



## **ADDENDUM II**

**SUBJECT:** Annual Contract for San Antonio Public Library Digital Experience Redesign, (RFCSP 26-029, 6100019598), Scheduled to Close: May 18, 2026; Date of Issue: April 15, 2026

**FROM:** Charisma Esparza  
Procurement Administrator

**DATE:** May 12, 2026

### **THIS NOTICE SHALL SERVE AS ADDENDUM NO. II - TO THE ABOVE REFERENCED REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS**

Respondents and bidders shall be responsible for reading the entire addendum. All addenda issued for this solicitation shall be attached to and become part of the solicitation and resulting contract documents for this project. By submitting a response to a City solicitation, respondent/bidder is acknowledging the receipt of this addendum.

By virtue of this addendum, the specifications, requirements and amendments stated below become a permanent addition to the solicitation referenced above.

### **THE ABOVE MENTIONED REQUEST FOR COMPETITIVE SEALED PROPOSALS IS HEREBY AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:**

- 1. EXTENSION: THE BID OPENING DATE IS HEREBY EXTENDED TO MONDAY, JUNE 1, 2026, AT 11:00 AM CENTRAL TIME.**
- 2. Add: Pre-Submittal Conference Sign In Sheet, this document will be posted as a separate file.**

### **QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 003, PRE-SUBMITTAL CONFERENCE:**

On Monday, April 27, 2026, the City of San Antonio hosted a Pre-Submittal Conference to provide information and clarification for the Annual Contract for San Antonio Public Library Digital Experience Redesign. Below is a list of questions that were asked at the pre-submittal conference. The City's official response to questions asked is as follows:

Question 1: Is the library looking for any specific functions or tools?

Response: Please refer to Section 004 – Specifications / Scope of Services.

Question 2: In Attachment K – Requirements Traceability Matrix, there is a column marked Evidence and another marked Compliance. Are those columns that should be filled out by the bidding vendor?

Response: These are columns for internal City of San Antonio (CoSA) use only.

Question 3: Can you share more about the goals of your D1-D6 discovery & search requirements in Attachment K – Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM)?

Response: The goal is to provide an easier way for Patrons to find and/or discover SAPL digital services. One that unifies the search across all San Antonio Public Library (SAPL) products and platforms.

Question 4: The Contracts Disclosure Form asks if this is a high-profile contract. Is this considered a high-profile contract?

Response: No, this is not high profile.

### **QUESTIONS SUBMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 003, RESTRICTIONS OF COMMUNICATION:**

Question 5: Would you extend the clarification deadline by one (1) more week?

Response: No, the deadline for clarification cannot be extended.

Question 6: Would you consider a one (1) week extension of this project?

Response: This solicitation has been extended to June 1, 2026.

Question 7: Can you confirm the expectation of the Security Questionnaires (Attachment G – I)? Do we need to fill out all 3 or only the questionnaire applicable to the vendor's solution? If only filling out one of the three, do we mark the others as N/A and still submit with our proposal?

Response: Yes, the appropriate Security Questionnaires need to be completed as part of the vendor's proposal. Security Questionnaires that do not apply do not need to be submitted.

Question 8: Does Exhibit I – Statement of Work need to be completed and submitted or is this post-award?

Response: The Statement of Work will be completed during the contracting process with the recommended vendor.

Question 9: Regarding Financial Information, would a financial stability package be acceptable, such as a letter from our VP of Finance, as well as letters from independent auditors for the previous two years? We will also include a D&B report. Audited Financials would require signing a Nondisclosure Agreement (NDA).

Response: Please refer to Section 003 – Instructions for Respondents, Part B – Submission Requirements.

Question 10: Can you confirm the final submission of how this proposal should be uploaded? The RFCSP states, "Each separate section should be attached as a separate file." Does this mean everything in the Form of Response should be labelled as applicable and uploaded separately?

Response: Please refer to and utilize Attachment L – Proposal Checklist and upload all documents according to the checklist.

Question 11: Regarding Interlocal Participation, can we agree to this but under the condition that pricing would change site to site?

Response: Interlocal Participation is not applicable to this RFCSP as it is not indicated in the Supplemental Terms and Conditions portion of this RFCSP.

Question 12: What is the estimated budget range or the “not-to-exceed” amount for this project, and has this funding already been officially allocated?

Response: The City welcomes competitive pricing; however, the budget will not be disclosed.

Question 13: Is the Library open to a full custom-built solution that prioritizes speed and user flow, provided it integrates with your backend data (ILS) via API?

Response: Yes. However, the full cost (including maintenance costs) needs to be included in the vendor’s proposal.

Question 14: Is this the only domain in scope: <https://www.mysapl.org/> or does the scope include subdomains such as [ask.mysapl.org](https://ask.mysapl.org/)?

Response: All Library online services are included in the scope. The goal is to make all SAPL online services seamless, regardless of domain name or subdomain.

Question 15: What is the budget?

Response: Please refer to the response to question 11.

Question 16: What is the timeline?

Response: Please refer to the Schedule of Events found on the Pre-submittal Presentation uploaded into the SAePS Vendor Portal.

Question 17: Is there a Content Management System (CMS) platform preference?

Response: The City’s standard WCMS is OpenCities. Other CMS platforms will be considered on their merits and suitability.

Question 18: In order to properly quote hosting, can you provide the number of page views per month, currently, for the site?

Response: In 2025, the average number of page views was 370,000.

Question 19: What is the average bandwidth usage per month?

Response: We are unable to provide this data; the Library’s network traffic is not separate from other City network traffic.

Question 20: Can you provide current storage requirements for both database and files?

Response: It is approximately 5GB of pages and files.

Question 21: Who supports the current site?

Response: The library’s web presence is supported by a variety of vendors and city staff. See Section 4.1 of the RFCSP document.

Question 22: To help us shape our compliance response to Attachment K - Requirements Traceability Matrix, please clarify, with reference to Section 2.0 – Discovery & Search (D-1, D-2, D-3 and D-6), Section 3.0 – User Accounts & Circulation (CIR-1, CIR-2, CIR-3, and CIR-5), Section 4.0 – Digital Content Integration (DC-1 and DC-3) and Section 4.0 – Other Compatibilities (C-1), where the requirement is intended to be:

- (a) Delivered by the Respondent natively
- (b) Delivered by BiblioCommons, with the Respondent's role limited to interoperability at the level BiblioCommons supports
- (c) Shared, with delivery split between the respondent and BiblioCommons; or
- (d) Considered out of scope and not evaluated.

For requirements that fall under (b) or (d), it would also help us to know how the San Antonio Public Library (SAPL) intends to evaluate Respondent in the Proposed Plan score against those items.

Response: The City is looking for market-based solutions to meet the requirements outlined in the RTM. Any assumptions should be included as part of the proposal.

Question 23: We have worked with several libraries using BiblioCommons and our understanding from publicly available information is that BiblioCore and BiblioApps APIs are not generally exposed outside BiblioCommons' own engagements. So, we can size the integration work realistically and propose a credible delivery plan. Could you share what you know about the following:

- (a) the BiblioCommons APIs, SDKs, integration endpoints, webhooks, RSS or similar feeds that will be available to the awarded Respondent;
- (b) any commitments BiblioCommons has provided to the City and/or SAPL regarding the availability of those interfaces, and the timeline on which they will be made available;
- (c) whether technical documentation describing those interfaces is available to share with Respondents during the solicitation period, or with the awarded Respondent at contract execution;
- (d) where particular interfaces are not exposed by BiblioCommons, whether BiblioCommons will instead consume interfaces such as APIs, feeds, and widgets will be provided by the awarded Respondent; and
- (e) the City's expectations for how the awarded Respondent should proceed if the integration support needed to satisfy the requirements in A1 cannot be obtained from BiblioCommons within the project timeline.

Response: The City cannot provide detailed, technical interface information about our infrastructure prior to contract award.

Question 24: To help us design and pitch the right solution, could the City share its picture of what success looks like for the integration of BiblioCommons? Specifically:

- (a) the kinds of behaviors the City and/or SAPL would consider acceptable evidence of “interoperability,” e.g., single sign-on, deep-linking, embedded widgets, federated search, shared analytics, shared identity, shared visual design language, or a combination of these.
- (b) the patron-experience outcomes the City and/or SAPL has in mind for “seamless transitions” — e.g., common header and footer, common authentication, no re-authentication when moving between platforms, consistent typography and colors, persistent search context, or other.
- (c) any examples, whether internal or external, of platforms the City and/or SAPL sees as a useful reference for the standard it is hoping to achieve; and
- (d) how interoperability and seamlessness will be measured during User Acceptance Testing (T-1 through T-9) and final acceptance.

Response: Please refer to Section 4.2 - Desired State from the RFCSP document. Specific plans for how this could be achieved should be provided in your response.

Question 25: If integration with BiblioCore or BiblioApps requires effort by BiblioCommons, including professional services, custom development, or any third-party dependency the awarded Respondent does not control, can you confirm the City’s expectations for:

- (a) whether such costs are absorbed by the City and/or SAPL under its existing BiblioCommons contract;
- (b) whether such costs should be priced by the Respondent in Attachment B (we have no contractual relationship with BiblioCommons, so any pricing here would be best effort estimates against assumed scope);
- (c) how the acceptance, retainage, and three-strikes provisions in Section 005 apply if delays or scope changes during integration delivery originate with BiblioCommons rather than the Respondent; and
- (d) whether the awarded Respondent will have a contractual route to escalate BiblioCommons-side delivery questions to the City and/or SAPL for resolution.

Response: Respondent assumes responsibility for overall system integration and shall, in its proposal, disclose to City and advise on professional services, custom development, or any third-party dependency that will be required from BiblioCommons and Respondent shall disclose to City and advise on potential BiblioCommons issues. Costs within scope of the project will rest with the awarded vendor.

Question 26: To help us validate our approach against precedent, are there particular library or municipal customer deployments that are running a non-BiblioCommons digital experience platform alongside a retained BiblioCommons discovery layer that the City and/or SAPL sees as a useful reference for the integration outcome you are seeking? If so, we would be grateful for the names so we can study them and propose accordingly.

Response: Some examples of libraries that run a non-BiblioCommons digital experience platform alongside a BiblioCommons discovery layer are as follows:

- Seattle Public Library
- San Francisco Library
- Multnomah County Library
- Vancouver Public Library

Question 27: Section 4.2.4 (Third Party Software Solutions) provides that *“the respondent assumes responsibility for overall system integration.”* To help us model risk and acceptance criteria appropriately in our proposal, please confirm:

- (a) whether that responsibility statement is intended to apply to BiblioCore and BiblioApps, or only to third-party software the awarded Respondent itself proposes;
- (b) how the City and/or SAPL would expect to characterize an acceptance failure under the three-strikes provision in Section 005 where the underlying cause sits with BiblioCommons rather than the Respondent; and
- (c) whether the City would be open to making clear in the contract terms that BiblioCommons-caused issues are excluded from Respondent acceptance criteria.

Response: (a) The responsibility statement is only intended to apply to third-party software that the awarded vendor proposes.  
(b) Respondent assumes responsibility for overall system integration and shall, in its proposal, disclose to City and advise on potential BiblioCommons issues.  
(c) Respondent assumes responsibility for overall system integration and shall, in its proposal, disclose to City and advise on potential BiblioCommons issues .

Question 28: Several of the discovery and content requirements in A1 may be at least partially deliverable by a non-discovery platform, e.g., search across staff-authored website content (CMS pages, events, blog, FAQ, A-Z guides) as distinct from catalogue search. To make sure we propose the right architecture, please clarify whether the City and/or SAPL has in mind:

- (a) the Respondent providing search across its own content surfaces only, with catalogue search remaining entirely within BiblioCore;
- (b) a federated user-interface that combines the Respondent’s content search with BiblioCore catalog search results; or
- (c) some other configurations the City and/or SAPL has in mind.

If (b), this also relates to A2 - whether BiblioCommons will provide an API or feed that makes the federation technically possible.

Response: The City and SAPL are open to all potential options, with the customer experience of the solution being the deciding factor.

Question 29: Proposed Plan item #7 references transition of events calendar data from Trumba to the new platform. Could you clarify the expected migration scope — historical events (and if so, how many years of history), future-dated events, open registrations and waitlists at the cutover point, and any Trumba-managed event URLs that may need to resolve to equivalent destinations post-migration?

Response: Historical events are not needed longer than 30 days after the event. Currently, there are 2,500 future events in Trumba. Registrations and waitlists are included in scope of what moves over.

Question 30: Section 4.1 notes that the current DotNetNuke contract expires in December 2027. Does the City have a target go-live date, or a window within which the new platform must be in production, that Respondents should align their proposed schedules to?

Response: Yes, the new platform needs to be Live before December 2027.

Question 31: To help us propose accurately sized hosting and licensing, please could you share the following figures (or reasonable estimates where exact figures are not available):

- (a) average and peak monthly unique visitors to mysapl.org;
- (b) peak concurrent users;
- (c) current number of email-marketable patron records and typical monthly email volume in the Orangeboy Savannah deployment;
- (d) anticipated number of staff CMS user accounts (CMS-19 references “50 or more”);
- (e) typical monthly event registration volume; and
- (f) approximate number of content pages currently in the DotNetNuke site that are candidates for migration.

Response: (a) 75k average monthly unique visitors & 122k peak monthly visitors  
(b) 68k peak concurrent daily visits, 153k concurrent visits at Noontime  
(c) ~700,000 patron records and growing, 3 million emails per month  
(d) correct, no fewer than 50  
(e) 1,000 registrants  
(f) There are currently 93 pages in DNN. However, not all will be migrated.

Question 32: Requirement SYS-17 and Proposed Plan item #9 reference PCI DSS compliance and integration with “CoSA-approved payment processors.” Could you confirm the City’s preferred or approved payment processor(s), whether the Respondent is expected to redirect patrons to a City-hosted payment page or to integrate a tokenised payment flow, and whether SAPL plans to collect fines/fees, event fees, or both through the new platform?

Response: The Library currently processes payments through Pharos and e-Biz. However, we are anticipating a change in the near future.

Question 33: Requirement 4.2.2.2 encourages a SaaS, on-demand, hosted model. Could you confirm that a fully vendor-hosted, multi-tenant SaaS solution meets the City’s preferred hosting posture, and that proposals based on on-premises or City-hosted infrastructure would not be scored advantageously where an equivalent SaaS alternative is offered?

Response: On-premises solutions are not preferred.

Question 34: Section 005 describes a 10% retainage on deliverables, released on final acceptance. Could you confirm that the retainage applies to one-time implementation deliverables only, and that recurring annual SaaS subscription, hosting, and support fees are not subject to retainage?

Response: Retainage applies to deliverables as set forth in a Statement of Work and is paid upon final acceptance of the Platform as a Service (PaaS) solution. Annual SaaS subscription, hosting, and support fees are applicable after implementation / set up and therefore retainage is not applicable.

Question 35: Section 005 provides for a five-year initial term plus two optional one-year renewals. Would the City consider pricing that includes a defined annual escalator (for example, CPI-based and capped) in the renewal years, or does the City prefer fully firm pricing for the full potential seven-year term?

Response: No. However, the price schedule is set up to allow for escalating pricing.

Question 36: Administrative Directive 7.3a (Exhibit IV) addresses data security. Could you confirm whether the City and/or SAPL has any data-residency requirement beyond what is stated in the Directive - specifically, whether production hosting, backups, and support access are required to be within the United States, or within a narrower geographic boundary?

Response: Data residency in the United States is required.

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <hr/> <p>Original Signature of Person Authorized to Sign Bid/Contract (<b>Please Sign</b>)</p> <hr/> <p>Signer's Name</p> <hr/> <p>Vendor Name</p> <hr/> <p>Vendor Address</p> <hr/> <p>City</p> <hr/> <p>State, Zip code</p> |  <hr/> <p>Procurement Administrator<br/>Finance Department, Procurement Division</p> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|