

ADDENDUM 1 TO RFS NO. 17-001

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO RFS NO. 17-001 FOR ORDINANCE CODIFICATION AND LOOSELEAF SUPPLEMENT SERVICE

Question 1: Could you provide any information as to why the County had decided to get quotes at this time?

Answer: **The existing code codification contract expires August 1, 2017.**

Question 2: Since 8,225 pages is a large number to fit into two binders, and since the County's current publisher traditionally uses large gaps in its page numbering system, could you verify that 8,225 is the approximate number of actual pages in the current Code rather than just the last page number in the Code?

Answer: **8,225 is not accurate as there are gaps in the page numbering system.**

Question 3: I want to be certain that the County is looking for a company to take over just the loose-leaf supplements of the code of ordinances and not a complete recodification of the complete code of ordinances?

Answer: **The existing and future county code must be available online and in printed format. Respondents may propose how they would meet those RFS requirements as they see fit.**

Question 4: What does the County pay for the ability to perform multi-code/multi-state search capabilities on your current publisher's website?

Answer: **There is no extra charge.**

Question 5: What do citizens and other non-county users (law firms, developers, realtors, etc.) pay for the ability to perform multi-code/multi-state search capabilities on your current publisher's website?

Answer: **Please refer to Municipal Code Corporation for any such access requirements.**

Question 6: What does the County pay for your current publisher to keep an inventory of Codes and supplements?

Answer: **No fee.**

Question 7: What annual fee does the County currently pay your current publisher for Web Service/Internet access?

Answer: **\$550 annually.**

Question 8: What does the County currently pay per Supplement Codification page?

Answer: **\$19.95 per page.**

Question 9: What does the County currently pay for a complete copy of the Code, binders and tab?

Answer: **\$151 Internal Subscriber Price.**

Question 10: What does the County currently pay for a set of binders and dividers and tabs?

Answer: **\$90 Internal Subscriber Price.**

ADDENDUM 1 TO RFS NO. 17-001 (cont'd)

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO RFS NO. 17-001 FOR ORDINANCE CODIFICATION AND LOOSELEAF SUPPLEMENT SERVICE

Question 11: What does the County pay for the code on disk?

Answer: **No fee.**

Question 12: What does the County currently pay for Internal Subscriber Postage (for supplements mailed to the County Attorney)?

Answer: **Direct Freight Costs.**

Question 13: What does the County currently pay for OrdBank?

Answer: **\$950 flat annual fee.**

Question 14: Are the 42 copies of each supplement supplied to the County Attorney the only copies the County receives or do other departments individually subscribe with your current publisher? If other departments do subscribe, please provide the names of each department and how many supplements that they purchase.

Answer: **The 42 copies of the supplements provided to the County Attorney are inclusive of all County departments.**

Question 15: In order to provide the County with the most competitive quote possible, it is important to determine the value of the project by reviewing current and historical subscriber revenue history. Can the County or current publisher provide the number of current subscribers to the code, their current subscriber fees, names and addresses of subscribers, and overall subscriber revenue for 2014, 2015 and 2016.

Answer: **The County is not involved in providing subscriptions to external subscribers. The external subscriber fee is \$300 for a complete copy of the Code, binders and tabs. Please refer to Municipal Code Corporation for all other information related to current and past subscriber revenue.**

Question 16: Will the County provide a formatted, electronic copy of the current code to the new publisher?

Answer: **No.**

Question 17: Should the proposal be double-spaced?

Answer: **Yes.**

Question 18: Does the requested Scope of Work pertain only to the continuation of supplement and website hosting services for the Code, or is the County requesting a complete recodification of the Code? A recodification includes an attorney review of the Code to ensure that it is free of internal conflicts and conforms to the laws of the State of Florida, and a reorganization and numbering of the code, if recommended. The process also includes an attorney conference to review the

ADDENDUM 1 TO RFS NO. 17-001 (cont'd)

QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES TO RFS NO. 17-001 FOR ORDINANCE CODIFICATION AND LOOSELEAF SUPPLEMENT SERVICE

legal findings of the analysis, followed by the County's official adoption of the revised and republished code.

Answer: Refer to the answer to question 3 above. Proposers should refer to the provisions of the RFS and their own code codification experience in preparing their responses.

******NO FURTHER QUESTIONS ON THIS RFS WILL BE CONSIDERED******