

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. Contract Number POKA-2006-B-0015-MN	Page of Pages 1   1	
2. Amendment/Modification Number <b>5</b>		3. Effective Date 2/8/2008		4. Requisition/Purchase Request No.	
5. Solicitation Caption: DDOT Street & Bridge Maintenance Facility					
6. Issued By: District Department of Transportation Construction Contract Branch 2000 14th Street, NW, 6th Floor Washington, DC 20009			Code KAO	7. Administered By (If other than line 6) Procurement Support Branch 2000 14th Street, NW, 3rd Floor, Bid Room Washington, D.C. 20009	
8. Name and Address of Contractor (No. Street, city, country, state and ZIP Code)				(X)	9A. Amendment of Solicitation No. POKA-2006-B-0015-MN
					9B. Dated (See Item 11) 12/10/2007
					10A. Modification of Contract/Order No.
					10B. Dated (See Item 13)
Code			Facility		
<b>11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS</b>					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers <input type="checkbox"/> is extended. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or fax which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment number. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or fax, provided each letter or telegram makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.				
12. Accounting and Appropriation Data (If Required)					
<b>13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14</b>					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A. This change order is issued pursuant to: (Specify Authority) The changes set forth in Item 14 are made in the contract/order no. in item 10A.				
	B. The above numbered contract/order is modified to reflect the administrative changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) set forth in item 14, pursuant to the authority of 27 DCMR, Chapter 36, Section 3601.2.				
	C. This supplemental agreement is entered into pursuant to authority of:				
	D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)				
<b>E. IMPORTANT:</b> Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return <u>1</u> copies to the issuing office.					
14. Description of amendment/modification (Organized by UCF Section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)  Amendment No. 5 is being issued to address and clarify additional questions received from prospective Vendor. See attached  1) Questions and responses dated 2/08/08 (consisting of 1page is attached with this amendment)					
<b>Bids Will Be Opened On February 13, 2008 at 2:00 PM</b>					
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item (9A or 10A) remain unchanged and in full force and effect					
15A. Name and Title of Signer (Type or print)			16A. Name of Contracting Officer Jerry M. Carter		
15B. Name of Contractor		15C. Date Signed		16B. District of Columbia	16C. Date Signed 2/8/2008
(Signature of person authorized to sign)			(Signature of Contracting Officer)		

**DATE: February 8, 2008**

**DDOT Street & Bridge Maintenance Facility  
POKA-2006-B-0015-MN**

**ADDENDUM-NO.5**

**RESPONSE TO CLARIFY QUESTIONS FROM PROSPECTIVE VENDOR**

Action: Questions and Request for Clarification

1. Question: The answer to question #14 of the addendum requests the contractor to propose a security system for the project. This leaves a lot of variables to be clarified, as well as parts of the response to be explained. The response mentions **IR** cameras but the drawings indicate IR indicates "infrared motion detector". As IR cameras are very expensive compared to IR motion detectors, this requires owner clarification.

Response: IR motion detectors are fine.

2. Question: Re: same question as above. Addendum mentions "Door control". What is the owners definition of door control? Does the owner want access control, that is, something like a keypad combination or magnetic swipe-card entry access system, or do you just want some sort of intrusion alarm control? (In general, D.C. stands for "dry contacts")

Response: We are looking for both intrusion alarm and some sort of controlled entry on secondary doors and all doors after hours.

3. Question: Re: same question as above, do you want the system installed in conduit or is plenum rated wire adequate?

Response Plenum rated wire should be adequate for all interior applications.

4. Question: Re: Question #10- The question of who supplies the telephone manhole remains unanswered. Please respond. Also, the statement that the hand hole should be "minimum 6" by 6" doesn't address the fact that this system is comprised of two 2" conduits and a 6"x 6" box would be inadequate for this installation. A 16" x 16" would be more in line with requirements.

Response: 16" x 16" would be much easier to work with and may even save money in construction time. 6"x 6" is merely the minimum/

**Observations**

We feel the authority's estimation of the PEPCO fee amounts for this project are rather inadequate when taking into account the high cost of copper conductor and the high cost of PEPCO installation fees. Unless the authority (DDOT) has actually negotiated these amounts with PEPCO, further evaluation may be called necessary.

Response: A representative from DDOT has spoken with PEPCO engineers and was informed that \$15,000 is a reasonable general estimate for that particular activity of the project. The price may go higher or lower depending on the final evaluation. However, with the recent communication with utility connections, DDOT strongly stays with Pepco price NOT TO EXCEED Fifteen Thousand (\$15,000:00) dollars.