



MAIN STREET IQ
AI-Augmented Strategic Advisory

Website Audit

Main Street IQ

Prepared by
Scott Hess, Main Street IQ
scott@mainstreetiq.com
May 27, 2026

Executive Summary

This Website Audit evaluates <https://www.mainstreetiq.com> across three search-visibility layers (classic SEO, answer-engine optimization, and generative-engine optimization) and four supporting modules (technical performance, mobile friendliness, accessibility, and platform health). Findings are written for direct hand-off to a web partner or marketing operator.

The audit surfaced 6 high-priority, 12 medium-priority, and 5 low-priority findings, for a composite score of 59.6 / 100 (Underperforming digital surface; priority gaps to address). The three highest-leverage actions are below.

If you do nothing else in the next 30 days, fix these

- 1 No schema.org structured data. Add JSON-LD for the page type (Organization on home, Service on service pages, Article on posts, FAQPage where applicable).
Lift: +5 of 35 SEO, +5 of 100 overall

- 2 No question-shaped headings. Add 3 to 6 H2s phrased as the questions a buyer would actually type, each followed by a direct 40 to 60 word answer.
Lift: +5 of 25 AEO, +5 of 100 overall

- 3 No direct-answer paragraph near the top. Within the first viewport, place a 40 to 60 word paragraph that directly answers the page's primary question, then expand below.
Lift: +4 of 25 AEO, +4 of 100 overall

Top 10 priority synthesis

Sort key: impact times inverse-difficulty. Easy fixes weight higher than hard ones at the same impact level. Structural walls (bot-protection challenge, JS-only shells) are excluded from this table; they remain visible in the per-phase findings where they are the right lead.

#	Issue	Impact	Fix difficulty
1	Form inputs without labels	H	E
2	No direct-answer paragraph near the top	H	E
3	Largest Contentful Paint above target	H	M
4	No question-shaped headings	H	M
5	No schema.org structured data	H	M
6	No FAQPage or QAPage schema	M	E
7	Open Graph tags incomplete	M	E
8	Orphan pages with no inbound links	M	E
9	Thin sameAs entity graph	M	E
10	Title is short	M	E

Impact: H = High, M = Medium, L = Low.

Fix difficulty: E = Easy (under 1 hour), M = Moderate (under 1 day), H = Hard (multi-day or vendor work).

Three-Layer Snapshot

Why we measure this. Search visibility is not one number; it is three layers stacked. Classic SEO is how Google ranks you. AEO is how answer engines (featured snippets, voice assistants) excerpt you. GEO is how AI assistants like ChatGPT, Claude, Perplexity, and Gemini decide whether to mention you. We score all three on a 100-point composite so you can see where the leverage is, not just that something is broken.

What your result means. Your composite is 59.6 of 100 (Underperforming digital surface; priority gaps to address), with 40.4 points of recoverable deductions. The table below shows where those points are sitting. Lower numbers are bigger opportunities, not failures; the score deduction is the lift you can earn back.

What good looks like. For small-business e-commerce or service, healthy sites land at 75 or higher on the composite; 85 or higher puts you in the top decile of the segment. Calibration anchors include category-leading SMBs in the segment as industry exemplars for the segment, not abstract SMB-e-commerce averages.

Each finding in this report carries a Score Impact: the points you would gain back if the issue were fixed. The composite is a 100-point score weighted across SEO (35), AEO (25), GEO (25), and the Technical / Mobile / Accessibility group (15). Use this table to read the scale of every finding that follows.

Layer	Weight	Your score	Deductions
SEO	35	22.8	12.2
AEO	25	10.5	14.5
GEO	25	18	7
Technical, Mobile, A11y	15	8.3	6.7
Composite	100	59.6	40.4

Site Coverage

Why we measure this. An audit that only looks at the homepage misses where most buying decisions actually happen. Service pages, blog posts, and About pages are where buyers and AI engines spend their time. We crawl the whole site so a finding that affects 30 pages reads as one fix, not thirty.

What your result means. We evaluated 63 of 63 accessible pages. The coverage table below shows how consistently the site applies the basics (title, meta, H1, schema, alt text) across every page. Gaps here usually point to a template-level fix that ripples across the whole site at once.

What good looks like. Healthy sites show 95% or better on every coverage signal in the table. Gaps under 80% almost always come from a missing field in the CMS template.

This audit crawled and evaluated 63 of 63 pages on the site. Per-page SEO, AEO, mobile, and accessibility checks were run on each. Findings below are deduplicated across the site, so a single issue affecting many pages reads as one finding with the affected URLs listed.

Coverage at a glance

Signal	Healthy pages
Pages with title tag	21/63 (33%)
Pages with meta description	41/63 (65%)
Pages with single H1	63/63 (100%)
Pages with JSON-LD schema	60/63 (95%)
Pages with responsive viewport	63/63 (100%)
Pages with alt text on every image	0/63 (0%)

Key page health

These are the highest-leverage pages we identified on the site. Issue counts reflect findings on each individual page.

Page	URL	High	Med	Low	Total
Home	/	1	4	2	7
Services	/our-services	2	5	3	10
Case Studies	/our-work	1	5	4	10
Team	/interim-finance-leadership	1	3	4	8
Insights	/blog/cfo-finance-director-controller	0	4	2	6
Contact	/contact	2	6	4	12
About	/about	1	4	3	8

Pages with the most issues

Top ten pages ranked by total findings (high-severity weighted first). Fix the top pages first to make the most progress per hour spent.

URL	High	Med	Low	Total
/fit-call	4	4	5	13
/partners	3	3	4	10
/contact	2	6	4	12
/ecommerce	2	5	5	12
/our-services	2	5	3	10
/blog	2	5	3	10
/wellness-assessment	2	4	5	11
/aesthetics-assessment	2	4	5	11

URL	High	Med	Low	Total
/ecommerce-assessment	2	4	5	11
/our-work	1	5	4	10

AI Visibility Snapshot

Why we measure this. Buyers are asking AI assistants for recommendations before they ever see a Google result. If ChatGPT, Claude, Perplexity, and Gemini do not mention you when a buyer asks for the best in your category, the site can rank perfectly on Google and still be invisible to half your pipeline.

What your result means. Across 10 buyer-shaped queries, your brand was mentioned in 10% of answers and your URL was cited in 0%. The query-by-query table later in this report shows exactly which prompts surface you and which surface competitors instead.

What good looks like. We treat 35%+ mention rate as the floor for a brand that competes in AI search; 60%+ is the band where you are clearly in the consideration set. Citation rate (your URL actually appearing) typically lags mention rate by 10 to 20 points.

AI assistants are increasingly the first place buyers turn for category research. We tested visibility across 10 project-relevant queries sent to ChatGPT, Claude, Perplexity, and Gemini (40 total model responses scored).

Each query is sampled 3 times per platform and a brand mention only counts when it appears in a majority of runs. This smooths over the run-to-run variance inherent to AI assistants and keeps the visibility number from swinging on a single sample.

Brand mention rate	10.0%
URL citation rate	0.0%

Reading the score. Visibility is measured against each platform's API. Consumer chat surfaces (claude.ai, chatgpt.com) include web search, conversation history, and a system prompt that the API does not, so an individual test from a logged-in user may produce different specific recommendations. The score reflects baseline model knowledge of the brand, which is what informs every higher-context surface.

SEO Findings

Mechanical signals: title and meta tags, structured data, headings, link integrity, crawler access.

1. Images missing alt text

MEDIUM

Type Imagery | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +2 of 35 SEO, +2 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

image-search visibility + accessibility coverage +2% to +5% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

63 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /, /about, /our-services, /interim-finance-leadership, /finance-director-services, +58 more. Sample evidence (from /): 1 of 3 tags lack alt attributes (33%).

RECOMMENDATION

Add descriptive alt text to every meaningful image; use alt="" for purely decorative images.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Image search indexes the assets and screen-reader users get the same context as sighted users.

2. Meta description likely truncated

LOW

Type Metadata | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +1 of 35 SEO, +1 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

organic CTR on affected pages +3% to +6% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

22 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /about, /our-services, /interim-finance-leadership, /finance-director-services, /contact, +17 more. Sample evidence (from /about): meta description is 214 characters.

RECOMMENDATION

Trim to under 160 characters; keep the value proposition in the first 120.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

The intended message renders in full on most devices.

3. Title is short

MEDIUM

Type Metadata | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +2 of 35 SEO, +2 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

organic CTR on affected pages +3% to +7% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

42 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /interim-finance-leadership, /finance-director-services, /contact, /ecommerce, /wine-country-intelligence, +37 more. Sample evidence (from /contact): <title>Contact | Main Street IQ</title> is 24 characters.

RECOMMENDATION

Extend the title to 50-60 characters with the primary keyword and brand name.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Search snippets carry more context, improving click-through.

4. No Twitter Card metadata

LOW

Type Social Preview | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +0.25 of 35 SEO, +0.25 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

Twitter/X share rendering quality +1% to +3% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

7 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /partners, /fit-call, /ecommerce, /wine-country-intelligence, /wellness-assessment, +2 more. Sample evidence (from /partners): No <meta name="twitter:*"> tags present.

RECOMMENDATION

Add twitter:card, twitter:title, twitter:description, twitter:image (or rely on OG fallback).

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Shared links on X render with the intended preview rather than a plain URL.

5. No schema.org structured data

HIGH

Type Schema | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +5 of 35 SEO, +5 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

rich-result + AI citation eligibility +4% to +9% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

3 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /partners, /fit-call, /ecommerce. Sample evidence (from /partners): No application/ld+json blocks found in the page.

RECOMMENDATION

Add JSON-LD for the page type (Organization on home, Service on service pages, Article on posts, FAQPage where applicable).

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Search results gain rich-result eligibility and AI assistants understand entity relationships.

6. Open Graph tags incomplete

MEDIUM

Type Social Preview | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +1 of 35 SEO, +1 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

social-share click-through +1% to +4% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

1 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /ecommerce. Sample evidence (from /ecommerce): Missing: og:image.

RECOMMENDATION

Add og:title, og:description, and og:image (1200x630) for predictable social previews.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Links shared on LinkedIn, Slack, and iMessage render with branded preview cards.

7. Orphan pages with no inbound links

MEDIUM

Type Site Architecture | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +1 of 35 SEO, +1 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

ranking signal reaching deep pages +3% to +8% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

7 crawled page(s) are not linked from any other page on the site. Examples: /finance-director-services, /wine-country-intelligence, /winery-assessment, /wellness-assessment, /aesthetics-assessment, /fractional-cfo-vs-cpa, +1 more.

RECOMMENDATION

Either link to each orphan from a relevant parent page (so the navigation graph reaches it), or remove the page if it is no longer needed. Pages with no inbound links rarely accumulate ranking signal and are missed by users browsing the site.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Every page on the site is reachable through navigation; ranking signal flows to all published content; users do not land on dead-end paths.

AEO Findings

Answer-engine readiness: question-shaped headings, snippet-eligible paragraphs, FAQ and HowTo schema, direct-answer placement.

1. No question-shaped headings

HIGH

Type Content Structure | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +5 of 25 AEO, +5 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

AI mention rate + PAA snippet eligibility +8% to +15% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

41 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /, /about, /our-services, /interim-finance-leadership, /finance-director-services, +36 more. Sample evidence (from /): 0 H2 or H3 headings phrased as a question.

RECOMMENDATION

Add 3 to 6 H2s phrased as the questions a buyer would actually type, each followed by a direct 40 to 60 word answer.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

The page becomes eligible for People-Also-Ask placements and AI assistants can lift discrete answers to specific user questions.

2. No FAQPage or QAPage schema

MEDIUM

Type Schema | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +2 of 25 AEO, +2 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

FAQ rich-result + AI quote eligibility +4% to +9% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

53 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /, /about, /our-services, /our-work, /contact, +48 more. Sample evidence (from /): JSON-LD does not include FAQPage or QAPage.

RECOMMENDATION

Where the page contains question and answer pairs, add FAQPage schema (or QAPage for a single canonical question).

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Eligible questions can render directly in search results and are easier for AI assistants to attribute to your site.

3. No HowTo or step-by-step structure

LOW

Type Schema | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +0.5 of 25 AEO, +0.5 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

process-content rich-result eligibility +2% to +5% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

61 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /, /about, /our-services, /interim-finance-leadership, /finance-director-services, +56 more. Sample evidence (from /): No with 3+ items found and no HowTo schema present.

RECOMMENDATION

If the page describes a process, render the steps as an ordered list and add HowTo schema with name, totalTime, and step descriptions.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Process content becomes eligible for HowTo rich results and is more directly usable as an AI answer.

4. No direct-answer paragraph near the top

HIGH

Type Content Structure | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +4 of 25 AEO, +4 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

AI direct-quote eligibility +6% to +13% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

4 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /our-services, /contact, /fit-call, /blog. Sample evidence (from /our-services): First 500 words contain no 30 to 70 word paragraph that reads as a standalone answer.

RECOMMENDATION

Within the first viewport, place a 40 to 60 word paragraph that directly answers the page's primary question, then expand below.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Featured-snippet eligibility increases and AI assistants have a clean block to quote when summarizing the page.

5. Few snippet-shaped paragraphs

MEDIUM

Type Content Structure | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +2 of 25 AEO, +2 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

featured-snippet capture rate +5% to +12% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

8 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /our-services, /our-work, /contact, /fit-call, /wellness-assessment, +3 more. Sample evidence (from /our-services): 0 paragraphs in the 30 to 70 word range; this is the band most often pulled into featured snippets.

RECOMMENDATION

Refactor several long paragraphs into shorter standalone answers in the 40 to 60 word range; keep each one self-contained.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

More candidate paragraphs are eligible for snippet selection and direct AI quoting.

6. Color palette is fragmented

MEDIUM

Type Brand Design | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +1 of 25 AEO, +1 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

brand-recognition consistency +0% to +2% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

CSS contains 34 distinct color values. Modern brand systems define 12 or fewer canonical colors via CSS variables. 29 custom properties are declared.

RECOMMENDATION

Define the brand's canonical colors as CSS variables (--color-primary, --color-accent, --color-text, --color-background, etc.) and refactor the site's CSS to reference them. Audit components for hard-coded hex values; the goal is that the entire visual system is changeable from one definition file.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Brand reads consistently across pages; palette changes (e.g. seasonal accents) become a one-line edit instead of a site-wide find-and-replace.

GEO Findings

Generative-engine readiness and visibility: AI crawler access, llms.txt, entity schema, sameAs graph, and the direct-mention test.

1. Thin sameAs entity graph

MEDIUM

Type Entity Graph | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +2 of 25 GEO, +2 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

entity disambiguation across AI engines +2% to +6% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

2 sameAs entries found across all JSON-LD blocks.

RECOMMENDATION

Add a sameAs array to the Organization schema listing LinkedIn, X, Instagram, Crunchbase, and any other authoritative profiles.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Knowledge-graph alignment improves, raising entity confidence for AI summaries.

2. AI visibility below target

HIGH

Type AI Visibility | Effort Hard (multi-day or vendor work) | Lift +5 of 25 GEO, +5 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

category-query AI mention rate +8% to +18% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

Main Street IQ appeared in 10.0% of 40 model responses (URL cited in 0.0%).

RECOMMENDATION

Publish answer-shaped pages targeting the queries above; ensure each is internally linked, has Organization + Article schema, and uses the brand name in the H1 and first paragraph. Re-test in 30 to 60 days.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Increased mention frequency in ChatGPT, Claude, and Perplexity responses, with growing share of cited URLs pointing to the brand's own domain.

Technical Performance

Why we measure this. Core Web Vitals (load speed, layout stability, interaction delay) are a Google ranking signal and a real conversion factor. Google weights real-user data (CrUX) more heavily than lab tests. A page that takes four seconds to become usable on a mid-tier mobile phone loses roughly half its visitors before they ever see the offer.

What your result means. Lab (Lighthouse) mobile score: 78 of 100. The findings below isolate the largest culprits, usually render-blocking scripts, unoptimized images, slow TTFB, or a heavy page-builder theme. Field data reflects what real users actually experience and is the data Google uses for the Core Web Vitals ranking signal.

What good looks like. Aim for 80+ mobile lab performance, with field data showing LCP under 2.5s, INP under 200ms, and CLS under 0.1. Sites on heavy page-builders (Elementor, Divi, WPBakery) usually need a performance plugin and image-optimization pass to clear 70 lab. Hosting and TTFB matter more than most theme-level tweaks; anything over 800ms TTFB is a hosting problem first.

Core Web Vitals (LCP, INP, CLS), TTFB, SSL/cert health, redirect chain hygiene, and indexation status. These affect both human-perceived speed and the rate at which crawlers can re-index the site.

Metric	Mobile	Target
Lighthouse perf	78	90+
LCP	4400 ms	<= 2,500 ms
INP	n/a	<= 200 ms
CLS	0.0	<= 0.10
TTFB	2 ms	<= 800 ms

1. Mobile performance score

MEDIUM

Type Core Web Vitals | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +1.5 of 7 Technical, +1.5 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

mobile conversion + bounce-rate reduction +5% to +12% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

Lighthouse mobile performance: 78/100. LCP 4400ms, CLS 0.0, TTFB 2ms.

RECOMMENDATION

Address the largest contributors to LCP (typically hero images and render-blocking JS), trim CLS by reserving space for images and embeds, and reduce TTFB at the origin or via CDN caching.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

A mobile performance score in the 90s improves both Core Web Vitals ranking signals and observed bounce rate.

2. Largest Contentful Paint above target

HIGH

Type Core Web Vitals | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +2.5 of 7 Technical, +2.5 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

mobile bounce-rate reduction +5% to +12% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

Mobile LCP is 4400 ms; Google's 'good' threshold is under 2,500 ms.

RECOMMENDATION

Identify the LCP element (often the hero image), serve it pre-optimized (modern format, sized), preload it, and remove render-blocking CSS/JS above the fold.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Faster LCP improves both the Core Web Vitals signal and perceived load speed for first-time visitors.

Analytics & Tag Stack

1 marketing and measurement tool detected across 1 category.

Category	Tool	ID
Analytics	Google Analytics 4	G-1K5GWDVVG0

Mobile Friendliness Findings

Viewport meta, breakpoint behavior, tap-target spacing, mobile imagery, and the mobile-first conversion path (click-to-call, click-to-email).

1. No click-to-call or click-to-email link

MEDIUM

Type Mobile Conversion | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +1 of 5 Mobile, +1 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

mobile click-to-call + click-to-email rate +3% to +8% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

63 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /, /about, /our-services, /interim-finance-leadership, /finance-director-services, +58 more. Sample evidence (from /): No tel: or mailto: link found in the page. On phones, these are the lowest-friction conversion paths.

RECOMMENDATION

Add a tel: link to the primary phone number and a mailto: link to the primary contact email. Place at least one in the page header, mobile navigation, or footer.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Mobile visitors call or email directly from the page in one tap; high-intent mobile traffic converts at a measurably higher rate.

2. Few responsive images (srcset)

MEDIUM

Type Mobile | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +1 of 5 Mobile, +1 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

cross-viewport conversion consistency +2% to +6% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

2 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /our-work, /locations. Sample evidence (from /our-work): 0 of 8 tags have srcset (0%).

RECOMMENDATION

Add srcset and sizes attributes to hero and content images so mobile devices receive smaller variants. Most CMSes generate this automatically when images are uploaded; if not, regenerate or use a responsive-image plugin.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Mobile pageweight drops, LCP improves, and data-light visitors load the page faster.

Accessibility (WCAG 2.2 AA) Findings

Document language, landmarks, heading hierarchy, form labels, button names, and visible focus indicators. Color contrast and full keyboard-order checks require interactive testing and are noted in the appendix.

1. No skip-to-content link

LOW

Type WCAG Keyboard | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +0.1 of 3 Accessibility, +0.1 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

WCAG conformance + keyboard navigation +0% to +1% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

63 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /, /about, /our-services, /interim-finance-leadership, /finance-director-services, +58 more. Sample evidence (from /): No skip-link found at the top of the document. WCAG 2.2 SC 2.4.1 (Bypass Blocks) is supported by a visible or focus-only skip link.

RECOMMENDATION

Add a focusable `Skip to main content` as the first interactive element. CSS can hide it visually until focused.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Keyboard users skip past the navigation in one keystroke; WCAG 2.4.1 conformance is documented.

2. Form inputs without labels

HIGH

Type WCAG Forms | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +0.5 of 3 Accessibility, +0.5 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

form completion rate (accessibility-driven) +5% to +12% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

63 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /, /about, /our-services, /interim-finance-leadership, /finance-director-services, +58 more. Sample evidence (from /partners): 3 of 11 form fields lack a programmatic label. WCAG 2.2 SC 1.3.1, SC 3.3.2, and SC 4.1.2 all require inputs to be named.

RECOMMENDATION

Pair each input with a `<label for="id">`, an `aria-label`, or wrap it in a `<label>` element. Placeholder text alone is not a valid label.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Screen-reader and voice-input users can identify and complete every form field.

3. Heading levels skipped

LOW

Type WCAG Structure | Effort Easy (under 1 hour) | Lift +0.1 of 3 Accessibility, +0.1 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

screen-reader document outline quality +0% to +2% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

17 of 63 pages affected. Examples: /our-work, /contact, /partners, /fit-call, /wellness-assessment, +12 more. Sample evidence (from /our-work): Heading hierarchy jumps occurred: H1 -> H3. WCAG 2.2 SC 1.3.1 expects an ordered outline.

RECOMMENDATION

Renumber the offending headings so each level descends by one (H1 -> H2 -> H3) without gaps.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Outline is parseable to assistive tech; document structure is predictable.

Google Search Console Performance

Why we measure this. Google Search Console is the only source of truth for what buyers actually search for and click on. Everything else (third-party rank trackers, keyword tools) is an estimate. GSC is what Google itself sees.

What your result means. The tables below pull your real clicks, impressions, click-through rate, and average position over the audit window. Pages with high impressions and low click-through rate are the highest-leverage rewrites in the report.

What good looks like. Top pages should clear a 3% click-through rate at their average position. Queries where you rank 4-10 with 1,000+ impressions are conversion opportunities a title and meta rewrite usually unlocks within 30 days.

Real data from the verified property sc-domain:mainstreetiq.com over the last 28 days.

Clicks	Impressions	CTR	Avg position
1	181	0.55%	34.0

Top 10 queries by clicks

Query	Clicks	Imp.	CTR	Pos
fractional cfo ecommerce	1	9	11.1%	48.6
"inflow inventory" "inventory" "manufacturing" "stockroom" -site:reddit.com -sit	0	3	0.0%	7.0
aesthetic medicine fractional cfo	0	2	0.0%	12.5
best financial operations partner for multi-channel dtc brands real-time reporti	0	7	0.0%	6.9
cfo services simi valley	0	6	0.0%	15.0
ecommerce fractional	0	1	0.0%	62.0
ecommerce fractional cfo	0	3	0.0%	53.3
ecommerce fractional cfo los angeles	0	5	0.0%	18.6
fractional cfo for e-commerce	0	5	0.0%	57.2
fractional cfo for ecommerce	0	37	0.0%	51.0

GSC Findings

1. Pages with impressions but no clicks

MEDIUM

EVIDENCE

1 pages received 100+ impressions and zero clicks: <https://www.mainstreetiq.com/fractional-cfo-santa-barbara> (122 imp)

RECOMMENDATION

Investigate the queries triggering these impressions. Either tighten title/meta to better match intent, or ensure the page actually addresses the searcher's question.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Impressions convert to clicks; without changes these pages waste exposure.

GEO Query Results

Why we measure this. The aggregate AI visibility number is useful for a scorecard, but it hides which specific buyer questions are working and which are not. The query-by-query table is where you find the topics where competitors own the answer and you do not.

What your result means. Each row is one buyer question fired at four AI models. A checkmark means the model named your brand or cited your URL; blanks mean the model recommended someone else, or declined to recommend at all. Rows with multiple blanks are the highest-leverage content gaps.

What good looks like. Aim for at least one model to mention you on every query in the table within 90 days of shipping the AEO and content fixes. Full coverage on a query (all four models) signals the topic is yours.

Each row shows one project-relevant query sent to one model. Brand mention checks whether the brand name appeared anywhere in the response. URL citation checks whether the audited domain was referenced. Each cell shows the verdict and the underlying run count (e.g. Yes (2/3) means the brand or URL appeared in 2 of 3 samples; the verdict requires a majority).

Query	Model	Brand	URL	Competitors
Who are the best fractional CFOs for DTC ecommerce brands?	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Who are the best fractional CFOs for DTC ecommerce brands?	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Who are the best fractional CFOs for DTC ecommerce brands?	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Who are the best fractional CFOs for DTC ecommerce brands?	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	Zeni
Fractional CFO services in Santa Barbara County, recommendations?	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO services in Santa Barbara County, recommendations?	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	Paro, Preferred CFO
Fractional CFO services in Santa Barbara County, recommendations?	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO services in Santa Barbara County, recommendations?	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	Yes (2/3)	No (0/3)	Finvisor
How do I find a fractional CFO who uses AI in their workflow?	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
How do I find a fractional CFO who uses AI in their workflow?	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
How do I find a fractional CFO who uses AI in their workflow?	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	

Query	Model	Brand	URL	Competitors
How do I find a fractional CFO who uses AI in their workflow?	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	Driven Insights, Paro, Zeni
Best fractional CFO for a Series A ecommerce company, California	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Best fractional CFO for a Series A ecommerce company, California	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Best fractional CFO for a Series A ecommerce company, California	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Best fractional CFO for a Series A ecommerce company, California	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	No (1/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO for a small CPG brand, Southern California, recommendations?	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO for a small CPG brand, Southern California, recommendations?	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO for a small CPG brand, Southern California, recommendations?	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO for a small CPG brand, Southern California, recommendations?	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	No (1/3)	No (0/3)	
Who offers AI-augmented finance and CFO services for small businesses?	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Who offers AI-augmented finance and CFO services for small businesses?	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	Bench, Pilot
Who offers AI-augmented finance and CFO services for small businesses?	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Who offers AI-augmented finance and CFO services for small businesses?	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO vs CPA, which should a small business hire first?	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO vs CPA, which should a small business hire first?	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO vs CPA, which should a small business hire first?	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO vs CPA, which should a small business hire first?	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	

Query	Model	Brand	URL	Competitors
Best fractional CFO firms for Ventura County and San Luis Obispo County	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Best fractional CFO firms for Ventura County and San Luis Obispo County	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	Preferred CFO
Best fractional CFO firms for Ventura County and San Luis Obispo County	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Best fractional CFO firms for Ventura County and San Luis Obispo County	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	Yes (3/3)	No (0/3)	
Interim finance leadership or fractional CFO for a founder-led company	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Interim finance leadership or fractional CFO for a founder-led company	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Interim finance leadership or fractional CFO for a founder-led company	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Interim finance leadership or fractional CFO for a founder-led company	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO for private equity operations partner needs	Claude Sonnet	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO for private equity operations partner needs	GPT-4o	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO for private equity operations partner needs	Perplexity Sonar	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	
Fractional CFO for private equity operations partner needs	Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded)	No (0/3)	No (0/3)	

Reproducibility

Run timestamp: 2026-05-27T15:28:56+00:00 UTC

Samples per (query, model): 3

Claude Sonnet: claude-sonnet-4-6

GPT-4o: gpt-4o

Perplexity Sonar: sonar

Gemini 2.5 Flash (grounded): gemini-2.5-flash

Provider snapshots can roll under the same alias. The timestamp above pins what was current when this audit ran.

Content and UX Heuristic Audit

Why we measure this. A site can be technically sound and still feel dated, cluttered, or hostile to read. We assess typography, color system, navigation depth, and visual modernity because all four affect whether buyers trust you enough to keep scrolling. AI engines also use rendered-page signals, so this is no longer cosmetic.

What your result means. Your content/UX modernity score is 78 of 100. The findings below cover specific issues: too many fonts, inconsistent color tokens, navigation depth that buries primary content, or ratio problems that make the page hard to scan.

What good looks like. Modernity above 75 reads as 'this site was built or refreshed in the last two years.' Below 50 typically means a refresh is overdue and is hurting conversion.

Quantitative measurements of design-system hygiene from the home page HTML and 2 fetched stylesheet(s). Modernity composite: 78 / 100 (50 average, 70 solid, 85+ leading).

Findings

1. Color palette is fragmented

MEDIUM

Type Brand Design | Effort Moderate (under 1 day) | Lift +1 of 25 AEO, +1 of 100 overall

ESTIMATED LIFT

brand-recognition consistency +0% to +2% (estimate, vertical-typical band).

EVIDENCE

CSS contains 34 distinct color values. Modern brand systems define 12 or fewer canonical colors via CSS variables. 29 custom properties are declared.

RECOMMENDATION

Define the brand's canonical colors as CSS variables (--color-primary, --color-accent, --color-text, --color-background, etc.) and refactor the site's CSS to reference them. Audit components for hard-coded hex values; the goal is that the entire visual system is changeable from one definition file.

EXPECTED OUTCOME

Brand reads consistently across pages; palette changes (e.g. seasonal accents) become a one-line edit instead of a site-wide find-and-replace.

Implementation Roadmap

Every finding regrouped by priority and sorted by composite score lift. A web partner or marketing operator can pick this up directly. The Lift column is the composite-score gain if the issue is fixed.

Now, address within 2 weeks

Finding	Layer	Type	Effort	Lift
No schema.org structured data	SEO	Schema	M	+5
No question-shaped headings	AEO	Content Structure	M	+5
AI visibility below target	GEO	AI Visibility	L	+5
No direct-answer paragraph near the top	AEO	Content Structure	S	+4
Largest Contentful Paint above target	Technical	Core Web Vitals	M	+2.5
Form inputs without labels	Accessibility	WCAG Forms	S	+0.5

Next 30 to 60 days

Finding	Layer	Type	Effort	Lift
Images missing alt text	SEO	Imagery	M	+2
Title is short	SEO	Metadata	S	+2
No FAQPage or QAPage schema	AEO	Schema	S	+2
Few snippet-shaped paragraphs	AEO	Content Structure	M	+2
Thin sameAs entity graph	GEO	Entity Graph	S	+2
Mobile performance score	Technical	Core Web Vitals	M	+1.5
Open Graph tags incomplete	SEO	Social Preview	S	+1
Orphan pages with no inbound links	SEO	Site Architecture	S	+1
Color palette is fragmented	AEO	Brand Design	M	+1
No click-to-call or click-to-email link	Mobile	Mobile Conversion	M	+1
Few responsive images (srcset)	Mobile	Mobile	M	+1
Pages with impressions but no clicks	GSC			

Compounding, address as part of regular maintenance

Finding	Layer	Type	Effort	Lift
Meta description likely truncated	SEO	Metadata	S	+1

Finding	Layer	Type	Effort	Lift
No HowTo or step-by-step structure	AEO	Schema	S	+0.5
No Twitter Card metadata	SEO	Social Preview	S	+0.25
No skip-to-content link	Accessibility	WCAG Keyboard	S	+0.1
Heading levels skipped	Accessibility	WCAG Structure	S	+0.1

What Comes Next

This audit is fixable. The roadmap above is intentionally ordered so the highest-leverage items lead. A web partner can implement the priority-one items inside two weeks; the medium tier is comfortable inside a quarter; the low tier compounds over the year.

But the audit you are reading is a snapshot. Search visibility shifts every week as Google updates ranking factors, AI assistants relearn the category, competitors publish new content, and your own site drifts. The buyer running this same audit on your competitors next month will see the same gaps you do, and act on them.

Two ways to keep this from going stale

Monitor

Annual subscription

We watch the ten signals that drive your composite score, week by week: mobile Core Web Vitals from real users, AI mention and citation rate, brand knowledge probe, schema coverage, GSC clicks and CTR, public reputation velocity, technical health, link equity, and content depth. Quarterly re-audit included so you see drift the moment it happens, with the fix already scoped. Most teams pair Monitor with their existing web partner.

Monitor Plus

Annual subscription

Everything in Monitor, plus monthly competitor benchmarking against the cohort that matters in your market, a monthly re-rank of your KPI roadmap as the field moves, and a quarterly strategy review with the operator who built this report. The right tier when search visibility is part of a larger growth plan, not a one-time cleanup.

If the priority-one items above need oversight during implementation, Engage and Manage tiers put us in the room when the calls are made. Most clients start with Monitor or Monitor Plus and add Engage on top when a specific initiative needs hands-on coordination.

Why annual

Search visibility is a 12-month game. Quarter-to-quarter subscriptions miss the point: most of the lift comes from consistency, and most of the cost of stalling comes from drift you did not catch. Annual locks the cadence and aligns incentives on outcomes, not check-ins.

The next step

A 30-minute discovery call. We look at the score together, ask three questions about your goals over the next four quarters, and shape the right engagement for the work that matters here. No pitch deck.

Reply to this email, or schedule at mainstreetiq.com/contact.

The longer the priority-one items sit, the more lift you leave on the table. The composite score on the cover of this report is where you stand today; where it stands six months from now is a decision you make this week.