sections of Attachment C in Word using Track Changes; submit as a document separate from the main PDF proposal
1 7	Appendix A: Complete and submit Attachment D Affidavit of Authenticity, including acknowledgement of all addenda by number	RFP 2.3.8 and 4.6	Pass/Fail	Sign the affidavit; list all addenda numbers and receipt dates; leave blank if no addenda issued by submission date
1 8	Appendix B: Provide resumes for all Key Personnel including sub-consultants	RFP 2.3.9	Scored (40 pts)	Resumes must highlight WCAG/accessibility experience, WordPress/CMS expertise, and municipal or public-sector work
1 9	Appendix C: Provide letter or COI from insurer confirming ability to obtain all required coverages	RFP 2.3.10	Pass/Fail	Obtain letter from insurer confirming ability to provide Workers Comp, CGL \$3M, E&O; \$1M, and Employee Dishonesty \$1M coverages
2 0	Appendix D: Disclose any contract terminations for default, criminal convictions, or debarment in last 5 years for all Key Personnel and sub-consultants	RFP 2.3.11	Evaluated	Complete Appendix D honestly; provide a position and response on any disclosed matters
2 1	WordPress CMS must be used; proprietary or closed platforms will not be considered	RFP Section 1.6 Task 3	Pass/Fail	Confirm WordPress as the proposed CMS in the proposal; do not propose any alternative platform

#	Exact Requirement	RFQ Section	Pass/Fail or Scored	Proposal Action Required
2 2	Website must comply with WCAG 2.2 Levels A and AA and Colorado C.R.S. Sections 24-85-101 et seq.	RFP 1.1.5	Pass/Fail	State compliance approach explicitly; describe testing methodology and tools; confirm ability to provide VPAT or written certificate on City request
2 3	Conflict of interest disclosure: disclose any firm personnel who are also SPR, Englewood, or Littleton employees or officials	RFP 4.2	Pass/Fail	Include disclosure statement in transmittal letter or as a named section of the proposal
2 4	All Key Personnel named in the proposal must remain on the project team throughout procurement and performance	RFP 4.4	Pass/Fail	Only name personnel confirmed as available and committed to this engagement
2 5	All deliverables must be submitted in electronic PDF format unless otherwise noted to SPR	RFP 1.2	Pass/Fail	Confirm in proposal that all deliverables will be submitted as PDF; note any exceptions required by the SOW

Section 6: Proposed Team Structure

Role	Responsibilities	Required Qualifications
Project Manager	Single point of contact for SPR; manages schedule, budget, and deliverable quality; leads weekly status meetings; coordinates sub-consultants; escalates issues promptly in writing	5+ years managing municipal or government web projects; PMP certification preferred; demonstrated ability to manage concurrent workstreams; experience with Colorado municipalities a plus
UX/Accessibility Lead	Leads discovery, stakeholder interviews, and user journey mapping; owns WCAG 2.2 AA compliance across all deliverables; oversees accessibility audits; prepares VPAT or written certificate	CPACC or WAS certification (IAAP); 3+ years WCAG 2.2 compliance work on government sites; experience with Colorado accessibility law (C.R.S. 24-85-101)
Lead Web Designer	Creates wireframes and prototypes; develops visual design aligned with SPR brand; designs mobile-first, WCAG-compliant page templates; manages revision cycles	Portfolio of municipal or public-utility website redesigns; strong typography and visual hierarchy skills; familiarity with WordPress Gutenberg or equivalent block editor
Lead WordPress Developer	Builds all site functionality in WordPress; develops custom page templates; implements search, event management, forms, microsite architecture, and interactive features	5+ years WordPress development; experience with advanced custom fields, custom post types, and REST API; PHP, JavaScript, and CSS proficiency; headless WordPress experience a plus
PARC and Interactive Features Developer	Designs and builds the interactive PARC project map, podcast enhancements, and other dynamic storytelling elements described in Task 4	Experience with mapping libraries (e.g., Leaflet, Google Maps API, Mapbox); JavaScript animation and interactive data display; audio/video embed integration

Role	Responsibilities	Required Qualifications
Content Migration Specialist	Audits existing content; manages structured content migration; develops URL redirect strategy; ensures all migrated content meets WCAG standards including alt text and proper tagging	Experience migrating government websites with 500+ pages; proficiency with Screaming Frog or equivalent; knowledge of SEO best practices and redirect strategies
QA and Testing Lead	Manages cross-device and cross-browser testing; runs formal accessibility audit prior to launch; documents and tracks deficiency remediation; validates all features before handoff	Experience with automated accessibility testing tools (axe, WAVE, Deque); cross-browser testing proficiency; experience with WCAG 2.2 auditing
Training and Documentation Specialist	Develops WordPress training materials and user guides; leads training sessions for SPR staff pre-launch; creates documentation for ongoing content management workflows	Experience developing training programs for non-technical government staff; WordPress content management training experience; clear technical writing skills
Technical Architect	Defines hosting, infrastructure, and integration architecture; ensures compatibility with existing SPR systems; oversees platform consolidation strategy; advises on long-term scalability	Cloud or managed WordPress hosting experience; experience integrating government CMS platforms with existing tools; security best practices for public-sector web environments
Account Executive / Quality Director	Oversees proposal quality and contract compliance; reviews deliverables before submission to SPR; manages change order process; escalates contractual issues	Senior-level consulting experience with government contracts; familiarity with Colorado municipal procurement; professional services agreement management experience

Section 7: Phase-by-Phase Timeline

The contract term is one year from execution. Assuming contract execution in late July 2026 (allowing for City Council approval and TABOR-compliant execution), the following phase breakdown aligns to the 9 milestones specified in RFP Section 2.3.4:

Phase	Duration	Team Members	Key Responsibilities
Phase 1: Discovery and Strategy	Weeks 1-4	PM, UX/Accessibility Lead, Content Migration Specialist	Kickoff meeting; analytics review; stakeholder interviews; content audit; user personas and journey maps; site structure recommendations; sitemap submission
Phase 2: Design and UX	Weeks 4-10 (concurrent with Phase 1 end)	Lead Web Designer, UX/Accessibility Lead, PM	Wireframes and prototypes for key templates; homepage design concepts submitted and approved; interior page template designs submitted and approved; brand alignment review

Phase	Duration	Team Members	Key Responsibilities
Phase 3: Development	Weeks 8-20	Lead WordPress Developer, PARC/Interactive Developer, Technical Architect	WordPress build; custom page templates; PARC interactive map; podcast enhancements; search, events, forms, microsites, interactive features; platform consolidation
Phase 4: Content Migration	Weeks 16-22 (concurrent with Phase 3 end)	Content Migration Specialist, Lead WordPress Developer, UX/Accessibility Lead	Structured content migration; URL redirect strategy implementation; accessibility tagging and alt text for all migrated content; removal of outdated content
Phase 5: QA, Testing, and Accessibility Audit	Weeks 22-26	QA and Testing Lead, UX/Accessibility Lead, Lead WordPress Developer	Cross-device and cross-browser testing; formal pre-launch accessibility audit; deficiency remediation; performance testing; client acceptance and final approvals
Phase 6: Launch	Week 26-28	PM, Lead WordPress Developer, Technical Architect	Go-live preparation; DNS cutover; post-launch monitoring; issue triage window
Phase 7: Training and Handoff	Weeks 26-30 (concurrent with launch)	Training and Documentation Specialist, PM	WordPress training sessions for SPR staff; delivery of user guides and documentation; training completion confirmation
Phase 8: Optional Ongoing Support	Month 7 onward (by mutual agreement)	PM, Lead WordPress Developer, UX/Accessibility Lead	Monthly maintenance; content updates; performance and accessibility monitoring; technical support

Section 8: Detailed Role Involvement

Role	Phase Involvement	Duration (Weeks)	Full-time or Part-time	Notes
Project Manager	All Phases 1-8	1-30+	Full-time (Phases 1-7); Part-time (Phase 8)	Single point of contact throughout; escalation owner
UX/Accessibility Lead	Phases 1, 2, 4, 5	1-26	Full-time (Phases 1-2, 5); Part-time (Phase 4)	Accessibility audit is a dedicated Phase 5 deliverable
Lead Web Designer	Phases 2, 3	4-20	Full-time	Revision cycles drive timeline; plan for 2-3 rounds per template
Lead WordPress Developer	Phases 3, 4, 5, 6, 8	8-30+	Full-time (Phases 3-6); Part-time (Phase 8)	Longest sustained engagement on the project

Role	Phase Involvement	Duration (Weeks)	Full-time or Part-time	Notes
PARC/Interactive Developer	Phase 3	8-20	Full-time	PARC map is a featured deliverable; allocate 15-20% of Phase 3 hours here
Content Migration Specialist	Phases 1, 4	1-4 and 16-22	Part-time (Phase 1); Full-time (Phase 4)	Audit in Phase 1 feeds the migration plan in Phase 4
QA and Testing Lead	Phase 5	22-26	Full-time	Formal pre-launch accessibility audit is a contractual deliverable
Training and Documentation Specialist	Phase 7	26-30	Full-time	Training must be complete before launch sign-off
Technical Architect	Phases 1, 3, 6	1-4, 8-20, 26-28	Part-time (Phase 1, 6); Full-time (Phase 3 planning)	Defines integration architecture early; critical for platform consolidation
Account Executive / Quality Director	All phases (oversight)	1-30	Part-time	Deliverable quality review before each City submission

Section 9: Gantt Chart Table

Project assumed to span 8 months from contract execution. Months are labeled M1 through M8.

Role	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
Project Manager	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	FT	PT
UX/Accessibility Lead	FT	FT	PT	PT	FT	PT	-	-
Lead Web Designer	PT	FT	FT	PT	-	-	-	-
Lead WordPress Developer	-	PT	FT	FT	FT	FT	PT	PT
PARC/Interactive Developer	-	-	FT	FT	-	-	-	-
Content Migration Specialist	PT	-	-	FT	FT	-	-	-
QA and Testing Lead	-	-	-	-	FT	FT	-	-
Training and Documentation	-	-	-	-	-	FT	FT	-
Technical Architect	PT	-	FT	PT	-	PT	-	-
Account Exec / Quality Dir	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	PT	-

FT = Full-time, PT = Part-time, - = Not engaged this month

Section 10: Key Recommendations

- 1. Lead with PARC, not with the platform.** The interactive PARC requirements are the most differentiating elements in the scope. Every competing firm will say they can build a WordPress site. Not every firm has built an interactive research map with podcast integration for a public utility. Open your experience section with the most relevant analogue you have, even if it is approximate. The evaluators for this RFP will respond to proposals that speak SPR's language.
- 2. Quantify your accessibility track record.** WCAG 2.2 AA compliance carries termination and indemnification consequences. A statement of intent means nothing. Show your testing methodology, name the audit tools you use (axe, WAVE, Deque), and provide a project example where you delivered a VPAT or signed compliance certificate to a government client.
- 3. Address the revision cycle question explicitly.** RFP Section 2.3.3 requires the firm to identify the number of revision cycles included for key deliverables. This is not a rhetorical question. Evaluators scoring the management approach section will look for a specific answer: how many rounds, for which deliverables, within what timeframes. Firms that omit this will score lower on the 40-point management criterion.
- 4. Name your sub-consultants or state clearly that none are proposed.** Any ambiguity about team composition is an evaluation risk. If you are using sub-consultants for interactive development, mapping, or accessibility auditing, name them and include their qualifications. If you are delivering all work with your own staff, say so explicitly.
- 5. Price for value, not for volume.** Cost is 20% of the score. A price 10% below the median will add roughly 2 points to a 100-point score. Those 2 points are unlikely to overcome a weaker experience or approach narrative. Price competitively within your cost floor, but do not discount to the point of creating delivery risk on a public contract with payment suspension clauses.
- 6. Acknowledge the dual-city governance in your approach.** SPR is jointly governed by Littleton and Englewood. Stakeholder interviews and workshops will likely involve staff from both municipalities. Proposals that acknowledge the multi-stakeholder environment and describe a workshop facilitation approach that accommodates multiple organizational cultures will score higher on project understanding.

Section 11: Remote vs On-Site Allocation

The solicitation does not mandate on-site presence for any specific role. Section 12 of the Draft Agreement states the firm's work will be conducted at its regular office, with City providing space where appropriate. The consultant must designate a PM as single point of contact and conduct weekly/bi-weekly status meetings, which can be virtual.

Role	Work Model	Duration	Feasibility of Remote	Notes
Project Manager	Hybrid	All phases	High; status meetings can be virtual	May need to attend key milestone reviews in-person at SPR office

Role	Work Model	Duration	Feasibility of Remote	Notes
UX/Accessibility Lead	Remote	Phases 1, 2, 4, 5	High	Stakeholder interviews and workshops can be conducted virtually or on-site; recommend on-site for initial discovery kickoff
Lead Web Designer	Remote	Phases 2, 3	High	Design review sessions can be conducted via screen share
Lead WordPress Developer	Remote	Phases 3-6, 8	High	All development work is off-site by nature
PARC/Interactive Developer	Remote	Phase 3	High	Coordinate closely with SPR PARC team; virtual meetings sufficient
Content Migration Specialist	Remote	Phases 1, 4	High	Requires access to SPR's existing CMS and analytics; remote access acceptable
QA and Testing Lead	Remote	Phase 5	High	All testing conducted on staging environment; no on-site requirement
Training and Documentation	On-site preferred	Phase 7	Medium; on-site preferred for training sessions	RFP requires WordPress training sessions for SPR staff prior to launch; on-site delivery more effective
Technical Architect	Remote	Phases 1, 3, 6	High	Architecture decisions can be made remotely; on-site for launch cutover recommended
Account Exec / Quality Director	Remote	All phases (oversight)	High	Quality reviews conducted on documents and deliverables; no on-site requirement

Cost, budget, pricing, and resourcing detail is omitted from this shared version. The complete pack is available under NDA.

Cost, budget, pricing, and resourcing detail is omitted from this shared version. The complete pack is available under NDA.

Section 15: Evaluation Criteria Analysis

Three evaluation factors carry all 100 points. Each is analyzed below with the scoring logic an evaluator will apply and the specific proposal strategy to maximize points.

Evaluation Factor	Weight	Subfactors	What a Winning Proposal Shows	What a Losing Proposal Typically Does
Experience and Technical Capability	Up to 40 pts	WordPress/CMS platform experience; municipal/public-sector website design; accessibility (WCAG 2.2 AA); content migration; microsite management; prior WRRF or utility experience	2-5 comparable projects with named clients, contact information, contract values, and timelines. Demonstrates accessibility compliance delivery (VPAT or certificate). Shows microsite architecture and CMS consolidation experience. Mentions water utility or government infrastructure clients.	Lists generic website projects without municipal context. Claims WCAG 'familiarity' without documented audit experience. Provides project descriptions with no contract values or client contacts. Fails to address microsite management as a distinct capability.
Project Understanding and Management Approach	Up to 40 pts	Understanding of SPR scope; proposed methodology; feedback and revision management; schedule with all 9 named milestones; team structure; sub-consultant qualifications; post-launch support approach	Addresses every milestone named in Section 2.3.4. Specifies revision cycle counts per deliverable. Acknowledges dual-city governance in stakeholder management approach. Describes PARC enhancement approach specifically. Provides a realistic schedule that includes City review and approval windows as named tasks.	Submits a generic digital transformation narrative without SPR-specific detail. Omits revision cycle count. Does not address PARC requirements. Provides a timeline with milestones but no City review periods. Does not mention dual-city governance.

Evaluation Factor	Weight	Subfactors	What a Winning Proposal Shows	What a Losing Proposal Typically Does
Price Proposal	Up to 20 pts	Best value relative to scope and demonstrated capability; itemized task costs; hourly rates for out-of-scope work; payment schedule	Provides a detailed cost breakdown by task with resource titles, hours, and rates. Includes clearly stated assumptions and exclusions. Offers tiered optional services pricing for ongoing support. Presents a milestone-based payment schedule tied to specific deliverables.	Provides a single lump-sum number without task-level breakdown. Omits hourly rates for out-of-scope work. Does not include payment schedule. Presents vague assumptions that give the City no basis for value assessment.

Section 16: Bidder Guidance Table

Category	Consideration	Step-by-Step Guide
Technical Readiness	WordPress expertise must be demonstrable, not implied	1. Identify 2-5 comparable WordPress municipal projects. 2. Gather client contacts and contract values. 3. Describe the hosting and architecture approach for SPR. 4. Explain your long-term scalability and independence strategy aligned to SPR's ownership requirement.
Compliance and Security	WCAG 2.2 AA and Colorado accessibility law compliance are contractual obligations with financial consequences	1. Name your accessibility testing tools and methodology. 2. Confirm ability to provide VPAT or written certificate within 30 days of request. 3. Describe your sprint-level accessibility process, not just pre-launch testing. 4. Address indemnification exposure in your pricing assumptions.
Stakeholder Engagement	SPR involves staff from both Englewood and Littleton plus a joint Supervisory Committee	1. Propose a structured discovery workshop that accommodates multi-organization participation. 2. Describe your approach to managing competing stakeholder priorities. 3. Identify how feedback from multiple stakeholders will be synthesized before design decisions are made.
Scalability	SPR wants a platform that reduces staff workload, not one that creates new dependencies	1. Describe how SPR staff will manage content independently after launch. 2. Explain the microsite architecture and how new microsites can be created without developer involvement. 3. Address how the platform handles future feature additions without full rebuilds.
Vendor Coordination	Sub-consultants must be disclosed and approved; all bound by Agreement obligations	1. Name all sub-consultants in the proposal. 2. Confirm each has been briefed on Agreement obligations including IP, confidentiality, and I-9 requirements. 3. Describe your sub-consultant oversight process.
User Experience	SPR's current site has known usability failures; the RFP is explicit about this	1. Reference the specific pain points described in Section 1.3 (navigation difficulty, microsite fragmentation, disconnected platforms). 2. Describe your UX research methodology for government utilities. 3. Address user personas and journey mapping as a deliverable, not a methodology.

Category	Consideration	Step-by-Step Guide
Budget Optimization	Price carries 20 points; best value, not lowest cost, is the stated criterion	1. Build a task-level cost breakdown with hours and rates. 2. Identify which tasks carry the highest risk of scope creep and build contingency there. 3. Price optional ongoing support separately so the core bid is not inflated by uncertain post-launch commitments.
Performance Benchmarks	No explicit SLAs are stated in the RFP, but testing and QA are named deliverables	1. Propose performance benchmarks (page load times, Core Web Vitals scores, Lighthouse accessibility scores) as part of your QA deliverable. 2. Commit to specific scores in the proposal; SPR evaluators will remember specific commitments. 3. Address mobile performance specifically given the responsive design requirement.
Communication and Reporting	Weekly or bi-weekly status meetings required per RFP Section 1.2	1. Describe your reporting format: will you use a dashboard, a status report, or a meeting deck? 2. Explain how decisions made in meetings will be documented. 3. Describe your written change request process, including turnaround time for written approvals.

Cost, budget, pricing, and resourcing detail is omitted from this shared version. The complete pack is available under NDA.

Cost, budget, pricing, and resourcing detail is omitted from this shared version. The complete pack is available under NDA.

Section 18: Submission Requirements

CRITICAL DEADLINE: June 16, 2026 at 2:00 PM Mountain Time (MT) **Method:** Electronic only (no physical copies accepted) **Late bid consequence:** Will not be considered; firm assumes full responsibility for timely upload **Technical Support:** (800) 835-4603, option 2 **Procurement Contact for 1:45 PM escalation:** Alyssa Hoffman, procurement@englewoodco.gov

#	Document	Mandatory	Format	Where It Goes	Status
1	Transmittal Letter (max 2 pages, firm letterhead, authorized signature)	Y	PDF	First document in proposal package; not counted in 10-page limit	Prepare
2	Table of Contents	Recommended	PDF	After transmittal letter; not counted in 10-page limit	Prepare
3	Part 1: Experience and Technical Capability	Y	PDF	Within 10-page narrative	Prepare
4	Part 2: Project Understanding and Management Approach	Y	PDF	Within 10-page narrative	Prepare
5	Part 3: Proposed Timeline	Y	PDF (may use 1-2 tri-fold pages from 10-page allowance)	Within 10-page narrative or as tri-fold exhibit	Prepare
6	Part 4: Price Proposal (separate PDF labeled 'Proposed Fee')	Y	Separate PDF	Separate upload; not counted in 10-page limit	Prepare
7	Part 5: Draft Agreement Review acknowledgement	Y	In Transmittal Letter	Transmittal Letter section	Note in cover letter
8	Part 6: Draft Statement of Work (Attachment C, completed in Word with Track Changes)	Y	MS Word (.docx)	Separate file upload; not counted in 10-page limit	Prepare
9	Appendix A: Completed Affidavit of Authenticity (Attachment D) with addenda acknowledgement	Y	PDF	Appendix section of proposal package	Sign and attach

#	Document	Mandatory	Format	Where It Goes	Status
10	Appendix B: Key Personnel Resumes (including sub-consultants)	Y	PDF	Appendix section; not counted in 10-page limit	Compile
11	Appendix C: Evidence of Ability to Obtain Insurance (letter or COI from insurer)	Y	PDF	Appendix section; not counted in 10-page limit	Obtain from insurer
12	Appendix D: Termination, Convictions, and Debarment disclosure for all Key Personnel	Y	PDF	Appendix section	Complete honestly
13	Addendum Acknowledgement (if addenda issued before June 16, 2026)	Y if applicable	In Affidavit of Authenticity	List addendum numbers and receipt dates on Affidavit	Monitor for addenda

Strategic Q&A; Questions Worth Submitting by May 26, 2026 at 4:00 PM MT

1. PARC Interactive Map: Are there existing GIS data layers or mapping datasets that SPR can provide for the interactive PARC project map, or will the consultant be responsible for building the dataset from scratch?

Rationale: The answer affects development scope and cost significantly. A firm that scopes this incorrectly in its price proposal risks a change order dispute post-award.

2. Hosting: Does SPR have an existing managed WordPress hosting relationship, or is the consultant expected to procure, configure, and transition hosting as part of this scope?

Rationale: Hosting setup is not explicitly scoped as a deliverable. Clarification prevents a cost exclusion argument at contract execution.

3. Revision Cycles: Can SPR confirm the expected number of revision rounds for homepage design, interior templates, and final development deliverables?

Rationale: The RFP asks proposers to state revision cycles; knowing SPR's expectation lets you align your proposal to avoid over- or under-scoping.

4. Content Volume: Approximately how many pages of content and how many documents (PDFs, files) are on the current SPR website?

Rationale: Migration complexity and cost scale directly with content volume. This question protects the bidder and the City against a scope gap.

5. Existing Platforms: Can SPR identify the current CMS or web platform(s) in use so that bidders can assess migration complexity?

Rationale: The RFP describes fragmented platforms but does not name them. Migration from certain legacy systems requires specialized tooling.

Section 19: Risk Register

#	Risk	Category	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation	Owner
1	Portal technical failure preventing timely upload	Submission	Low	Critical	Begin upload by 1:00 PM MT; have procurement agent's phone number ready; contact Vendor Support (800) 835-4603 option 2 immediately if issue arises; contact Alyssa Hoffman by 1:45 PM if unresolved	US Prime PM
2	Addendum issued June 2 changes scope or pricing assumptions materially	Scope	Medium	High	Monitor the procurement portal after May 26, 2026 for the final addendum; reassess price proposal and technical approach before June 16; acknowledge addendum in Affidavit of Authenticity	US Prime PM
3	WCAG 2.2 AA compliance failure post-launch triggers payment suspension	Compliance	Low-Medium	High	Integrate automated accessibility testing (axe, Deque) in every development sprint; conduct formal pre-launch audit (Phase 5); deliver VPAT or signed certificate; retain remediation capacity post-launch	UX/Accessibility Lead
4	Key personnel change between proposal submission and project execution	Team	Low	High	Name only personnel confirmed as available; communicate immediately in writing if change is required; propose a personnel of equal or greater qualifications for City approval	Account Exec / PM
5	WordPress plugin or third-party tool creates proprietary dependency	Technical	Medium	Medium	Use only GPL-licensed plugins; avoid proprietary page builder subscriptions; document all third-party dependencies in the technical architecture section of the proposal	Technical Architect
6	Content migration scope underestimated due to unknown content volume	Scope/Cost	Medium	Medium	Submit Q&A; question about content volume before May 26 deadline; include a stated content volume assumption in price proposal assumptions; price migration as a separate line item	Content Migration Specialist

#	Risk	Category	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation	Owner
7	Distributed sub-consultant not approved by City before commencing work	Compliance/Legal	Low	High	Disclose all distributed sub-consultants in the proposal; obtain City approval at contract execution; do not assign distributed tasks until written approval received	US Prime PM
8	Dual-city governance causes stakeholder disagreements delaying approvals	Schedule	Medium	Medium	Propose a joint kickoff workshop with representatives from both Englewood and Littleton; document stakeholder decision authority in the RACI matrix submitted in the management approach	PM
9	PARC interactive features require data that SPR cannot provide at project start	Scope	Medium	Medium	Submit Q&A; question about PARC data availability before May 26; price PARC map development with a stated data provision assumption; include a change order trigger if data is not provided within 4 weeks of kickoff	PM / PARC Developer
10	City exercises 30-day convenience termination after significant work has been performed	Contract	Low	High	Structure the payment schedule to recover costs in early milestones; avoid front-loading overhead in later-phase tasks; ensure each milestone payment reflects the work performed to that date	Account Exec
11	Accessibility indemnification claim arising from third-party complaint post-launch	Legal	Low	Very High	WCAG 2.2 AA compliance is a contractual obligation with indemnification exposure; maintain professional liability/E&O; insurance at \$1M minimum; retain accessibility documentation for the full contract period	UX/Accessibility Lead / Account Exec
12	Proposal disqualified for non-responsive format (font size, page count, missing appendix)	Submission	Low	Critical	Conduct a format compliance check 24 hours before submission deadline; verify page count, font size, all appendices present, all signatures in place, addenda acknowledged	US Prime PM

Section 20: IT, Cyber, and Digital Strategy

This solicitation requires a publicly accessible, WordPress-based website for a water resource recovery facility that is critical public infrastructure. The IT strategy implications are significant even though the RFP does not invoke an explicit cybersecurity framework.

WordPress security is a real and specific vulnerability class for government websites. Any proposal that does not address it invites an evaluator question about whether the firm understands the risk profile of the platform it is proposing. Address the following directly:

- Plugin management policy: commit to using only actively maintained, GPL-licensed plugins with documented security histories. Name the plugin audit process you will use before deployment.
- Hosting architecture: recommend managed WordPress hosting (e.g., Pantheon, WP Engine, or comparable government-grade managed hosting) with automatic core updates, daily backups, and WAF (web application firewall) included.
- Content Security Policy (CSP) headers: describe how you will configure CSP headers to protect against cross-site scripting attacks on a site that will embed third-party tools including translation services, mapping APIs, and podcast players.
- CMS administrator credentials: SPR staff will be trained to manage content. Your proposal should address user role configuration, password policy, two-factor authentication for admin accounts, and the process for revoking access when staff leave.
- VPAT and accessibility: while WCAG compliance is about user accessibility, it intersects with IT strategy because accessible code is also more structured and less vulnerable to certain injection attacks. Frame accessibility work as both a compliance and a security posture.
- Data residency: the solicitation does not specify data residency requirements, but for a Colorado municipal entity, proposing USA-based hosting is a straightforward risk reduction measure worth stating explicitly.

Analyst assessment: The firm that wins this bid will not win on IT security messaging alone. But the firm that loses because an evaluator asked 'what is your WordPress security approach' and found no answer in the proposal will regret the omission. Address it in half a page and move on.