



FAQ

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 07-26)

MUNICIPAL AND TOURISM WEBSITE; CODE ENFORCEMENT SOFTWARE

Date of Issue: July 22, 2026

To: All Prospective Proposers

The City of Walterboro has received questions from prospective proposers regarding RFP 07-26. The questions and the City's responses are provided below and are being distributed to all firms that received the RFP to ensure a fair and consistent process. Where questions were substantially similar, they have been consolidated.

Please note that the City has issued Addendum No. 1 to this RFP, which (1) extends the proposal due date to 2:00 p.m., August 7, 2026, and (2) revises the Content Management System Requirements to permit proposals recommending either open-source or proprietary platforms, provided the required disclosures regarding content ownership, licensing costs, and export provisions are included. Proposers shall acknowledge receipt of Addendum No. 1 in their proposal submissions.

SECTION A — ELIGIBILITY, SUBMISSION, AND EVALUATION

Q1. Are firms located outside of South Carolina, including firms based outside the United States (for example, in Canada or Pakistan), eligible to submit proposals? Are there international compliance or registration requirements?

A. All proposers, regardless of location, must be able to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and must complete required tax documentation upon award. Foreign firms should identify their tax and registration status in their Statement of Basic Qualifications.

Q2. What state license is required?

A. The RFP does not mandate a specific license. The Statement of Basic Qualifications should include any federal or state license applicable to the proposer's business and the services offered. Proposers are responsible for identifying and maintaining any licenses or registrations required by law to perform the work.

Q3. Is South Carolina municipal experience a mandatory qualification, or a preferred/scored evaluation factor? Will equivalent experience with public agencies in other states, or federal contracting experience, receive full consideration?

A. South Carolina municipal experience is not a mandatory threshold qualification. The RFP asks firms to describe their background and experience with a focus on South Carolina municipalities, and municipal references are preferred. Experience delivering a similar scope of services to other public-sector clients, including municipalities in other states and federal



FAQ

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 07-26)

MUNICIPAL AND TOURISM WEBSITE; CODE ENFORCEMENT SOFTWARE

agencies, will be considered; however, directly relevant South Carolina municipal experience may be weighed favorably in evaluation. All responsive proposals will receive full consideration.

Q4. Are four municipal references mandatory, or only preferred?

A. Four references are required. Municipal references are preferred but not mandatory; firms should provide their four most relevant references, including email and telephone contact information.

Q5. Is there a local vendor preference, or a preference for vendors holding particular certifications? Will local vendors receive higher weights in scoring?

A. Per City of Walterboro Code of Ordinances Sec. 2-251, a local vendor preference does apply to this procurement. "Local" is defined as a business physically located and operating within the City of Walterboro or Colleton County. Qualifying local vendors receive a percentage deduction from their total evaluated score (not price alone), on a sliding scale based on the contract value, with City-based vendors receiving a slightly higher preference than County-based vendors. To claim this preference, a vendor must complete the local preference application process, demonstrate a physical office within the City/County for at least one year (or a City business license held more than 90 days, for the city-level preference), and submit proof of applicable local tax/fee payment with their proposal. There is no separate scoring preference for holding particular certifications under this ordinance.

Q6. May proposals be submitted electronically, or are the four sealed physical copies the only accepted submission method?

A. No. As stated in Section 3 of the RFP, four (4) sealed copies must be physically delivered to the Tourism Director and Main Street Manager at 242 Hampton Street, Walterboro, SC 29488, no later than 2:00 p.m., August 7, 2026. Electronic submissions will not be accepted.

Q7. Does the City have a target budget or not-to-exceed amount for this engagement, including the website rebuild for both sites, the code enforcement software, and ongoing support?

A. The City has not published a budget or not-to-exceed amount for this engagement. As outlined in the Proposal Requirements, firms should describe their fee structure and rates for services; comparative examples and fee ranges are encouraged. Cost will be considered as part of a best-value evaluation.



FAQ

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 07-26)

MUNICIPAL AND TOURISM WEBSITE; CODE ENFORCEMENT SOFTWARE

Q8. Does the City have a desired launch or completion date?

A. The City has not established a fixed launch date. Firms should propose a realistic milestone schedule as described in the Proposal Requirements, including target dates for stakeholder interviews, design mockups and approvals, development and migration, code enforcement software integration and testing, soft launch, and final launch, and should highlight dependencies and potential delays.

SECTION B — CURRENT WEBSITE ENVIRONMENT

Q9. What platforms are walterborosc.org and visitwalterborosc.org currently built on, and who hosts them today?

A. VC3 (walterborosc.org) and Revize (visitwalterborosc.org.)

Q10. What API integrations and plugins are currently in use on each site?

A. Neither walterborosc.org nor visitwalterborosc.org currently uses any API integrations or plugins. Firms should not assume any existing third-party integrations need to be carried forward; any integrations proposed for the new sites should be identified in the proposal along with their rationale and any associated licensing or subscription costs.

Q11. Is there an existing website vendor or hosting contract the City needs the selected firm to account for in the transition?

A. No.

Q12. Approximately how many pages, documents, news articles, and media assets need to be migrated across both sites?

A. Firms may review the live sites to estimate scope and that final migration scope will be confirmed during discovery.

Q13. Are there existing forms, payment systems, GIS tools, public records tools, agenda/meeting systems, or resident service systems that must be integrated or accounted for?

A. No.



FAQ

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 07-26)

MUNICIPAL AND TOURISM WEBSITE; CODE ENFORCEMENT SOFTWARE

SECTION C — WEBSITE REQUIREMENTS AND PREFERENCES

Q14. Is the City looking for a more modern CMS, or does it prefer to remain on its current platform? Are proprietary platforms acceptable?

A. As revised by Addendum No. 1, proposals may recommend either an open, widely supported platform or a proprietary content management system, provided the platform allows city staff to create, edit, and publish content without dependence on the vendor for routine updates. Firms proposing a proprietary system must describe the terms of the City's access to and ownership of its content, any licensing or subscription costs, and the process and provisions for exporting content should the City later migrate to another system. All proposals should specify the recommended platform, the rationale for that choice, and the post-launch training plan for staff.

Q15. Does the City want one CMS managing both sites, or two separate CMS instances?

A. The City prefers a single content management system managing both websites. This approach supports consistent staff training, streamlined workflows, and simplified long-term maintenance. Firms should describe how their recommended platform will manage both sites within one system, including how the two sites will maintain distinct branding and how user roles and permissions will be handled across municipal and tourism content.

Q16. Is tourism content managed by the same staff as municipal content?

A. Yes.

Q17. Will the current brand remain in place for the new sites?

A. Yes.

Q18. What accessibility level is expected?

A. The new websites must conform to WCAG 2.1 Level AA and applicable requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Proposals should describe the firm's approach to accessibility during design, development, content migration, and ongoing maintenance.

Q19. Does the City desire website personalization (content that changes based on visitor interests and past interactions)?

A. Personalization is not a required feature. Firms may present personalization capabilities as an optional enhancement with associated costs identified separately.



FAQ

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 07-26)

MUNICIPAL AND TOURISM WEBSITE; CODE ENFORCEMENT SOFTWARE

Q20. Does the City desire AI-powered features, such as an AI trip planner?

A. AI-powered features are not required. Firms may present such capabilities as optional enhancements with associated costs identified separately.

Q21. Does the City desire to capture first-party data (e.g., newsletter signups, visitor guide requests)?

A. Yes, the tourism site should support first-party data capture such as newsletter signups and visitor guide requests, consistent with applicable privacy requirements. Firms should describe their approach.

Q22. Will the new sites require translation? If yes, into which languages?

A. The City does not require professionally translated content. However, the new sites should support machine translation of site content (for example, through an integrated translation tool or compatibility with browser-based translation), and the selected platform should not interfere with these functions. Firms may present enhanced multilingual capabilities as an optional feature with associated costs identified separately.

Q23. Will the City provide all content for the sites, including photos, videos, copy, visitor guides, business listings, and events?

A. The City will provide existing content, including photography, copy, visitor guides, business listings, and event information, and will coordinate content review. Firms should identify any content development, photography, or copywriting services they propose as part of, or in addition to, the base scope, with costs identified separately.

Q24. Does the City expect post-launch content updates to be performed by the vendor or primarily by staff?

A. Routine content updates will be performed primarily by city staff. Consistent with the Content Management System Requirements as revised by Addendum No. 1, the selected platform must allow staff to create, edit, and publish content without dependence on the vendor, and proposals must describe how staff will be trained to manage content independently following launch. The vendor's ongoing role is described under Ongoing Services: post-launch technical support for a period of 3–6 months and long-term maintenance services, including security patches, feature upgrades, and performance optimization.



FAQ

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 07-26)

MUNICIPAL AND TOURISM WEBSITE; CODE ENFORCEMENT SOFTWARE

Q25. How long is post-launch support required?

A. As stated in the Scope of Services, the selected firm will provide post-launch technical support and updates for a period of 3–6 months to address technical issues, followed by ongoing long-term maintenance services. Firms should describe and price both phases in their fee structure.

SECTION D — CODE ENFORCEMENT SOFTWARE

Q26. Does the City already have a preferred or existing code enforcement software product?

A. No. The City does not currently use a dedicated code enforcement software product and has no preferred product. Firms should recommend the solution they believe best fits the City's needs as described in the Scope of Services, including the rationale for the recommendation, the licensing structure, and all associated costs.

Q27. Is the City currently using a legacy application or internal database (e.g., Excel, Access, or a proprietary platform) to track active code enforcement cases and inspections?

A. Yes. Code enforcement staff currently track cases in an Excel workbook that identifies code enforcement issues and the steps taken to address each violation. There is no dedicated software application or database in use.

Q28. Is the selected vendor expected to license software, recommend software, configure software, or build software? Will the City accept a newly developed, City-owned custom application, or must respondents propose an established commercial product with existing municipal deployments?

A. The City has not predetermined the delivery model. Firms may propose an established commercial product (with the vendor providing selection guidance, integration, configuration, and training) or a custom-developed solution. Firms proposing a custom solution must clearly describe ownership, hosting, long-term support, and total cost of ownership, and should identify comparable municipal deployments of their approach. All proposals must clearly state licensing structure and associated costs.

Q29. Would the City be open to holding the software license directly, with the vendor providing selection, integration, configuration, and staff training?

A. The City has not made a determination on licensing structure at this time. Firms may propose either model — the City holding the software license directly with the firm providing selection guidance, integration, configuration, and staff training, or the firm holding or reselling the



FAQ

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 07-26)

MUNICIPAL AND TOURISM WEBSITE; CODE ENFORCEMENT SOFTWARE

license as part of its services. In either case, proposals must clearly distinguish software licensing costs from professional services fees and must fully disclose the terms of the City's access to and ownership of its data, all ongoing costs, and exit provisions should the City discontinue the relationship. Licensing structure will be considered as part of the City's best-value evaluation.

Q30. Will the selected vendor be expected to migrate historic case files and active records into the new software, or will the deployment start fresh?

A. The deployment will start fresh. The selected vendor will not be expected to migrate historic case files or active records into the new code enforcement software. Firms should scope their proposals accordingly and should not include data migration costs for the code enforcement component.

Q31. Beyond case management, inspections, and reporting, are minimum required workflows or functional specifications available (e.g., complaint management, violations, notices, citations, mobile inspections, GIS integration)?

A. Detailed functional requirements will be refined during the staff interviews described in the Scope of Services. At minimum, the solution should support complaint intake, case management, inspections (including field/mobile use), violation and notice tracking, and reporting. Firms should describe their solution's standard capabilities in these areas, including any GIS integration.

CLOSING

Except as modified by Addendum No. 1, all terms, conditions, and requirements of RFP 07-26 remain unchanged. Proposals are due no later than 2:00 p.m., August 7, 2026, at 242 Hampton Street, Walterboro, SC 29488.

Questions regarding this document shall be directed to:

Patricia Utsey Fleming
Tourism Director and Main Street Manager
City of Walterboro
Putsey@walterborosc.org