Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

Request for Qualifications: 2026-004-RFQ	**Addendum Number: 2**

Website Redesign Services

Due Date and Time: October 30, 2025, at 2:00 pm <u>Arizona time</u>

The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) is modified as set forth in this Addendum. The original RFQ Documents and any previously issued addenda remain in full force and effect, except as modified by this Addendum, which is hereby made part of the RFQ. Offeror shall take this Addendum into consideration when preparing and submitting its Statement of Qualifications. Responses to questions are in red.

<u>QUESTIONS</u>
The following questions were received in writing prior to the deadline:

Q1. Please confirm whether electronic submission via email will be accepted in lieu of mailing the required six hard copies or whether hard copies are mandatory. Response: The Airport requires hard copies to be submitted.

Q2. Will you be attaching the winning vendor's RFP response to your form contract, or will the winning vendor have an opportunity to negotiate a scope of work to be attached to your form contract? Response: The Airport will not be attaching the full RFQ response submitted by the selected Offeror to the final contract. However, the key personnel proposed by the selected Offeror, as required in the RFQ, will be included. The base Scope of Services is already outlined in both the RFQ and the sample service agreement. Following selection, the Airport may negotiate a more detailed scope of work, if necessary, based on the selected Offeror's proposal and recommendations, which will be included in the Airport's service agreement.

Q3. What specific challenges or limitations are you experiencing with your current ASP.Net system that are driving this redesign? (e.g., difficulty updating content, technical resource dependency, maintenance costs). Response: This redesign project is being driven by design and a need to meet current best practices and industry standards for websites, especially in the airline industry.

Q4. Which of your current website functionalities listed in Exhibit 1 are most critical to maintain, and are there any you'd like to eliminate or significantly modify? Response: At this stage, the Airport is relying on the selected Offeror to evaluate and advise on which existing functionalities are essential to retain, which may be outdated or unnecessary, and what should be added to ensure the website aligns with current best practices for a fully modern airport website. Staff welcomes the Offeror's expertise in identifying areas for improvement, streamlining, or enhancement based on industry standards and user experience.

Q5. Do you have any preferred CMS platforms or technologies you'd like us to consider, or are you open to recommendations based on your specific needs? Response: The Airport does not have a preferred CMS platform and is relying on each Offeror to propose a solution they

Mesa Gateway Airport

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

believe best meets the Airport's needs, as outlined in the RFQ, based on their professional experience.

Q6. Regarding the requirement that "MGAA does not have a preferred Content Management System" - are there any CMS platforms you would NOT want to use or have had negative experiences with? Response: No.

Q7. What source provides the XML data for the Parking Information feature, and is it integrated by embed or through a direct API connection to the database? Response: The XLM data for the Parking Information feature is currently provided from the Offeror of the Airport's parking system. The Airport will have to reforward the XML file since the parking system is not accessible from outside the Airport's network.

Q8. For QR codes, is the goal simply to link visitors to a specific page and track visits, or is there another intended use? Response: No other intended uses. The QR codes are to be created on an as-needed basis for marketing a specific page.

Q9. Can you describe how your current file manager works, whether it's a paid or free solution, and what file security level you require? Response: The Current file manager is home-built in asp.net. The Airport currently has 2 file security levels: Admin, which has full rights everywhere, and then a role for each role of user to upload in their specific areas. The Airport does not anticipate needing any additional levels.

Q10. What source supplies the XML data for the Flight Status feature, and is it connected through an embed or direct API integration? Response: Flight status information is coming from a system that is accessible only from within the Airport's network. The Airport will reforward the feed.

Q11. Which Web Service do you currently use to power form field autocomplete? What information does it fill in for users, and where is this feature available on your site? Response: Currently, autosuggest for form fields is handled using ASP.Net AJAX control toolkit that uses an Airport-hosted and developed web service to pull values from the database. This is not necessarily a required feature.

Q12. Is the Vendor Login on the Procurements, Vendors & Surplus Property page simply an external link, or is it part of an intranet included in the project? If included, how is the page's data populated? Response: It is a link to a separate system and is not part of the website's infrastructure. The selected Offeror will not be responsible for modifying or maintaining it.

Q13. Beyond rewriting existing website content, how many new pages of copy should the selected vendor plan to create? Response: The selected Offeror is to recommend the content to the Airport based on their expertise. This can mean keeping the same site map or reconfiguring the site map completely. The goal is for a simple, easy-to-use user experience.

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

Q14. How many different types of content administrators do you anticipate needing, and what is the typical technical skill level of staff who will be updating content? Response: The final determination will depend on the selected Offeror's recommendations regarding site organization and structure. It is anticipated, however, that the content administrators will possess a moderate level of technical proficiency, including familiarity with HTML and CSS.

Q15. Beyond the IT department training mentioned in the RFP, how many total staff members across different departments would need CMS training? Response: Approximately 10-15 may need some level of training.

Q16. Do you have technical documentation or APIs available for the existing integrations (parking, flight info, training schedules, etc.), or will discovery be needed to understand these connections? Response: We do not have specific documentation for the Parking or Flight Information feeds, as these are straightforward data sources. For third-party integrations such as Constant Contact, relevant documentation is available directly from the provider. Other components, like training schedules and the Lost and Found system, are embedded via iframes and do not require API documentation.

Q17. What is the total CPU, storage (TB), and memory allocations for the application? Response: Currently, all sites are hosted on a single IIS server with the following specs: 2 cpu, 8GB RAM, and considerably less of these resources are consumed. Storage for the sites is as follows:

Site	Current Storage Usage
GatewayAirport.com	
Prod	2.9 GB
Dev	2.6 GB
ChooseGatewayAirport.com	
Prod	~200 MB
Dev	~200 MB
GatewayFBO.com	
Prod	~150 MB
Dev	~160 MB

Q18. Fruition requires a WAF (Web Application Firewall), either by an external proxy such as CloudFlare or an ingress-based solution such as ModSec. What is your preference? Response: A proxy such as CloudFlare would be the preferred solution.

Q19. Does your organization currently use a web application firewall (WAF) and, if so, will you continue using the same WAF for the new website? Response: Due to the cybersecurity nature of this question, we will not publicly discuss cyber mitigation programs we have in place. Once an offeror is selected, we will discuss the relevant information.

Q20. In addition to uptime, do you have RTO and RPO targets? Response: Our RTO target is 8 hours. We don't expect the data on our website to be so dynamic that we would need a high RPO, but we cannot provide a specific number without understanding the Offeror's proposed solution.

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

Q21. While pricing isn't requested in the RFQ, do you have a target budget range that would help us tailor our CMS recommendation appropriately? Response: While a specific budget range has not been established at this stage, the Airport is looking to develop the budget based on the selected Offeror's recommendations and approach. We encourage you to propose a CMS solution that you believe is the most appropriate and cost-effective based on the Airport's needs as outlined in the RFQ. Any recommendations should be scalable and reflect a thoughtful balance between functionality, long-term value, and budget considerations.

Q22. The RFP mentions no specific launch date has been established - do you have any internal deadlines or events (conferences, announcements, etc.) that might influence the project timeline? Response: No. As part of the Offeror's submittal, they are required to include a proposed project timeline that outlines key milestones and deliverables – See Section Two, I, Submittal, Tab E, Project Understanding and Approach, item 8. The complete timeline will be finalized with the selected Offeror.

Q23. Are there plans for future website enhancements or additional functionality that we should consider in our CMS architecture recommendation? Response: There are no specific enhancement plans at this time. However, the Airport is looking to the selected Offeror to recommend additional functionality or features that may currently be lacking, but are considered best practices for a modern airport website.

Q24. Can you please share what triggered this website request? Response: See response to question 3 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q25 Can you please share what are considered the top attributes of MGAA's current website? Response: Navigation is easy for users, and it is photo/video-forward.

Q26. What CMS is MGAA utilizing? Also, if applicable, can you please share any issues or opportunities for improvement associated with the current CMS/infrastructure? Response: The Current CMS was developed in-house as needed and is limited in what it allows non-administrators to manage. The existing website design has been in place for more than six years; the Airport is looking for a modern, ADA-compliant design.

Q27. Are there any server requirements that we need to consider? Response: See response to question 17 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q28. In lieu of Adobe Photoshop formats, can layout concepts utilize digital prototype systems such as Figma? Figma offers modern UI/UX strategies with vector tools, responsive design features, grids, and prototyping in a web browser, whereas Photoshop is based on raster-based image editing and is not optimized for interface design or web layout logic. We will also deliver concepts in image and PDF files. Response: Yes, the Airport will accept the final files in Figma, however, it is not the preferred format. Final deliverables must also include image and PDF files.

Q29. To ensure we capture MGAA's vision, please confirm that the by-products of the design phase are: A) Unique design for each website, B) Identical website concepts for all three websites, or C) Something

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

else (Please explain). Response: As noted in the Project Description of the RFQ, the Airport is looking for a template design for all three websites for easier maintenance as well as cohesion. Each website would have different content to customize the design for that particular audience. So, option B is the closest to what we are looking for.

Q30. Regarding what will be on the new website, is MGAA seeking to house the Press Releases, Procurement, Board Meeting agendas and minutes data within the new database/website ecosystem, or is the data source being pulled externally via RSS feeds? Response: Content such as Board Meeting Agendas and Minutes, as currently implemented, would need to reside within the new website ecosystem. Our preference is to keep the database and web environment integrated. Separating them would require us to develop and maintain RSS feeds or other data connections on our end to supply content to the new site, which we would prefer to avoid.

Q31. Will the "Schedule a Class" system remain on a third-party site, or will this be developed in the new environment? Response: It will remain with the third-party.

Q32. Is it acceptable to assume that the website functionalities referenced in Exhibit 1 are the same across all three websites, or are there distinctions? If the latter, please describe. Response: The three websites have different functionalities. Some functions are present in all three sites (such as alerting), but the majority of the functionality listed in Exhibit 1 are NOT present in all three sites.

Q33. Regarding Flight Status and Parking Information elements that will be developed for MGAA, can you share what is being created? Will it be XML/JSON endpoint feeds that need to be consumed by the CMS and displayed, iframe/java integration, or something else? Response: These feeds do not currently exist as would be consumed by a hosted solution. Development would be of an XML or JSON feed. The Airport will develop the feed, and can coordinate with the selected Offeror on which feed is preferred.

Q34. Can you please share what MGAA considers the top attributes they would like to see in their website development partner? Response: The Airport does not have a predefined list of top attributes it is seeking in a firm. Rather, the evaluation will be based on the overall qualifications and relevant experience of the proposed team, as they align with the requirements outlined in the RFQ. Firms are encouraged to highlight the strengths and expertise of their team in relation to the scope and criteria provided.

Q35. In addition to what has been expressed in the RFP, are there any operational bottlenecks, marketing challenges, or stakeholder interaction issues/opportunities for improvement that should be factored into our proposed solution? Response: The Airport's brand has been in place since 2007, however, the airport's name recently changed. It is essential that the new name is clear and prominently displayed throughout the website content. Search engine optimization is a high priority, as there are many third-party websites with outdated or incorrect information about our services. Our official website must appear among the top search results to ensure accuracy and visibility.

Q36. In lieu of sending our response via postal mail or courier service, can we email or upload our response to a platform such as Google Drive or Dropbox? Response: See response to question 1 of this Addendum No. 2.

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

Q37. May we provide reference summaries, telephone numbers, and email addresses for each contact? We have found lower response rates when references are asked to submit surveys and such. Response: The Airport requires Attachment F, Project Reference Questionnaire, be submitted by each of the Offeror's references.

Q38. Can we use page dividers that are not tabbed? Response: For clarity and ease of review, the Airport strongly encourages Offerors to utilize tabbed dividers as outlined in the RFQ.

Q39. To what extent should the single template be visually differentiated across the three external sites beyond navigation and content changes. Reference: Section Two, A.1, page 10. Response: The Airport's current three sites all follow the same template now. Photos, video, and copy are unique to each site's audience, but the sites' layouts are the same.

Q40.   Recognizing that a new information architecture will be proposed, are any existing sections or features on any of the three sites considered out of scope for the redesign. Reference: Section Two, A.1, page 10. Response: As with all content, some pages may no longer be active by the time this site goes live. For example, Travel ID may not have relevance, and the content could be moved to the FAQ page. Beyond this example, all pages, as they are now, are still relevant content.

Q41. Are there MGAA policies or constraints on approved cloud vendors or data-hosting regions. Reference: Section Two, A.2, page 10. Response: The site should be hosted fully in the United States.

Q42. What up-time and recovery objectives should we plan for in the cloud environment, such as target RTO and RPO. Reference: Section Two, A.2, page 10. Response: See response to question 20 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q43. Beyond having no preferred CMS, does MGAA require specific editorial workflows or role granularity that the CMS must support. Reference: Section Two, A.4, pages 10–11. Response: See response to questions 9, 14, and 15. In addition, it is expected that we will not need extensive permission levels or editorial workflows.

Q44. Regarding the current system lists authentication and role management. Should the new CMS replicate these capabilities one for one or can they be simplified. Reference: Exhibit 1, items 1–2, pages 28–29. Response: They could be simplified or made more complex based on the solution proposed by the Offeror.

Q45. Are there preferred export or backup formats for site content and data to satisfy MGAA administrative access and retrieval needs. References: Section Two, C.1.f, page 11; Section Two, A.7, pages 10–11. Response: The Airport anticipates that we would access any exports or backups using Microsoft products (SQL Service, Office Suite (Word/Excel/Access) or Adobe Creative Suite products.

Q46. Of the functionalities listed, which are mandatory to preserve and which may be replaced

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

or retired during redesign. Reference: Exhibit 1 preface, page 28. Response: See response to question 4 and 23 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q47. Please confirm providers and access details for these items so we can scope integrations and testing: flight status, two XML feeds, parking availability XML, Constant Contact, HubSpot, Lost and Found embed, Schedule–a–Class, QR code tracking, RSS feeds. References: Exhibit 1, items 9, 14, 5, 11, 20, 18, 19, pages 28–30. Response: See response to question 7 of Addendum No. 1 and questions 7 and 10 of Addendum No. 2.

Q48. Are technical specifications and non-production credentials available now for each integration, and will MGAA facilitate vendor contacts. References: Section Two, E.1.j–k and knowledge–transfer language, page 12; Exhibit A collaboration notes, page 39. Response: MGAA will facilitate vendor contacts where appropriate, and will work as an intermediary between the Offeror and the third-party where needed.

Q49. For Drone Requests, Noise Complaints, Terminal Feedback, and Public Records Requests, should the new site continue email-only handling or capture submissions in a database. References: Exhibit 1, items 7, 13, 21, 17, pages 29–30. Response: Continue Email only.

Q50. Which analytics platforms are currently in use, and should we plan a migration or a parallel run when we recommend and configure analytics. Reference: Section Two, E.1.d, page 12. Response: Google Analytics is the current platform in use. The Airport will defer to the selected Offeror for recommendations on migrating to a new platform if the Offeror advises switching.

Q51. What success metrics and KPIs should we track per site when we define SEO goals and key performance indicators utilizing HubSpot and a recommended analytics program. Reference: Section Two, E.1.e, page 12. Response: The specifics will be defined in collaboration with the selected Offeror. Please note that HubSpot is only applicable to the business development website (www.choosegatewayairport.com). An analytics solution will be implemented across all three websites, and the Airport has a preliminary set of key performance indicators, which will be refined in partnership with the selected Offeror.

Q52. Are there SEO objectives beyond image and video optimization and friendly URLs that we should include. Reference: Section Two, C.1.b–c, page 11. Response: The Airport will defer to the selected Offeror's expertise in SEO to recommend best practices.

Q53. Writing scope clarification: would you like us to write copy for both section landing pages and all child pages across the three sites, or landing pages only. See Examples.
>   Examples:
>   a. On gatewayairport.com the Restaurants and Shops landing page and each tenant entry such as First Jet Market and Coffee Shop, and the Parking section including items like Covered Parking in the Economy Lot.
>   b. On choosegatewayairport.com the Available Properties overview and each individual property detail page.
>   c. On gatewayfbo.com the Services overview and each service or facility page such as Facilities.
>   Please confirm the expected level of copywriting based on these example patterns.
>   Reference: Section Two, E.1.f, page

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

Response: The specifics will be refined with the selected Offeror; however, in general, we would like all copy on every page to be reviewed and edited as a minimum. Copy on a linked PDF or frame (like https://www.choosegatewayairport.com/availableproperties#5803SSossamanRd) does not need to be updated.

Q54. Will MGAA supply all imagery, or should we plan for additional asset development beyond the high-resolution photos MGAA will provide. Reference: Section Two, F.1.a, page 13. Response: The Airport will provide high-resolution photos and video assets. If additional content is required, the Airport will coordinate to capture it as needed. Should stock imagery or video be necessary, the airport will handle the procurement.

Q55. Beyond layered PSD files at acceptance, are additional layout or component deliverable formats desired. References: Exhibit A, acceptance item b, page 39; Section Two, G.1.b. Response: Per the RFQ G, 1, A – Any relevant source code file developed (HTML, CSS, JS etc.)

Q56. WCAG 2.1 is specified. Do you require specific audit artifacts at acceptance, such as manual testing reports or assistive technology test matrices? Reference: Section Two, A.1.d, page 10. Response: This is a new area for the Airport, and we will rely on the selected Offeror to provide guidance and informed recommendations.

Q57. Beyond input validation and protections against SQL injection and cross-site scripting, are there MGAA security standards we should explicitly cite. Reference: Section Two, C.1.e, page 11. Response: There are no specific standards we are requiring, MGAA wants the Offeror to explain how they protect against attacks.

Q58. What is the review and turnaround process for approving third-party controls, code, or scripts. Reference: Section Two, C.1.d, page 11. Response: MGAA will have staff review any third-party controls, code, or scripts and will provide a response within an agreed upon time with the Offeror.

Q59. Please confirm desired repository platform and environment structure for MGAA administrative access to CMS, hosting, and source control, and whether you want separate development, test, and production under MGAA ownership. References: Section Two, A.7, pages 10–11; Exhibit 2, Section XXI Rights, Title, and Access to Website Assets, pages 37–38. Response: The Airport would like full admin access to any hosted site, CMS, and Source control. The Airport would like at minimum development and production sites.

Q60. For third-party materials governed by separate licenses, are there preferred licensing terms or restrictions we should observe. Reference: Exhibit 2, Section XXI, pages 37–38. Response: MGAA has no preferred licensing terms for third-party materials.

Q61. Who should be trained and at what depth for functionality and code-level topics, and how many sessions should we plan. References: Section Two, training items under C and E, page 12; Exhibit A knowledge-transfer requirements, page 39. Response: See response to questions 9, 14, and 15 of this Addendum No. 2.

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

Q62. Since no launch date is set, are there external milestones we should align to, and what internal review cycles should we assume for concepts, content, and QA sign–offs. Reference: Section Two, A.5, page 10. Response: There are no external milestones. Offerors can use past experiences on average turnaround time with clients on concepts, content, and QA sign-offs. This project is a priority for the Airport, so staff will be responsive.

Q63. Will interviews include demonstrations of comparable airport sites. Reference: RFQ Information box, Interviews if conducted, page 1. Response: If the Evaluation Panel determines that interviews are necessary, they may include demonstrations of comparable airport websites or relevant project work, at the panel's discretion. Additional guidance will be provided to shortlisted firms if interviews are scheduled.

Q64. Within your evaluation and submittal structure, are there emphasis areas you want Offerors to prioritize in the Statement of Qualifications. Reference: Section Two, Tab E Project Understanding and Approach, page 15. Response: The Airport is seeking a complete and comprehensive submittal. Offerors are strongly encouraged to familiarize themselves with the Evaluation Criteria outlined in the RFQ, as these will guide the assessment of all Statements of Qualifications.

Q65. After acceptance of the Scope of Work, MGAA may execute the Offeror Support and Maintenance Agreement. Are there preferred service levels and response times we should propose? References: Section Two, A.6, page 10; Submittal Tab H, page 15. Response: The Airport is requesting the Offeror's standard Support and Maintenance Agreement template that outlines the typical terms and conditions provided for routine or basic services. This may include, but is not limited to, items such as security updates, uptime monitoring, bug fixes, API maintenance, and minor content adjustments. The intent is to understand the scope and structure of your standard support offerings as well as standard liability and indemnification clauses.

Q66. Brand standards and assets: can MGAA confirm whether brand guidelines exist for the three sites and whether those assets will be provided to the selected consultant. Response: See response to question 5 of Addendum No. 1.

Q67. Multilingual requirements: does MGAA anticipate needing multilingual capability for any of the three sites. Response: The Airport understands the importance of meeting Title VI requirements and currently anticipates including required statements on the Procurement Page in both Spanish and Filipino. Given our regional demographics, Spanish is the most relevant, though we recognize that other languages, such as French, may be worth considering based on visitor trends. This is an area where we look to the selected Offeror to provide guidance on best practices and help determine the most appropriate language support for accessibility and compliance.

Q68. Performance benchmarks: are there specific target metrics for page load, Core Web Vitals, or uptime that you want included in testing and acceptance. Response: The selected Offeror is expected to be well-versed in current industry best practices for page speed and optimization, and other key SEO performance metrics. The airport currently utilizes Google PageSpeed Insights as a reference tool for evaluating website performance.

Q69. We plan to implement a single codebase with a multisite CMS to maintain shared components across all three domains. Are there any policy constraints we should consider (e.g., separate content

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

owners, shared modules, or approval requirements)? Response: No.

Q70. Are there any staff skill limitations we should plan for (e.g., limited to CMS-level editing or comfortable with light HTML/CSS)? Response: See response to questions 9, 14, and 15 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q71. Does MGAA require single sign-on (SSO) integration for administrators, or are CMS-native role permissions sufficient? Response: SSO is not required.

Q72. Please confirm the authoritative data sources for:
    a. Flight status (currently from two XML feeds)
    b. Parking availability (XML data source)
    c. Airline and route maps (AMCharts data)
    d. HubSpot and Constant Contact integrations
    e. Lost & Found system provider
Response: Please see response to question 7 of Addendum No. 1 and questions 7 and 10 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q73. Are there any technical documents or API details available for these systems? Please see response to question 7 of Addendum No. 1 and questions 7 and 10 of Addendum No. 2.

Q74. How frequently do these data feeds or APIs change, and does MGAA have a versioning or notification process when endpoints are updated? Response: Very infrequently.

Q75. Are there new systems or integrations anticipated within the next 12–24 months (e.g., parking, training, flight data) that we should plan for or future-proof against? Response: None currently anticipated.

Q76. Please share MGAA's brand guidelines (logo, color palette, typography, tone). Should each site maintain consistent branding or feature minor visual distinctions? Response: Staff will provide brand files to the selected Offeror. Each site will have unique content – photos, video, and copy, but brand – logo, font, colors – will be the same. Voice may change behind sites due to the audience.

Q77. The RFQ references developing new site maps and fresh copy. Are we authorized to restructure the information architecture based on analytics and stakeholder interviews, or must we maintain certain existing structures? Response: Yes, if the results justify a change, the Airport fully supports it. We are looking for the selected Offeror to recommend an organized, intuitive website based on the information gathered on step A of the Scope of Work (E, 1, a).

Q78. From MGAA's perspective, what are the top user or internal pain points for each of the three existing sites? Response: See response to question 3 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q79. For the alert/notice system, should this integrate with any emergency or operations systems, or remain a manual publishing process with role-based approvals? Response: Currently, the alert system is used by Airport staff to communicate important notices to website visitors; it is not intended for relaying

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

emergency information. However, the selected Offeror is welcome to propose an alternative approach if they believe enhanced alerting capabilities are appropriate for a modern airport website.

Q80. Does MGAA have a preferred cloud provider (AWS, Azure, or GCP) currently in use for other systems that we should align with? Response: No, not specifically.

Q81. What specific security validations or testing are required (e.g., penetration testing, SOC 2 compliance, vulnerability scanning, security headers)? Response: Annual penetration testing, and SOC 2 compliance will be required.

Q82. What are MGAA's uptime expectations and redundancy requirements (e.g., active-active failover, RTO/RPO targets)? Should we propose standard SLA-based hosting or enhanced high-availability infrastructure? Response: See response to question 20 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q83. The RFQ requests that we define SEO goals and KPIs per site and track via HubSpot and analytics tools. Which performance metrics are most important to MGAA (e.g., engagement, flight lookups, business inquiries, or parking actions)? Response: The KPIs differ by website. Staff will review this with the selected Offeror.

Q84. Who will own ongoing analytics and SEO oversight post-launch (IT, marketing, or business development)? Should we establish a monthly reporting cadence or self-serve dashboard? Response: Marketing. Assistance with setting up a structured monthly reporting process would be greatly appreciated and is considered a valuable part of the project support.

Q85. What is the preferred training format (on-site sessions, virtual meetings, or recorded videos)? Response: The Airport is open to any of these formats.

Q86. What type of administrative documentation would be most valuable — a step-by-step Admin Guide, technical runbooks, or visual architecture diagrams? Response: The Airport feels that each of these would be valuable to different audiences.

Q87. Our standard workflow includes weekly progress meetings with milestone reviews. Does this cadence align with MGAA's expectations? Response: Yes, that is acceptable.

Q88. Who will be the primary decision-maker or approval committee for design and content reviews? Response: Design and copy-related decisions will be made by the Communications and Government Relations (Marketing) Department.

Q89. Are there any public-facing events, campaigns, or seasonal milestones we should plan around during development and launch? Response: Not at this time. The Airport will discuss and develop the project schedule with the selected Offeror.

Q90. Would MGAA benefit from an initial discovery workshop (analytics review + stakeholder interviews) before we finalize the sitemap and CMS configuration? Response: See the Scope of Work (E, 1, a) on page 12.

	Airport Administration
	5835 South Sossaman Road
	Mesa, Arizona 85212
	Telephone 480.988.7600
	FAX 480.988.2315
	www.gatewayairport.com

Q91. For WCAG 2.1 accessibility, does MGAA currently use a third-party accessibility auditor, or should we include independent testing and certification in our proposal? Response: The Airport does not currently have anything set up and looks to the selected Offeror for recommendations.

Q92. The RFQ requests three complete design concepts leading to one final design. Does MGAA prefer three distinct art directions, or one unified design system shown across three brand variations? Response: The three design concepts are *concepts*, not a final design, that we can choose from. Therefore, the three concepts should be distinct to give us three varying options to consider. All should utilize our existing brand.

Q93. Beyond the required layered PSD files, are Figma prototypes or component library documentation also desired? Response: We do not currently use Figma, hence we request PSD files. However, if your staff prefer Figma, we will accept Figma files as long as the final image and PDF files are provided.

Q94. The RFQ asks for our Support & Maintenance Agreement. Could MGAA clarify which services should be covered under this agreement (e.g., security updates, uptime monitoring, bug fixes, API maintenance, minor content adjustments) so we can align scope accordingly? Response: See response to question 65 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q95. What CMS platform are you wanting to build the new website in (for example, WordPress or Drupal)? Response: See response to question 5 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q96. What are your current pain points on the website(s)? Response: See response to question 3 of this Addendum 2.

Q97. Is there any wishlist functionality that you're hoping to incorporate outside of what exists today on any of the websites? Response: See response to questions 4 and 23 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q98. For submissions, should all copies be identical in printing, or would it be okay to submit 1 color copy with 5 black and white copies? Response: While all copies must be identical in content, please note that the Evaluation Panel consists of several members who will each review the submitted materials individually. To ensure consistency in how your submission is reviewed and interpreted, particularly for any visual elements such as graphics, charts, or images, the Airport strongly recommends providing all copies in color.

Q99. What led to this RFQ being originated - what is our context? What is the backstory on the project? What is the trigger problem that occurred/issue we want to address? Response: See response to question 3 of this Addendum No. 2.

Q100. In Section A1, three distinct websites with their own target audiences are highlighted (general travel, private aviation, commercial/retail partnerships). Which of the following are you looking for?
   a. Three separate best-of-breed websites - currently they all look alike which can be an issue.
   b. Singular digital asset management system with common elements that can be leveraged across all.
   c. Both. If so, please elaborate.

Response: The Airport requests one design template that will be utilized for all three websites. The template defines the layout, menu structure, and overall look of the site. The colors, photos, video, and copy will then be unique for each website.

Q101. What is the composition of the Mesa Airport team? Of your team members, executive stakeholders %, business strategy %, marketing %, technical %, operations %? Response: Related to the project team: 20% Executive stakeholders, 10% business strategy, 30% marketing, 30% technical, and 10% operations.

Q102. What are your "envy" sites - sites whose functionality/experience you aspire to have inside/outside the industry? Response: Long Beach Airport, Ontario International Airport, and Palm Springs International Airport are all good examples of what we are looking for.

Q103. You mention Google analytics driving design. What are the KPIs currently driving your business & are specific shortfall challenges driving this activity? Response: We will get into specifics with the selected Offeror, but the example conversions include click-throughs to the airline websites from the passenger service website (to buy airfare) and phone number clicks and form submissions on the business development website.

Q104. Have you considered qualitative research with users/commercial ventures/private aviation to better qualitatively understand "humancentric design"? Response: The selected Offeror can provide a recommendation.

Q105. Do you have any specific performance metric/goals (data retrieval and display/page load speed)? Response: Airport staff will work with the selected Offeror to decide on specific KPIs based on best practices.

Q106. Do you have or aspire to have integration with a third-party:
    a. SSO (single sign on) Authentication system?
    b. RBAC (role-based access control) system like Active Directory?
Response: No, not necessarily. We are open to using Microsoft's SSO provider, but it is not required.

Q107. What are your security practices that we need to meet? Response: Annual penetration testing, Multifactor authentication for user accounts, and SOC 2 annual reports

Q108. You are integrating multiple data/content systems - what type of governance or workflows have you already implemented or would like to explore? Response: Since the current website has been created in house, we will work with the Offeror on creating the workflow and governance needed to integrate our content systems. This will include workflows, data access and data security, and audit trails.

Q109. The Scope of Work references reviewing Google Analytics for the Airport's three external websites (Section E.1.a) and also requires the Offeror to "recommend analytic solution(s) and configure" (Section E.1.d) as well as "recommend analytics services for the sites moving forward" (Section C.1.h). Will MGAA continue to use Google Analytics for website tracking and engagement analysis, or would you be open to evaluating and potentially implementing a new analytics solution? Reference: Section Two, Section

Airport Administration
5835 South Sossaman Road
Mesa, Arizona 85212
Telephone 480.988.7600
FAX 480.988.2315
www.gatewayairport.com

E.1.a, E.1.d, E.1.e; Section C.1.h, Page 13. Response: We currently have Google Analytics; hence, we ask the Offeror to review the existing and past data in E, 1, a. Moving forward, we want the selected Offeror to recommend an analytics solution and configure it. So yes, the Airport is open to evaluating and implementing a new analytics solution.

Q110. The RFQ requires that the website design be ADA-compliant and meet Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.1 standards (Section A.1.d). What accessibility testing tools is MGAA using today, if any, and are they open-source, proprietary, or a combination of both Reference: Section Two, Section A.1.d, Page 11. Response: The Airport is not currently using anything.

Q111. The RFQ requires that "all images and videos will be formatted for search engine optimization" (Section C.1.b) and mentions that MGAA will provide hi-res photos (Section F.1.a). How is content such as images and video currently managed today (e.g., via file manager, database, or other system)? Reference: Section Two, Section C.1.b, Page 13; Section F.1.a, Page 14. Response: A file manager.

Q112. Exhibit 1 lists various forms used to collect information, including Drone Reporting, Lost & Found, and Noise Complaints. Are these forms currently created using custom code or with a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) product? Reference: Exhibit 1, Items 6, 11, 13, Pages 28-29. Response: Most data collection is done using custom code, but some items such as Lost and Found are embedded iframes from third-party applications.

Offeror shall indicate receipt of this Addendum and any previously issued Addenda by completing and including the Addenda Acknowledgement Attachment for the RFQ.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE RFQ REMAIN UNCHANGED.

The above referenced RFQ Addendum is hereby issued and executed on October 22, 2025, at Mesa Gateway Airport Authority, Mesa, Arizona.

Marian Whilden

_____
Procurement Officer
Mesa Gateway Airport Authority