ADDENDUM 5

To: All Interested Proposers

From: Linda Mena, Inventory Bid Technician

Date: April 13, 2010

Subject: RFQ # 10-021(RFQ) Secure Border Trade Demonstration Project

Please Note:

On pages 17 and 37 change the definition of the acronym BASC from Business Anti-Smuggling Coalition to Business Alliance for Secure Commerce.

Delete all references to CELC in the RFQ (pages 17 and 37). CELC is no longer associated with BASC.

The Purchasing Department received questions relating to the above referenced proposal; following are responses to these questions and clarifications to the RFQ:

1. Can the financial statement be reviewed, by our accountants not audited?

Answer: No. This was addressed in Question #7 of Addendum 1. “Audited” financial statements are required to be submitted by the prime contractor and by any subcontractor performing over 25% of the contract work.

2. Does GPS have to be the tracking technology or can it be RFID?

Answer: This was addressed in Question #3 of Addendum 3. The County will attempt to be open and accepting of different technologies and approaches to achieving SBT system goals. We ask that proposers (respondents) make the case for the technical approach they are proposing. In the Technical Specification that we will be issuing, we will identify the functional system needs.
3. What is the frequency of positioning checks for the freight trucks required? Is it constant, at specific points?

Answer: We have not yet taken a position on this issue. The County is seeking creative approaches to this issue from would-be responders. Security is the key issue and to assure the vehicle is moving to its destination in a secure manner the check points may have to be varied.

4. What are the Key Performance Metrics that the success of the contract will be based on?

Answer: This issue was addressed in the response to Question #12 in Addendum 3.

5. Is the RFQ more interested in testing the efficacy of certain component technologies or the success of the systems as a whole?

Answer: It is difficult to provide specific weights to the importance of these issues. If there are failures in components of the SBT that are serious, the entire system could be in jeopardy. However, if the system is technically successful but we cannot get the stakeholder agencies to buy into the resulting product, we have not achieved the critical goal of the demonstration.

6. Will the stakeholder be willing to consider incentives for organizations to participate in this program on an ongoing basis? (e.g. green lane, tax incentives, etc.)

Answer: As we indicated in our answer to Question #11 in Addendum 3, research has clearly shown that private sector shippers at the border want a return for their security investment. This was the premise behind the CBP C-TPAT program. The goal of the system is to achieve the CBP objective of improving security while expediting the movement of cargo for the private sector.

7. Can contributions for the cost share be in-kind labor discounts and COTS Software discount pricing?

Answer: In-kind labor has traditionally been an acceptable cost-share approach. Discounts on in-kind labor would have to be based on documented labor rates that are discounted. We anticipate we would have to get US-DOT concurrence in the use of this as in-kind match. In the past, software has been an acceptable match. However, the commercial value has to be firmly established before US-DOT will approve its use.
8. Are unaudited statements and other financial information, prepared by an independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party, acceptable in lieu of “Audited” financial statements due to the cost and time to create audited statements?

Answer: This was addressed in Question #7 of Addendum 1 and Question #1 of this addendum.

9. On page 26, there is a requirement for three years of audited financial statements. As a privately held company, ownership does not require audited financial statements. Can alternative information be provided that will represent the financial health of the company such as: tax filings, bank statements and financials certified by the financial officer of the company?

Answer: This was addressed in Question #7 of Addendum 1 and Question #1 of this Addendum.

10. The RFQ page 16 states "designated tractors and trailers equipped with Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) components as a result of this Project will be registered in the FAST Program." Will these trucks utilize only the lane(s) dedicated for FAST trucks?

Answer: The assumption is that by registering these vehicles in the FAST Program, they will receive faster clearance at the POEs. If this is not the case, the vehicles will operate through whatever lanes provide optimal clearance.

11. How many lanes at each commercial border crossing are dedicated to FAST trucks? Is there a designated FAST lane at each commercial border crossing that is always open?

Answer: There are two FAST lanes at the Bridge of the Americas and one at the Zaragoza (Ysleta) Port of Entry. They are open as per the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bridge of the Americas</th>
<th>Zaragoza (Ysleta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>6am-6pm</td>
<td>6am-12am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>6am-2pm</td>
<td>9am-5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>