KITSAP TRANSIT
Question and Answer Addendum
PRTPO Website ADA Compliance
IFB KT #26-060
October 28th, 2026

60 Washington Ave. Ste. 200
Bremerton, WA 98337
Phone: 360.479.6962
Fax: 360.377.7086

www.kitsaptransit.org

Note: All Proposers shall acknowledge the receipt of this Addendum on their Bid Form. This Addendum contains the following:

I. Questions Asked and Answers Given
II. Due Date Extension

I. Questions Asked and Answers Given

Question 1: Document volume and scope (Exhibit A, Task 2.2): prtpo.org currently links about 68 PDF files. In a sample of 14, we counted about 1,900 pages, including annual Resource Manuals of 360 to 450 pages each and a scanned 1995 Regional Transportation Plan. Should proposers price remediation of every linked file? Or only current and active documents, with superseded and historical files moved to a clearly labeled archive under the archived-content exception in the U.S. DOJ ADA Title II web rule (28 CFR 35.201), and accessible versions provided on request? Will PRTPO provide the native source files (Word, PowerPoint, InDesign)?
Answer: Yes, please include all files in the pricing.

Question 2: Can Kitsap Transit share an estimated budget or not-to-exceed range, and the expected contract duration in working days (Sample Contract item 3)? Should ongoing maintenance under Task 5 be priced now as an optional recurring service, or only described as a draft agreement for later execution?
Answer: PRTPO has a “not-to-exceed” $12,500 for the initial setup. The contract should be developed for 3-years of maintenance with an option to extend in two one-year extensions.

Question 3: What form of certification does PRTPO expect? For example, would a WCAG 2.1 AA conformance report (an Accessibility Conformance Report using the VPAT 2.5 WCAG edition) with the supporting test results meet the requirement? Does WSDOT's statewide initiative require a specific format?

Answer: The WCAG 2.1 AA is the target certification.

Question 4: Will Kitsap Transit accept as "similar projects" website design and development projects in which WCAG 2.1/2.2 AA accessibility was designed, built and tested into a new site, rather than only stand-alone audits of existing sites? Are private-sector client references acceptable?
Answer: Yes, Kitsap Transit will accept similar projects, and public sites are preferred but private sites or non-profits may be cited.

Question 5: Will PRTPO give the consultant an administrator or contributor account on its Squarespace site? The site uses a Squarespace 7.0 template. If remediation is best achieved by moving to a Squarespace 7.1 template, is that within scope? Are the embedded ArcGIS Online maps (prtpo.maps.arcgis.com) and YouTube videos on the Meetings page also in scope?
Answer: Yes, Kitsap Transit will grant access to Squarespace. Version 7.1 is acceptable if required. The GIS maps and the YouTube videos are within the scope.

Question 6: May a project count as completed if the work was delivered and accepted within the last five years and the client's reference and live website can be provided?
Answer: Yes

Question 7: Are accessibility certifications (for example IAAP CPACC or WAS) required or specifically scored? Or is demonstrated experience with comparable testing tools and methods acceptable? May specialist subcontractors be identified as assigned personnel?
Answer: There are no know certificates required at this time. Demonstrated experience is acceptable. Subcontractors may be assigned.

Question 8: Approximately how many pages does the PRTPO website contain, and approximately how many PDFs or other attached documents require remediation? Which Squarespace version is the site on, and does it include third-party embedded content?
Answer: It is not known how many document pages are contained on the website. There are six webpages housing the documents. Recorded meetings and videos do not need captions. PRTPO is on Squarespace version 7.0

Question 9: Regarding Exhibit A, Task 2: what is meant by "develop the tool(s)" to upgrade the website? Please describe the expected tool deliverables. Is the long-term maintenance contract referenced in Task 5 expected to be part of this award or a separate procurement?
Answer: PRTPO is looking for software that has processes, templates, checklists and testing or monitoring tools for staff. This is for a long-term (3 years with extensions of up to two one-year periods).

Question 10: Section 3.17: the Commercial Auto Liability requirement is $300,000. May this be waived or modified where the work is performed entirely remotely and no vehicles are used? Also, confirm that the Washington UBI number and business account are required at contract execution rather than at proposal submission.
Answer: Commercial Auto Liability requirement will be waived. Per 3.13 (D) – While non-US firms may be considered, all vendors must have business accounts established with the Washington State Department of Revenue and have valid UBI at time of bid due date.

Question 11: Has PRTPO or Kitsap Transit completed a prior accessibility audit or gap analysis of the website that can be shared with proposers?
Answer: The PRTPO informally reached out to CivicPlus to perform a potential customer-based assessment. The assessment provided an example of the CiviPlus tool used to convert documents contained in the website and a high-level overview of the Squarespace accessibility outcome. Unfortunately, PRTPO does not have access to this

Question 12: Would a foreign contractor be required to obtain a Washington State UBI and business registration before contract execution?
Answer: A contractor must have obtained a Washington State UBI and business registration before bid opening.

Question 13: Are modifications to the insurance requirements possible for a fully remote technology services engagement? Our firm owns no vehicles and has no employees in Washington. Would non-owned and hired auto coverage meet the Commercial Auto requirement, and is a workers' compensation exemption acceptable?
Answer: Yes – Kitsap Transit will waive auto insurance

Question 14: Can relevant projects completed by proposed team members under previous employers or by named subcontractors be included as qualifying past-performance references?

Answer: No, work must have been completed by personnel currently with the vendor.

Question 15: "Tools" in Tasks 2 and 3. Does PRTPO mean processes, templates, checklists and testing or monitoring tools for staff, rather than a custom software product?
Answer: That is correct

Question 16: Can staff training be delivered by video conference? For Task 5, should we price an ongoing maintenance agreement as part of this proposal, and over what term?
Answer: Please price ongoing maintenance with the proposal and video conference for training is fine.

Question 17: The RFP requests a minimum of three comparable projects completed within the past five years. For a proposing firm utilizing experienced independent consultants or subcontractors, may projects completed by named team members or subcontractors under previous employers or engagements satisfy this requirement? If permitted, how will those projects be evaluated compared with projects the proposing firm completed directly? Are there specific documentation requirements for demonstrating subcontractor qualifications and experience?
Answer: It is all right to submit comparables with team members when they were at other firms. There will not be a scoring difference. Past projects will be scored per Section 4 - #4: Past Performance

Question 18: Task 2 references updating file links and specific files necessary to achieve WCAG 2.1 AA compliance. Could PRTPO provide an approximate inventory of documents requiring accessibility evaluation or remediation, including file formats, quantities, page counts, and complexity? Will remediation be limited to an identified collection of documents, or will the contractor be responsible for evaluating and remediating all publicly available documents linked from the website?
Answer: The contractor will be responsible for remediating all documents. A majority of the documents are in PDF form. The documents are found on our webpage at www.prtpo.org. We do not have a count of the total files.

Question 19: Which Squarespace version is the site on, and does it include third-party embedded content?
Answer: 7.0 – Yes, Youtube

Question 20: Does PRTPO intend to retain Squarespace as its website platform throughout the project? Are custom code modifications, replacement of inaccessible components, third-party integrations, or migration to another platform permitted if required to achieve accessibility conformance? Are there known platform limitations or restrictions the selected contractor must accommodate?

Answer: The PRTPO will retain Squarespace. If compliance problems are found the selected firm will provide a list of items for correction(s) for the PRTPO staff to access.

Question 21: Would configuring and deploying established accessibility evaluation and monitoring software satisfy the requirement to develop or deploy accessibility tools, or is PRTPO requesting a custom-developed solution? Does PRTPO currently maintain any accessibility software licenses or have preferred testing and monitoring tools?

Answer: Configuring and deploying established accessibility evaluation and monitoring software will be permitted as a solution tool. The PRTPO does not have accessibility software or a preferred testing and monitoring method.

Question 22: The scope references accessibility testing and certification. What specific certification, conformance report, or supporting documentation is required for final acceptance? Would a documented WCAG 2.1 AA assessment identifying the testing methodology, evaluated content, applicable success criteria, findings, corrections, and remaining exceptions satisfy this requirement? Additionally, what are the acceptance criteria if accessibility barriers cannot be fully corrected due to third-party services or limitations of the existing website platform?

Answer: Yes, a documented WCAG 2.1 AA assessment identifying the testing methodology, evaluated content, applicable success criteria, findings, corrections, and remaining exceptions will be acceptable. For items that cannot be corrected a report of such items and suggested methods for correction will be acceptable.

Question 23: Could PRTPO clarify the anticipated number of staff training sessions, participants, and required training materials? Who will publish pages and documents after the project? Does the vendor support agreement or long-term website and file maintenance arrangement need to be included within the initial not-to-exceed price, or should ongoing maintenance services be proposed and priced separately? If ongoing support is required within the base proposal, what is the anticipated service period, response-time requirement, or estimated monthly workload?

Answer: The number of staff training sessions is unknown at this time. However, with just two part-time employees, the PRTPO is able to flex based upon the complexity of the training. The proposal shall include the

price for extended maintenance for three-years with the option of two one-year extensions. Response time should be within 3 business days of a request for assistance during the maintenance period. Monthly workload consists of one staff meeting and one Board or Committee meeting to include the agenda, supporting documents, etc. There are larger documents that are completed each year as required by the PRTPO. These documents are normally PDF form or Squarespace format.

Question 24: Is there an anticipated final completion date for Tasks 1–5 following the estimated November 2026 notice to proceed? Will the selected contractor receive access to the Squarespace administrative environment, existing website assets, and original source documents upon contract execution? Are there specific review periods or approval milestones between the initial assessment, remediation, and final acceptance?

Answer: The Federal regulation requires the PRTPO to be complying by April of 2028. The selected contractor will have access to the PRTPO Squarespace account and documents within, and documents shared by the PRTPO staff as required including original documents. There are not specific milestones identified.

Question 25: If the initial accessibility assessment identifies remediation requirements beyond the quantities or assumptions included in the accepted proposal, will Kitsap Transit permit a written change order or separately authorized additional work? How should bidders address accessibility issues that cannot reasonably be quantified until the initial assessment is complete while still providing the requested not-to-exceed price?

Answer: Yes, the PRTPO and Kitsap Transit will allow for change orders up to the PRTPO micro purchase limit of $7,500. Any requested change orders beyond $7,500 must be approved by the PRTPO Board. Bidders should provide language in there proposal as to how they will address unknown future changes including an estimated cost per hour or comparable measure.

Question 26: Could Kitsap Transit confirm whether the insurance requirements listed in Section 3.17 apply in full to a contractor performing digital accessibility services remotely? Are professional liability/errors and omissions or cyber liability policies required in addition to the coverages explicitly identified in the RFP? Where subcontractors perform specialized accessibility testing, document remediation, or website development, must they maintain the same coverage limits as the prime contractor, or will requirements be determined based on their assigned responsibilities?

Answer: Insurance requirements listed in 3.17 will remain except Commercial Auto Liability. Subcontractors must have these coverages if not covered by prime contractor

Question 27: Could you confirm the applicable time zone for the October 21 clarification deadline and October 30 proposal submission deadline?
Answer: All time and dates are in Pacific Standard Time

Question 28: Will Kitsap Transit accept equivalent coverage from a non-U.S. insurer to satisfy the requirements in Section 3.17? If not, may the certificate be provided after award, within the 10-day contract execution window?
Answer: Equivalent non-US insurance will not be accepted. Insurance certificate can be submitted to Kitsap Transit within the 10 day window after notification of award.

Question 29: Kitsap Transit's payment terms are in U.S. dollars. May payments be made by ACH to a U.S. dollar account held with a U.S.-based provider in the Contractor's business name? Please also confirm what vendor registration and tax forms are required from a non-U.S. firm.
Answer: Kitsap Transit is not setup to send ACH. It is up to the vendor to confirm with the Washington State Depart of Revenue the relevant tax forms they will require to operate in Washington State. Kitsap Transit can confirm that upon award, we will require a W9 from the awarded vendor.

Question 30: May a proposer subcontract specialized accessibility testing or document remediation to a qualified third party, provided costs are itemized separately as required in Section 4?
Answer: Subcontractors are acceptable. If being used, please submit Exhibit A – Subcontractor form – with your submission.

Question 31: Some files on the site were written by other organizations (for example WSDOT and Transportation Commission reports, county plans, EV studies and grant applications from project sponsors). Should those be remediated, or linked to the publisher's own copy?
Answer: To the best of the ability they should be remediated.

Question 32: Are the meeting videos on PRTPO's YouTube channel, and the ArcGIS StoryMap and maps linked from the site, within the scope of this work? If so, does PRTPO hold editing access to the YouTube channel and the ArcGIS items?
Answer: Yes, we hold editing rights for YouTube and ArcGIS

Question 33: Would a documented conformance report against WCAG 2.1 AA (for example, an Accessibility Conformance Report on the VPAT template) meet this item, or does PRTPO expect validation by a separate third party?

Answer: Yes, a documented report will work

Question 34: May past meeting materials and superseded plans be placed in a clearly labeled archive section with an accessible-copy request process, as the DOJ Title II rule allows for archived content, rather than remediated now?

Answer: Yes

Question 35: Does PRTPO have the Word or other source files for its plans, RTIP reports, and agenda packets?

Answer: Yes

Question 36: Is Code Injection available on this Squarespace site?

Answer: Unknown

Question 37: Task 5 asks for "development of contract for long-term website and file maintenance." Should the proposal include a priced maintenance option, or only a draft agreement?

Answer: Yes, a priced maintenance option

Question 38: Can training be delivered as recorded videos with written guides and written Q&A?

Answer: Yes

Question 39: Is there a not-to-exceed budget for this contract?

Answer: Yes, $12,500 for the initial setup

Question 40: "Staff training / vendor support agreement" as a deliverable. Can Kitsap Transit clarify the intent behind this item? Specifically, (a) what topics or skills the staff training should cover (e.g., how to maintain accessibility when publishing new content), who the audience is, and the expected format/duration; and (b) whether the "vendor support agreement" refers to a separate ongoing support/maintenance contract to be proposed as part of this RFP, or simply a description of post-implementation support included within this?

Answer: The training and vendor support is for the two Kitsap Transit staff members administering the PRTPO website and program. We would like this support to continue for three years with an option of two one-year extensions.

Question 41: Is the selected vendor expected to implement website accessibility corrections directly, or is the primary deliverable an audit and remediation plan?

Answer: Yes, the selected vendor is expected to implement the corrections

Question 42: What type of evidence or acceptance testing is expected to demonstrate that the agreed accessibility corrections have been completed?

Answer: Automated, manual and/or assistive technology testing is to be provided by the selected vendor such as voluntary product accessibility templates, letter of compliance from third-part accessibility auditor, automated scan results, etc.

Question 43: Will the consultant work directly in the Squarespace editor with contributor access, or should fixes be delivered for PRTPO staff to apply?

Answer: Yes, the consultant is to work directly with Squarespace and the PRTPO staff

Question 44: If there are issues specifically with the Squarespace platform that the vendor cannot alter, do they have support at Squarespace to make updates?

Answer: This is unknown. We will request the vendor notates these issues and PRTPO will review.

Question 45: Does the ongoing compliance method mean a monitoring tool and staff process only, or should the proposal price an ongoing monthly service, and for what term?

Answer: Please have your cost proposal for 5 years with each year separated out with a final “not to exceed” price for those 5 years

Question 46: The RFP says award goes to the lowest responsive and responsible proposer, while section 4 lists point scores for experience, past performance, personnel and cost. Which governs the award?

Answer: Award is governed by Section 4

Question 47: Is there a DBE participation goal for this contract?

Answer: No

Question 48: Does "Update the Squarespace PRTPO website to level AA" mean the selected consultant is expected to directly implement all accessibility remediation within Squarespace, rather than identify issues and provide remediation guidance to PRTPO staff or another developer?
Answer: The consultant will be responsible for directly implementing accessibility remediation. Some expectations may be made as the process kicks off.

Question 49: Is the selected consultant expected to directly remediate the identified files, or identify the files requiring remediation and provide guidance/tools for PRTPO staff to remediate them?
Answer: Directly remediate the files

Question 50: Should the cost proposal include ongoing vendor support and long-term website/file maintenance after the initial remediation project, or should Tasks 3–5 result only in a recommended support/maintenance approach and proposed future agreement? If ongoing services are to be included, what contract period should be priced?
Answer: Please include long-term website/file maintenance costs. This project is for two (2) years with three (3) one (1) year optional extensions.

Question 51: Could you please confirm the exact production website URL(s), including any subdomains, password-protected areas, staging environments, or duplicate Squarespace sites that should be included in the accessibility review?
Answer: https://prtpo.org/ and there are two back up URLs www.prtpo.com and www.kitsaptransitprtpo.org

Question 52: Are editable source files available for the priority PDFs and Office documents, or are some materials available only as flattened or scanned PDFs?
Answer: Most files are editable PDFs. There are some older scanned PDFs that we will determine the need to maintain them on the website

Question 53: Are there specific browsers, operating systems, devices, screen readers, zoom levels, or other assistive technologies that must be included in the formal acceptance test matrix?
Answer: No

Question 54: Where third-party services cannot technically be modified by PRTPO or the selected consultant, would documentation of the limitation together with an accessible alternative or mitigation be acceptable for final acceptance?
Answer: Yes

Question 55: Does PRTPO prefer an open-source/manual accessibility monitoring process, or should the proposal include a commercial monitoring platform? If a commercial platform is preferred, is there an existing Kitsap Transit or WSDOT license/vendor that should be used?
Answer: We do not have a preference and do not have an identified vendor

Question 56: What ongoing support model would be preferable after the initial remediation - monthly support, quarterly accessibility reviews, annual audits, or an on-demand maintenance arrangement?
Answer: Any of the above methods will work well. Pricing for all methods should be included

Question 57: Could you please confirm the expected approval process for the remediation plan and final validation, including who will provide final acceptance on behalf of PRTPO/Kitsap Transit?
Answer: The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) will likely certify the websites contents. However, being a new process there may be other organizations that will provide feedback. For this contract, the final acceptance will be conducted by the PRTPO staff with assistance from the WSDOT.

Question 58: Does your organization currently work with an incumbent website design firm?
Answer: No

Question 59: The RFP mentions a remediation plan but does not detail its execution. Is there an expectation that we outline an execution plan in the proposal?
Answer: Yes

Question 60: Are there print materials that need updating as well?
Answer: No

Question 61: Are you open to another platform that has the capabilities to grow more effectively with your organization and is simpler for your team to update (e.g., Sanity or WordPress), or does the site have to stay on Squarespace? I ask because the outline in the RFP is quite difficult to execute well in

Squarespace as that platform is meant for DIY businesses rather than enterprise organizations like yours.

Answer: We are open to suggestions to help improve accessibility over time

Question 62: Would PRTPO accept moving older material into a clearly labeled archive, using the archived content exception in the DOJ Title II rule, with accessible copies provided on request? If so, we'd remediate the current and active documents. If there's a priority list, a page count target, or a working budget, it would help us price this fairly.

Answer: Yes, this would be helpful

Question 63: The site runs on a Squarespace 7.0 template. Should we keep the current template, or is PRTPO open to a template change or a move to Squarespace 7.1 if that's the cleanest path to WCAG 2.1 AA? Will the consultant get administrator access to the Squarespace account? And should we treat the Google Translate widget as part of the site to fix, replace, or remove?

Answer: We are open to moving towards 7.1 and the consultant will get access to the account. Google Translate can be used but is not required as we do not have a need for language translation.

Question 64: Are the original source files (Word, InDesign, Excel, etc.) available for the PDFs currently published on the website, or do the PDF files need to be edited directly?

Answer: There is a mix of editable PDFs with MS Office source documents and older PDFs without the original source document

Question 65: Tasks 3 through 5 mention ongoing support and long-term compliance. Should we include the cost of ongoing monitoring and maintenance as a line item in our initial proposal?

Answer: Yes, please include ongoing monitoring and maintenance in your proposal

Question 66: Are PRTPO PDFs in the scope of this review, and should the selected vendor plan on remediating these for accessibility?

Answer: Yes

Question 67: Staff accessibility knowledge. What level of existing accessibility knowledge does the staff being trained have?

Answer: Almost none

Question 68: Task 2 calls for updating the existing Squarespace site to WCAG 2.1 AA. Would PRTPO consider a rebuild of the site on WordPress if it better supports long-term accessibility compliance (Task 4) and maintenance (Task 5)? Section 2.8 rejects multiple proposals from one proposer. May a single proposal include the Squarespace remediation as the base option and a WordPress rebuild as a separately priced alternate?

Answer: Please do not include WordPress option. PRTOP will continue to utilize Squarespace. If compliance problems are found the selected firm will provide a list of items for correction(s) for the PRTPO staff to access

Question 69: Maintenance agreement (Exhibit A: documentation and maintenance planning). Should the long-term website and file maintenance agreement be priced in this proposal? If so, what term (months) and service level do you expect, and should it be a separate line from the one-time project in the Cost Proposal (Section 4.6)?

Answer: Yes, contract shall have an initial length of two years with three (3) one (1) year optional extensions

Question 70: Unit pricing (Section 2.8B.2; Section 4.6). Section 2.8B.2 says a proposal may be irregular if "a price per unit cannot be determined." For document remediation, should we give a per-page or per-document unit price in addition to the not-to-exceed total?

Answer: Please submit as a “not to exceed” total

Question 71: Insurance for remote, non-driving work (Section 3.17). The work will be done remotely, with no vehicles used. Will Kitsap Transit accept proof that no vehicles are used in place of the $300,000 commercial auto liability requirement, or a hired/non-owned auto endorsement only? Is Washington workers' compensation required for a consultant with no employees working in Washington? Please also confirm that professional liability (E&O) is not required.

Answer: Commercial Auto Liability will be waived. Workers compensation would be waived for vendors without employees. Commercial general liability is required.

Question 72: Remote delivery and training (Exhibit A: staff training; Section 3.30). May all work, meetings and staff training be delivered remotely (video call plus recorded session and written guide)? How many PRTPO staff should we plan to train?

Answer: Yes, it may be completed remotely, and the recorded video and written guide would be helpful

Question 73: Payment schedule (Section 3.18B and F). Since pre-payment isn't permitted, may progress payments follow milestones (for example, assessment report accepted; remediation complete; validation and training complete)?
Answer: Yes. Vendor will work with project manager on what milestone payments will be acceptable

Question 74: Can PRTPO provide the current website URL
Answer: www.prtpo.org

Question 75: For complex legacy documents, will accessible HTML equivalents or replacement documents be accepted where appropriate, or must every original PDF itself meet accessibility requirements?
Answer: Yes. Equivalents are acceptable

Question 76: The scope combines two practices that are normally kept separate. One is independent accessibility auditing and validation (Tasks 1 and 3). The other is hands-on remediation of the Squarespace site and the PDFs (Task 2). They call for different skill sets. Keeping them apart also gives the validation real weight, since a firm that fixes the site and then certifies its own work is reviewing itself. Would Kitsap Transit accept a proposal covering only the audit, remediation plan, validation testing and documentation work (Tasks 1, 3 and the documentation portion of Task 5)? Or can the scope be awarded in parts?
Answer: The award is only for the full scope of work

Question 77: Some linked documents were authored by other organizations, such as grant applications, county policies, state law, and outside studies. Should these be remediated, or linked to their original source?
Answer: Yes, to the extent possible

Question 78: Are documents published during the contract term in scope? If so, about how many are published per month?
Answer: Yes, about two PDFs per month

Question 79: Meeting WCAG 2.1 AA often requires some visual changes, such as color contrast, focus indicators, and link styling. We will review these changes with PRTPO staff as part of the remediation

plan. Beyond those, is PRTPO interested in additional time for minor visual refreshes to the site while the work is underway?

Answer: No. We are only interested in meeting the 2.1 AA

Question 80: Section 2.1 states that the RFP covers federal clauses, but they do not appear in the posted documents. Can you provide the federal clauses that will apply to this contract, along with the DBE goal for this contract?

Answer: This project is not federally funded and federal clauses are not applicable

Question 81: Is a document remediation subcontractor acceptable? Separately, our team members are 1099 independent contractors who work full-time and exclusively for our firm. Would they be considered part of the proposer's own staff, or counted as subcontractors?

Answer: Please identify any subcontractor as a member of the primary contractor's team with reference to the subcontractor's company, etc. in your letter of transmittal

Question 82: Our preliminary review identified potential color contrast issues. To address these and other accessibility requirements, may the selected vendor recommend reasonable adjustments to colors, typography, spacing, buttons, and other visual elements, subject to PRTPO approval?

Answer: Yes

Question 83: Must the past projects referenced in the proposal be completed, or may current engagements be included?

Answer: Current engagements may be included with references

Question 84: Is PRTPO able to replace a file or site element whose Squarespace configuration prevents WCAG 2.1 AA remediation within the existing template?

Answer: PRTPO believes they can do that

Question 85: Is there an incumbent contractor or current website provider performing accessibility assessment, remediation, or maintenance for PRTPO? If so, please identify the provider, describe its current responsibilities, and clarify whether it is eligible to compete for this procurement.

Answer: No

Question 86: Should pricing be submitted as a fixed-fee proposal, time-and-materials proposal, or a combination of both?

Answer: Vendors should submit cost as a “not to exceed” cost proposal

Question 87: Does this procurement include any preference, additional evaluation points, or eligibility requirement for firms located in Washington State or the PRTPO region? May an out-of-state firm perform the work remotely without maintaining a local office?

Answer: There is no preference or additional points for being outside the state of Washington. As long as the proposer has a currently Washington State business license and UBI, they are welcome to propose on this project.

Question 88: Section 4 requires proposals to respond to all parts of the RFP but does not identify a separate technical approach section. Should proposers provide a task-by-task response to all five tasks and their subtasks in Exhibit A, including methodology, deliverables, staffing, schedule, and assumptions? If so, where should this response appear, and how will it be evaluated?

Answer: Kitsap Transit is only looking for proposal content to cover the 6 items listed within section 4

Question 89: Are there any minimum company experience requirements, such as a specified number of years in business or a minimum number of completed ADA/WCAG remediation projects?

Answer: No minimum experience requirements. Kitsap Transit would only like to see the three past projects the vendor performed

Question 90: Are client references required to be based in the United States, or will references from international clients be accepted?

Answer: We prefer US based references as the we are working with US guidelines and regulations. Please note that vendor will be required to have active Washington State business licenses and active UBI

Question 91: Are there any requirements for the contractor to maintain a physical U.S. office, employ U.S.-based personnel, or have a U.S.-based project manager?

Answer: No

Question 92: Please identify the current CMS, hosting environment, themes or templates, third-party integrations, and the level of administrative and source-code access that will be provided to the selected contractor.

Answer: We can provide administrator access to the Squarespace site. Beyond this PRTPO cannot answer the question as we do not know.

Question 93: Please confirm that Section 3.15 will permit the contractor to retain ownership of its pre-existing software, SaaS platform, accessibility tools, methodologies, templates, and reusable components, while granting Kitsap Transit appropriate rights to project-specific reports and deliverables.

Answer: Yes, only item specifically developed for Kitsap Transit would remain as Kitsap Transit property

Question 94: If there are issues specifically with the Squarespace platform that the vendor cannot alter, do they have support at Squarespace to make updates?

Answer: Squarespace offers limited support. This will be a challenge if there are not methods to alter the site

Question 95: Beyond the primary public Squarespace domain, are there any authenticated portal areas, subdomains, or external web applications (e.g., interactive mapping, trip planners) that should be included in the evaluation scope? For authenticated portal areas (if applicable), will Kitsap Transit/PRTPO provide dedicated test accounts for our team on every portal, with the role and permissions for each, and pre-populated dummy test data?

Answer: We only have ESRI GIS story maps on the site which can be altered by staff as needed

Question 96: Do internal or external developers supporting this project currently utilize AI coding agents or automated testing within their integrated development environments (IDEs)?

Answer: PRTPO has no outside or internal developer support

Question 97: Could Kitsap Transit expand on the expectations or required Service Level Agreements (SLAs) for the vendor support agreement following testing and certification?

Answer: No. Kitsap Transit would like to review possible SLA's as Kitsap Transit will possibly have to negotiate these after awarding this contract

Question 98: How does the development team currently manage website defects (e.g., Jira, Azure DevOps, or manual spreadsheets)?

Answer: We do not manage or know of any defects and the PRTPO staff is made up of two part-time Regional Transportation Planners. Kitsap Transit's IT staff can assist as needed when something goes wrong but are not involved in the day-to-day operations of the PRTPO website

Question 99: How many developers (internal staff or third-party agency personnel) will actively be involved in code remediation and fixing accessibility defects?
Answer: There are no developers involved and only the two planners from the PRTPO with an on call option for the Kitsap Transit IT staff to help

Question 100: Who will ultimately be responsible for executing code and content fixes during the project - Kitsap Transit/PRTPO staff, an existing web agency partner, or the awarded vendor?
Answer: The awarded vendor

Question 101: Section 2.8 mentions unit pricing, and Section 4 requests cost per SOW section. Does Kitsap Transit prefer the Cost Proposal to be formatted as a fixed deliverable package fee, or as an itemized unit rate?
Answer: Kitsap Transit would like to see itemized “not to exceed” cost proposal

Question 102: Will short-listed vendors be invited to conduct a brief technical presentation or tool demonstration before contract award?
Answer: No

Question 103: The sample contract lists PRTPO’s Executive Board Chair as signatory. Will the contract be with Kitsap Transit or PRTPO, and which entity or entities should be named as additional insured?
Answer: This contract will be with PRTPO. Kitsap Transit is just supporting the solicitation of this project. The “Regional Transportation Planning for the Peninsula Region” should be the additional named insured

Question 104: For a proposal submitted by a prime contractor with a subcontractor, may past projects and personnel from both firms count toward Past Performance and Personnel Assigned to Project?
Answer: Yes, please utilize projects that the proposer and subcontractor both worked on.

Question 105: Can remediated documents be processed or hosted on a vendor platform, or must every file live in Squarespace? Are there data security, data residency or AI-processing rules for PRTPO content?
Answer: We prefer the documents are hosted on Squarespace.

Question 106: Are accessibility overlays acceptable, prohibited, or not preferred?

Answer: Acceptable

Question 107: Does PRTPO want an accessibility statement and a feedback or accommodation-request process on the site?
Answer: Yes

Question 108: If a document cannot be fully remediated within budget, is it acceptable to publish a remediated alternative format (for example, an accessible HTML page) along with a documented process for requesting an accessible version?
Answer: Yes

Question 109: Our preliminary site crawl identified 7 broken links (including 3 pointing to missing PDFs) and an unlinked duplicate home page (home-copy). Should vendors include remediation of these content and navigation issues?
Answer: Yes

Question 110: Does PRTPO expect manual accessibility testing of every PDF included in the remediation scope, or would an agreed sampling and validation methodology be acceptable?
Answer: Manual or an automated testing of each pdf is required.

Question 111: Is usability testing with people with disabilities expected to verify conformance or would testing tools be sufficient?
Answer: No

Question 112: Tasks 2–4 refer to developing or deploying tools for accessibility remediation, testing, and ongoing compliance. Does PRTPO have a preferred approach, such as commercial monitoring software (e.g., Siteimprove, Monsido), documented staff workfl ows, or a combination? If a paid software subscription is recommended, should vendors include its cost in the proposal, or would PRTPO procure and maintain the license directly?
Answer: The PRTPO does not have a preferred option. If paid software subscription is proposed, please include in your cost proposal.

Question 113: Will a written Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) publishing guide satisfy the Task 5 website maintenance procedures documentation requirement?

Answer: Yes

Question 114: Is any content published in languages other than English?
Answer: No

Question 115: Section 3.17 states that damages recoverable by Kitsap Transit are not limited to the required insurance coverage, and that the contractor's liability extends up to applicable legal limits. Would Kitsap Transit consider modifying these provisions to establish a reasonable limitation of liability tied to the contractor's available insurance coverage? We would also appreciate clarification as to whether Kitsap Transit anticipates any exceptions to such a limitation, including for indemnification obligations.
Answer: These provisions are required by Kitsap Transit

Question 116: Who will own and pay for any Squarespace plan upgrades, plugins or third-party licenses needed?
Answer: The PRTPO

Question 117: Are there any data-residency or offshore-work restrictions
Answer: Kitsap Transit would prefer US work only. In our experience, the development and ongoing support will be a challenge. Product development is a challenge due to lost in translation, especially for vendors that do not have follow-the-sun support model (matching our business hours).

II. Due date extension

Kitsap Transit will extend the due date for KT 26-060 till 11/11/2026 to allow vendors ample time to review all answers given.

All other terms and conditions remain the same.

END ADDENDUM 2
Please remember to acknowledge this addendum.