
**THIS ADDENDUM SHALL BECOME A PART OF THE SOLICITATION
AND MUST BE ACKNOWLEDGED**

Request for Proposal RFP-25-051 – Digital Accessibility Consulting Project - dated May 5, 2025

CLARIFICATIONS:

- 1. RFP Response Submission Deadline has been extended to Wednesday, June 4, 2025 at 2:00PM.**

El Paso County will only accept electronic bid proposals submitted through the Rocky Mountain E-Purchasing system. A Submittal Log will be posted after the County has had an opportunity to review and verify the submittals offered to the County.

The original Offer must be received before the due date and time through an electronic package transmitted through the Rocky Mountain E-Purchasing system. The Vendor is responsible for ensuring its Response is posted in its entirety by the due date and time outlined in the solicitation document. No allowances will be provided to those Vendors whose submittal is not uploaded prior to the due date and time outlined in the solicitation.

If the submittal arrives late and/or is not uploaded in its entirety, it will not be included in the electronic lockbox.

ADMINISTRATION:

- The question period has expired
- Responses should follow the Response Format on pages 7-8 and include all responses to all mandatory requirements.
- We will be verifying submittals include the following:
 - Submittal properly acknowledged (Cover Sheet)
 - Addendum(s) Acknowledged
 - Required Documentation
 - Evaluation Criteria Documentation
 - Submission Form
 - Completed W9
 - Pricing Form

If a submittal is missing any of the above-mentioned documentation the submittal may be returned to the vendor as non-responsive and be deemed ineligible to participate.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS:

1. Can the County provide a list or inventory of all public-facing and internal websites, mobile applications, and digital tools intended to be included in this assessment?
 - a. 15 public-facing websites and 2 internal websites.

2. What criteria will the County use to define “essential information or services” for the subset of web pages to be tested? Will these be pre-selected by the County or should the consultant propose a methodology?
 - a. After the consultant reviews the risk for essential information or services for the County, the consultant can propose a methodology. The proposed methodology will then be reviewed by County leadership.
3. Are kiosk systems, standalone software, or specialized internal platforms (e.g., intranet tools, emergency systems) considered in scope for accessibility evaluation under this project?
 - a. Potentially, yes. If not, a risk assessment would be valuable to set a foundation for what systems create the most risk.
4. Can we assume that testing of all web content should be done to WCAG 2.1 Level AA to conform with both OIT and DOJ requirements even though WCAG 2.2 is currently being adopted by some jurisdictions?
 - a. Yes, testing of all web content should be conducted to WCAG 2.1 Level AA to conform with OIT and DOJ.
5. What accessibility standard should be used for non-web technologies, such as standalone software and hardware? For instance, should the consultant follow the Section 508 requirements or EN 301-549, even though the County is not subject to either of these requirements?
 - a. Non-web technologies should follow Section 508 or EN 301-549.
6. For PDF remediation, would you like the consultant to help perform day-to-day remediation or help the County identify the most effective solution from different vendors?
 - a. To identify the most effective solution from different vendors for large batch remediation.
7. Has the County established a digital accessibility committee that includes members of the County’s procurement, legal, IT, and ADA teams to ensure that the County has support from key stakeholders? If not, would the County desire assistance in establishing this committee and ensuring leadership buy-in?
 - a. Yes, we’d greatly value insight into establishing a committee and ensuring leadership buy-in.
8. Will the County assist with outreach to third-party vendors whose products require remediation, or is the Consultant expected to initiate that contact directly?
 - a. The county will assist. We do not anticipate the consultant will work directly with vendors.
9. Who will own and maintain the Roadmap once the project ends? Will the Consultant be expected to create a living document with templates and update processes?
 - a. The Roadmap will live with the Accessibility & Compliance Webmaster or respective areas in the county. Templates and processes will be updated by the county.
10. What form does the County’s “existing training” take, and how long is it? Is it documented?
 - a. In person, virtual and asynchronous have been the primary methods of training. However, it’s been limited in scope. Documentation has not yet been established as a requirement for all County staff.
11. How many County staff members are expected to receive digital accessibility training? Will sessions be tailored by department, role, or system (e.g., CMS editors vs. procurement staff)?
 - a. Preferred to have general overview training on digital accessibility for all El Paso County staff members. There will also need to be tailored training for departments that will be part of the compliance process (CMS editors and procurement staff).
12. Is providing training within the scope of this project if the Consultant determines that the County’s existing training is insufficient? If so, is the County seeking in-person training, live virtual sessions, recorded modules, or a combination? Should the Consultant build a reusable training library?
 - a. In this instance, preferred recorded modules that could be used as a training library.
13. Does the County have a Title II ADA Coordinator? Will they be involved in this process?
 - a. Title II ADA Coordinator will be brought into the process as deemed appropriate.

14. Does this training need to be customized to the specific CMS technologies? For instance, if a lesson is about providing alt text for images, does the training need to include screenshots and step-by-step instructions specific to that CMS?
 - a. It would be beneficial for our CMS technologies to be used for training to assist with clarity, however it is not mandatory.
15. Will the County expect follow-up support or “office hours” after training delivery to assist with implementation and questions?
 - a. No, this can be handled by the County’s Accessibility & Compliance Webmaster.
16. Does the County have existing processes for review of content before publication? In addition to a review process, would the County like the vendor to create checklists for content creators to ensure that they have fulfilled their accessibility responsibilities?
 - a. At this time, there are no known processes for review of content before publication. The creation of checklist for content creators would be invaluable.
17. Does the County have existing accessibility clauses in procurement documents that need revision, or will the Consultant be expected to develop those from scratch?
 - a. The procurement department already has an existing accessibility clause. They will more than likely need revision.
18. If the Consultant believes a procurement process to be insufficient, does the County want the Consultant to develop an improved procurement process? Also, does the County want the Consultant to further validate that process?
 - a. Yes, if the consultant believes the procurement process is insufficient, an improved process would be expected from the consultant. Further validation of the process would be appreciated if appropriate.
19. The first sentence is unclear because “determining the appropriate level of information and services provided digitally” is not related to the County’s compliance with digital accessibility laws.
 - a. Roadmap deliverables #4 is essentially stating the consultant should, as part of the roadmap, make recommendations on improving or creating processes to the appropriate WCAG 2.1 AA level standard for any and all digitally provided information.
20. Does the County want the Consultant’s support to gain approval by County leadership of the Roadmap for implementation by the different agencies and departments in the County?
 - a. Yes, support for Roadmap implementation would be required.
21. Does the County also want other communications plans, such as to County leadership?
 - a. This is a possibility dependent on the outlined risk associated with various needs in the county.
22. Does the County have existing escalation plans for other ADA areas like documentation and approval of undue burden requests?
 - a. Yes. However, these plans are currently under review.
23. Can the County provide an inventory or estimate of the number and types of digital assets that fall within the scope of this project? Specifically: • - Number of public-facing websites or portals • - Number of internal platforms or intranet tools • - Number of digital documents (e.g., PDFs) in active use • - Number of CMS platforms in operation • - Are any high-risk/high-traffic pages or services already prioritized?
 - a. Not at this time.
24. Are there preferred tools, platforms, or methods the County expects for conducting accessibility audits (e.g., Axe, WAVE, JAWS, NVDA)?
 - a. We currently use Microsoft suite products, Continual Engine PREP, Siteimprove, Accessibility Insights for Web, ANDI, NVDA, WAVE, LightHouse, Screaming Frog SEO Spider. However if the consultant uses another option that is superior, we welcome the advice/knowledge on accessibility tools.

25. Will the Consultant be expected to conduct only sample-based assessments, or will a full review of all digital assets be required?
 - a. A full review of assets would be preferred.
26. Has any recent internal or external accessibility assessment been completed? If so, can that report be shared?
 - a. This is a work in progress.
27. Approximately how many County departments/divisions will the Consultant engage with throughout the project?
 - a. At least five main departments/divisions; the remaining will be cursory, the Accessibility & Compliance Webmaster will conduct most of the communication.
28. How many staff members are expected to receive training during the project term?
 - a. It is preferred to have recorded modules that could be used as a training library.
29. Does the County have a preference for training delivery formats (e.g., in-person, live virtual sessions, asynchronous/on-demand modules)?
 - a. It is preferred to have recorded modules that could be used as a training library.
30. Will training be targeted at content creators, IT/technical staff, or administrative leadership—or all groups?
 - a. Preferred to have general overview training on digital accessibility for all El Paso County staff members. There will also need to be tailored training for departments that will be part of the compliance process (CMS editors and procurement staff).
31. To what extent is the Consultant expected to perform actual remediation of digital content versus advising and equipping County staff or vendors to do so? Will the Consultant be expected to directly interact with third-party vendors to coordinate remediation and obtain compliance attestations?
 - a. The consultant will not be expected to remediate digital content; consultant will be expected to be an advisor. The consultant will not be expected to directly interact with third-party vendors.
32. Will the County require the Consultant to provide cost and resource estimates related to third-party vendor remediation as part of the Roadmap? Is there a preferred format or required structure for the Digital Accessibility Roadmap deliverables?
 - a. Estimates will be required. There is no preferred format for Roadmap deliverables.
33. Can the County confirm whether blended rate pricing is acceptable, or should pricing be structured by task and/or by labor category?
 - a. Pricing should be structured and broken down by task. On-call rate sheet should be broken down by labor category.
34. Will the County reimburse reasonable travel expenses separately, or must all travel be built into the fixed fee?
 - a. Must be built into the fixed fee.
35. Are contingency or optional line items for potential change in scope permitted in the pricing proposal?
 - a. No, please provide pricing based on the specifications and tasks outlined in the RFP.
36. Please provide a list of internal digital products, including URLs, for the purposes of scoping. If these systems are gated, please provide test credentials. In lieu of that, please provide an estimated count of unique pages/screens (pages/screens with unique functionality or code) plus examples.
 - a. This is not allowable due to security protocols.
37. Please provide a list of external digital products, including links to those products. For each, clarify whether functionality is out-of-the-box or to what extent workflows/screens are customized by El Paso.
 - a. This is a work in progress.
38. Please provide a count of electronic documents in scope by type (e.g., PDF, PowerPoint, Excel, Word) and sample files for each. Please clarify how many documents of each are active/in-use versus those that may

be considered archival content (documents which are not in active use and may only be minorly updated for things such as redacting information).

- a. The county website contains roughly 5013 PDFs, 193 Excel, 185 Word, 1 PowerPoint, and 22 Zip Archive files, currently on the site. According to a recent site crawl, these documents are all in active use. Each file ranges in complexity which depends on the department they originate from within the county. Some PDFs may be flyers for events while others may be multi-page site plans with maps, tables, and complex diagrams.
39. What is your primary CMS?
- a. WordPress is currently the primary CMS.
40. Please describe the team roles and headcount for individuals supporting El Paso County's digital presence? Include roles like procurement, customer support, or leadership. This question will help drive roadmap and training consideration.
- a. The county has various website editors responsible for web content across the county. The number responsible varies by department/office. An overall headcount would be roughly 82 individuals that would span the following departments: Assessor, Administration (Government Affairs, Communications, Human Resources, Digital, Strategy & Technology, Economic Development, Facilities Management, Finance, Procurement) Clerk & Recorder, County Attorney, Coroner, BoCC, Human Services, Justice Services, Community Services (Parks), Public Works, Retirement, Surveyor, Treasurer, Planning and Community Development.
41. At a high-level, please describe the current accessibility processes in place across content creation, procurement, policy development and enforcement, and similar areas.
- a. The consultant would assist in accessing areas of risk and recommending processes to implement across the county.
42. Accessibility roadmaps may vary in terms of detail. Who would be the primary recipients of the roadmap, and what details or information would make the roadmap most valuable and actionable?
- a. County Administrators, Executive Directors and Information and Security Compliance, and the Accessibility & Compliance Webmaster.
43. What are the primary knowledge gaps, both collectively and by role?
- a. Risk associated with the law, support necessary to achieve and maintain requirements set forth by HB21-1110 and Section 508, training on why digital accessibility is important and how it impacts every employee. This includes understanding the legal requirements, implementation processes, and the broader organizational impact. This is an overall collective snapshot of knowledge gaps.
44. How would El Paso envision an optimal training approach? For instance, does El Paso county have an internal learning management system with which content could be hosted? Does El Paso County envision training as intensive to establish core internal competence, or lighter augmentation to existing roles?
- a. A collective approach would be to have module-based learning or videos that could be used as a training library. County Administrators and Executive Directors would require in-person training and support tailored to their respective areas of expertise in addition to the module-based or video training library. Training would be considered a core internal competence.
45. What tools does El Paso County currently use to support content creation, testing, project management, and similar tasks?
- a. This varies by department; however, basic tools include Microsoft Office suite of programs, Adobe, SharePoint, Stream, Visio, Whiteboard, OneNote, Lists, Outlook.
46. What tools does EL Paso County use specifically for digital accessibility?
- a. Microsoft suite products, Continual Engine PREP, Siteimprove, Accessibility Insights for Web, ANDI, NVDA, WAVE, LightHouse, Screaming Frog SEO Spider.
47. Can we utilize subcontractors for this opportunity?
- a. Are we allowed to use the experience, past performance, and references of our subcontractors?

- i. Yes. Identify all subcontractors and/or subconsultants in RFP response. Summarize all qualifications, licensing, and training for Key Personnel and the Firm's capabilities, experience, and portion of the work to be performed.
 - b. Can we include private sector experience and references, or is public sector experience mandatory?
 - i. The County prefers government and public sector references but will accept other relevant experience.
 - c. Are we permitted to bid on this opportunity as a joint venture?
 - i. Yes. The County intends the contracting process to provide equal opportunity and joint ventures are encouraged.
 - d. Are there any specific font size, style, or margin requirements for preparing the proposals?
 - i. Please see section V (Response Format): To facilitate an effective evaluation process, responses must be submitted on 8.5 x 11-inch paper with a minimum font of 10, and all pages should be numbered in the following manner: page__of__ pages with a maximum of fifty (50) pages.
 - e. What is the required nomenclature or naming convention for the files that need to be submitted?
 - i. There is no requirement for a naming convention.
 - f. Is there an estimated budget for this project?
 - i. The anticipated budget is \$90,000 - \$120,000.
 - g. Apart from the information mentioned in Section V: Response Format, are there any other requirements we need to include in our proposal?
 - i. If your organization will be providing any type of digital programs to assist with the process, an Accessibility Conformance Report (ACR) or Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) will need to be provided.
 - h. Is there any local preference for vendors?
 - i. No local preference.
 - i. How many vendors does the county plan to award for this opportunity?
 - i. The County anticipates awarding to one vendor.
 - j. Is any registration or certification required to participate in the bid?
 - i. Specific certification as a Certified Professional in Accessibility Core Principals (CPACP) would be beneficial but is not required. There is no preference outlined for local subconsultants.
48. How many public-facing websites and web applications does the County maintain?
- a. 17 public-facing websites; 2 internal sites
49. Approximately how many internal and external digital assets (web pages, PDFs, forms) are in use and expected to be reviewed or remediated?
- a. The county website contains roughly 5013 PDFs, 193 Excel, 185 Word, 1 PowerPoint, and 22 Zip Archive files, currently on the site. According to a recent site crawl, these documents are all in active use. Each file ranges in complexity which depends on the department they originate from within the county. Some PDFs may be flyers for events while others may be multi-page site plans with maps, tables, and complex diagrams. Much of the remediation will be completed by county departments or an external vendor.
50. Will the consultant be doing actual remediation, or just providing guidance?
- a. The consultant will be providing guidance.
51. How many County staff will require training? And are there specific departments or roles (e.g., content creators, IT, procurement) that require tailored training, or will it be tailored towards all staff?
- a. A collective approach would be to have module-based learning or videos that could be used as a training library. County Administrators and Executive Directors would require in-person training and support tailored to their respective areas of expertise in addition to the module-based or video training library.
52. What training formats are preferred (live, recorded, LMS-based)?
- a. It is preferred to have recorded modules that could be used as a training library.
53. What is the desired project timeline or expected end date?

- a. The anticipated completion date is December 31, 2025. Please provide project timeline in your response.
54. Does the County currently use any accessibility testing or document remediation tools? What are they?
- a. Microsoft suite products, Continual Engine PREP, Siteimprove, Accessibility Insights for Web, ANDI, NVDA, WAVE, LightHouse, Screaming Frog SEO Spider.
55. Regarding the existing training for HB21-1110, are the training materials available to review before bidding?
- a. This is a work in progress.
56. Regarding the "Procedural and Policy Requirements" are these required as part of the deliverables?
- a. Yes, items found under Procedural and Policy Requirements are required.
57. The RFP mentions: "Create a messaging strategy for achieving buy-in from County leadership (including the IT Department, Legal, and Procurement) to create a virtual team to coordinate HB21-1110 collaboration." and "Develop a risk-based IT deployment and procurement process to ensure that procurements meet business needs while also achieving compliance with the Office of Information and Technology (OIT) Accessibility Rule." Kindly elaborate on what is expected here. What are the obstacles with the buy-in currently?
- a. One of the primary challenges to achieving full buy-in is a limited understanding of the requirements and potential risks associated with non-compliance under HB21-1110. This legislation establishes statewide digital accessibility standards for public entities, aligning with federal Section 508 guidelines and requiring conformance with WCAG 2.1 AA standards.
- The bill encompasses a broad range of digital systems, including websites, documents, and internal platforms. To support successful implementation, it is important to continue educating staff and leadership on what the law entails, why it matters, and how non-compliance could impact the County. Enhanced communication and training will be key in building shared understanding and long-term support.
58. How was the budget range determined?
- a. The budget range is established based on the availability of appropriated funds.
59. Is there a page limit for preparing the proposal?
- a. To facilitate an effective evaluation process, responses must be submitted on 8.5 x 11-inch paper with a minimum font of 10, and all pages should be numbered in the following manner: page__of__ pages with a maximum of fifty (50) pages.
60. Can we utilize multiple subcontractors for this proposal?
- a. Yes. Identify all subcontractors and/or subconsultants in RFP response. Summarize all qualifications, licensing, and training for Key Personnel and the Firm's capabilities, experience, and portion of the work to be performed.
61. Can we bid as both a prime contractor and a subcontractor simultaneously with different vendors?
- a. Yes, you may submit as both the prime and subcontractor.
62. Is there a diversity certification or diversity goal required for this opportunity?
- a. No diversity certification or goals are associated with this solicitation.
63. Can the county provide an estimate of the number of digital assets (e.g., websites, web pages, PDFs, applications) that require assessment or remediation?
- a. The county website contains roughly 5013 PDFs, 193 Excel, 185 Word, 1 PowerPoint, and 22 Zip Archive files, currently on the site. According to a recent site crawl, these documents are all in active use. Each file ranges in complexity which depends on the department they originate from within the county. Some PDFs may be flyers for events while others may be multi-page site plans with maps, tables, and complex diagrams. Much of the remediation will be completed by county departments. The county has 17 active websites with 10,000+ pages and 44+ platforms (and growing) 3 internal websites and well as numerous applications.

64. For the subset of pages to be tested for essential information or services (Page 5, Item 3), what is the expected sample size or selection criteria?
- To be determined, however, the sample will more than likely be randomized.
65. Approximately how many PDFs require remediation, and what is the typical complexity (e.g., text-heavy, forms, scanned documents)?
- The county website contains roughly 5013 PDFs, 193 Excel, 185 Word, 1 PowerPoint, and 22 Zip Archive files, currently on the site.
66. Are there specific tools or platforms currently used by the county for PDF creation or management that the consultant should consider?
- The county is currently utilizing Adobe and Continue Engine PREP for document remediation.
67. What is the county's primary CMS platform, and are there known accessibility issues or vendor support details available?
- The current CMS platform is WordPress.
68. Can the county provide details about the existing HB21-1110 training program (e.g., format, audience, content, frequency) to clarify the scope of refinement needed?
- This is a work in progress.
69. What is the expected number of staff to be trained, and are there preferences for training delivery (e.g., in-person, virtual, hybrid)?
- A collective approach would be to have module-based learning or videos that could be used as a training library. County Administrators and Executive Directors would require in-person training and support tailored to their respective areas of expertise in addition to the module-based or video training library.
70. Are there any restrictions or preferences regarding the number or type of subconsultants that can be utilized for this project?
- No restrictions on the type or number of subcontractors / subconsultants.
71. Does the county have a preference for local subconsultants or those with specific certifications?
- Specific certification as a Certified Professional in Accessibility Core Principals (CPACP) would be beneficial but is not required. There is no preference outlined for local subconsultants.
72. Does the county require or prefer any diversity certifications (e.g., MBE, WBE, DBE) for the consultant or subconsultants?
- No diversity certifications or goals are required.
73. Are there specific diversity or inclusion goals for this project that should be addressed in the proposal?
- No.
74. What is the estimated number of third-party vendors managing digital technologies that the consultant will need to contact for remediation?
- It is not anticipated for the consultant to work directly with third-party vendors. The consultant will work directly with the County's procurement team on processes.
75. What is the preferred format or level of detail for accessibility documentation (e.g., VPAT, ACR)? Should these be included in the proposal or provided later?
- Yes, a VPAT or ACR should be included as part of the proposal.
76. Is a demonstration recording of accessibility conformance required as part of the proposal submission, or is it optional?
- The County has the option to request a demonstration as part of the evaluation process if in the best interest of the County.
77. Can the county provide preferred milestones or interim deliverables for the project timeline (e.g., completion of assessments, delivery of the Digital Accessibility Roadmap)?

- a. A plan of deliverables will be developed by the Accessibility & Compliance Webmaster in conjunction with the consultant.
78. Are there critical deadlines within the contract period (June 25, 2025–December 31, 2025) that the consultant should prioritize?
- a. None specified at this time.
79. Are there specific compliance risks or past issues the county wants the consultant to focus on?
- a. The County would like for the consultant to assist the county in analyzing risk and creating plans on how to mitigate those risks.
80. Does the county have preferred or existing tools for accessibility testing, scanning, or compliance monitoring that the consultant should integrate into recommendations?
- a. The main accessibility testing tools being utilized by the County are Siteimprove and Continual Engine PREP. Other website scanning tools are being utilized on a quarterly basis such as Accessibility Insights for Web, Screaming Frog SEO Spider, ANDI, NVDA, WAVE, LightHouse.
81. Are there restrictions on recommending proprietary systems or software, given the county's stance on not committing to specific systems (Page 6, Item 8)?
- a. While consultants may recommend proprietary systems, they must also present alternative options. Additionally, the County is under no obligation to use the consultant's proprietary systems or software as a result of engaging in their services.
82. Are there specific certifications or qualifications (e.g., CPACC, WAS, Trusted Tester) that the county prioritizes for key personnel?
- a. Specific certification as a Certified Professional in Accessibility Core Principals (CPACP) would be beneficial but is not required. There is no preference outlined for local subconsultants.
83. How many key personnel are expected to be assigned to the project, and is there a preference for their roles (e.g., project manager, accessibility specialist)?
- a. Dependent on the scope of findings from the consultants' assessments.
84. What is the expected format and frequency of the weekly meetings with county staff (Page 5, Item 1), and who are the primary county stakeholders involved?
- a. Weekly meetings will primarily take place between the consultant and the County's Accessibility & Compliance Webmaster. When other meetings are necessary, those meetings will take place with department heads and leadership. The Accessibility & Compliance Webmaster will be involved in those meetings alongside the consultant.
85. Will the county provide templates or guidelines for deliverables like the Digital Accessibility Roadmap or training materials?
- a. Yes, templates can be made available.
86. Is there an incumbent for this contract or project?
- a. There is no incumbent, first time soliciting these services.
87. Is there a budget defined for this project?
- a. The anticipated budget is \$90,000 - \$120,000.
88. What forms of existing training does the City have in place and anticipate needing support with?
- a. Limited to none. A collective approach would be to have module-based learning or videos that could be used as a training library. County Administrators and Executive Directors would require in-person training and support tailored to their respective areas of expertise in addition to the module-based or video training library.
89. Has the City already completed an inventory of their external and/or internal digital assets that might fall under this scope?
- a. Yes, but that inventory may need to be updated.

90. Are there specific cost categories (e.g., travel, tools) that should be itemized separately in the pricing form?
- No. Please break down costs based on the tasks outlined in RFP specifications.
91. How much existing accessibility knowledge does the City's project team have in accessibility?
- County's Accessibility & Compliance Webmaster is the subject matter expert (SME) for the county. All other areas of the county defer to the SME for digital accessibility knowledge.
92. Does the City have an internal development team/s that will be handling remediation?
- Yes.
93. Is the CMS assessment expected to include a full audit, or is it limited to identifying barriers and coordinating with the vendor?
- A full audit would be beneficial, however, identifying barriers and coordination with the vendor would be of utmost importance.
94. Is there an estimate of the types of PDF documents (fillable forms, basic text content, etc) that will need remediation?
- The county website contains roughly 5013 PDFs, 193 Excel, 185 Word, 1 PowerPoint, and 22 Zip Archive files, currently on the site. According to a recent site crawl, these documents are all in active use. Each file ranges in complexity which depends on the department they originate from within the county. Some PDFs may be flyers for events while others may be multi-page site plans with maps, tables, and complex diagrams. Much of the remediation will be completed by county departments.
95. Is there any physical ICT that the City anticipates needing in-person testing for?
- No, not at this time.
96. Does all work have to be performed in the U.S.?
- No, the consultant can work from wherever is convenient. However, all work with county staff will be performed during business hours MST (8am-5pm).
97. Is the proposed budget for the June 25, 2025 - December 31, 2025 initial contract term, or for the entirety of the deliverables, which could include work performed within the 4 one-year extension period's budget?
- The anticipated budget is for the initial contract term and the deliverables outlined in the RFP specifications.
98. What is the date of the current ICT assessment?
- Do not have that information at this time. A new assessment will need to be completed.
99. Does the County have an accessibility plan for ICT? If so, can the County provide a copy?
- This is work that is in progress.
100. Can the County provide an inventory of the digital assets that are in scope? If possible, the following information would be helpful. -Approximate size (e.g., number of pages) -Type (website, web application, desktop application, or mobile app) -Whether it is public facing or internal -Whether or not an accessibility assessment has previously been performed on the asset.
- Not at this time.
101. What kind of accessibility training has County staff already received?
- Limited to none currently due to the creation of training documentation.
102. Does the County currently have any staff members whose primary job duties are accessibility compliance or remediation?
- Yes, the Accessibility & Compliance Webmaster.
103. Does the County currently use any kind of ticketing system to track accessibility issues?
- The county has implemented a request system and is working with our IT department to see if requests can be integrated into our ticketing system.

104. We noticed what appears to be an inconsistency in the insurance requirements that we'd like to bring to your attention. In Attachment A, Commercial General Liability is marked as "Waived," while Automobile Liability is marked as "Required." However, the minimum insurance requirements write "El Paso County must be included on the General Liability insurance as an additional insured". And the Sample Professional Services require both types of insurance.

- a. Commercial General Liability coverage has been waived from this solicitation. The Sample Professional Services agreement is for reference only. A final negotiated agreement will be updated to reflect the requirements outlined in the RFP.

Signature below indicates that applicant has read all the information provided above and agrees to comply in full. This addendum is considered as a section of the Request for Proposal and therefore, this signed document shall become considered and fully submitted with the original package.

PRINT OR TYPE YOUR INFORMATION

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Company Name: _____ | Fax: _____ |
| Address: _____ | City/State/Zip: _____ |
| Contact Person: _____ | Title: _____ |
| Email: _____ | Phone: _____ |
| Authorized Representative's Signature: _____ | Date: _____ |
| Printed Name: _____ | Title: _____ |
| Email: _____ | Phone: _____ |