

1. QUESTION: Does LBE include a place in the skid steer for an M-16 rifle rack?

ANSWER: There is no requirement for an M-16 rifle rack. LBE (Load Bearing Equipment) is the harness or vest that the soldier wears to carry ammunition, grenades, canteen, and other equipment. LBE is mentioned in paragraph 3.1.3 in the context of the operator cab. The cab and seat needs to be large enough to accommodate a soldier wearing heavy winter clothing and the LBE.

2. QUESTION: What are the required surface area dimensions on the tamping pad, or should the bidders provide their recommended tamping pad.

ANSWER: The offeror should provide his recommended tamping pad since nothing more definitive was mentioned in the Purchase Description, Addendum 7.

3. QUESTION: The offeror requests that freight charges incurred by the vendor for OCONUS shipments end at U.S. port locations or the shipping instructions are changed to FOB Origin.

ANSWER: The Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd, has been withdrawn and replaced with Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd, dated 24 Jun 02. Deliveries are F.O.B. Destination for CONUS shipments and F.O.B. Destination New Jersey or San Francisco for OCONUS shipments.

4. QUESTION: The offeror requests that the associated per diem and travel charges in Addendum 8 are priced separately from CLINS 0001-0005.

ANSWER: Training needs to be conducted at the destination points identified by each delivery order and will not be separately priced. The anticipated CONUS and OCONUS locations are identified in the solicitation. The contractor is only obligated to conduct one training session at a given location.

5. QUESTION: The offeror requests that more detail is provided to explain the attachment areas to be painted lusterless green referenced in CLINS 0002 - 0005.

ANSWER: The attachment areas that are to be painted are those that are normally painted for your commercial customers. Examples: It is commercial practice that fork arms are not normally painted, and need not be painted for this contract. The auger head is normally painted by commercial practice, and is to be painted for this contract. If you paint it as part of your commercial line, then paint it for us.

6. QUESTION: Could you provide estimated shipping quantities by location?

ANSWER: Yes. See Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd dated 24 June 2002.

7. QUESTION: Addendum 4, page 4, paragraph (o), warranty, requires that the contract establish a communication system for the repair/replacement of warranted items and a procedure. We wanted to understand if allowing 1 system for CONUS units and a separate system for OCONUS units was acceptable.

ANSWER: Whatever you provide for normal commercial practice.

8. QUESTION: Addendum 7, Page 6, paragraph 3.1.4.1, required that the skid steer loader be certified for helicopter sling load testing. We were wondering if this was part of the 1st article test procedures (similar to the transportability report) or if the certification had to be submitted as part of the RFP submission. If certification is required as part of the RFP submission, do you have recommended certifying authorities we could work with or certification criteria we could follow?

ANSWER: There is no first article test. Helicopter sling loading is part of the transportability analysis and report. There is no requirement to submit helicopter sling loading certification as part of your RFP submission.

9. QUESTION: Addendum 9 skips from Paragraph 2.5 to Paragraph 4. Paragraph 3 is referenced in bullet 4.2 as "Failure to fulfill requirements in paragraph 3 shall cause for rejection of the skid loader." Where is paragraph 3?

ANSWER: Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

10. QUESTION: Addendum 9, bullet 2.4 references enclosure 2 and bullet 2.5 references enclosure 3. I was unable to find these enclosures. Could you please tell me where they are located as well as enclosure 1 or others?

ANSWER: Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

11. QUESTION: Addendum 9, Paragraph 2.3 calls for 2 readable copies of contractors provided COTS manuals to be provided within each skid loader. Are COTS manuals (parts, technical, and operator) required for the attachments or are COTS only required for the skid steer loader.

ANSWER: Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002. However, each item has the potential to be purchased separately so a COTS manual for each attachment would be required.

12. QUESTION: Addendum 9, Paragraph 2.4 requires a leading page, parts list insert. Does this insert have to be bound or can this be loose. Does this have to be provided in the parts manual or in all manuals?

ANSWER: Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

DAAE20-02-R-0118
Questions & Answers
24 June 2002

13. QUESTION: Addendum 9, Paragraph 2.5 requires 2 pages of DA Form 2028 to be inserted as the last page of the COTS manuals. Does this insert have to be bound or can this be loose?

ANSWER: Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

14. QUESTION: Addendum 10 - Transportability Report. We were wondering if there was a requirement to respond to addendum.

ANSWER: No. Addendum 10 was furnished for information and guidance only.

15. QUESTION: In the synopsis, it mentioned that a transportability analysis would be conducted after contract award and will last approximately 120 days. We were unsure why addendum 10 was posted to the web at this time.

ANSWER: See Answer to Question 14. Addendum 10 outlines data required for the Transportability Analysis and Report. The analysis and report will be conducted after contract award.

16. QUESTION: Addendum 1, Para 1(b)(7) states that the technical proposal shall not exceed 10 pages. Does this allow for 10 pages on both sides (front and back) to total 20 sides?

ANSWER: No. The limitation is 10 pages, one-side only.

17. QUESTION: Addendum 1, Para 1(b)(8) does not state a limit as the paragraph above it does. Can we assume that the Global Commercial Logistical Support Proposal has no page limit? We will have attachments that are several pages long... for example, our worldwide dealer directory.

ANSWER: Addendum 1 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 1 dated 24 June 2002.

18. QUESTION: This solicitation's Pricing Evaluation Summary (Addendum #3) asks for pricing out for 5 years. The notes indicated that pricing is for evaluation purposes only. If the machine configuration needs to change due to a contractor required model update or Government-imposed requirement, will the Government allow the pricing on this summary to be modified appropriately via renegotiation?

ANSWER: The prices are not for evaluation purposes only--they are also legally binding. Total evaluated prices will be calculated from the price sheets for evaluation purposes. Once an award is made the configuration may not be changed absent mutual agreement. As a matter of contract administration either party may propose a change but neither party is required to accept one. The Government cannot award a firm fixed price contract knowing it will make a change. However, in the event the contract is changed, an upward or downward equitable adjustment may be warranted depending on the facts.

DAAE20-02-R-0118
Questions & Answers
24 June 2002

19. QUESTION: This solicitation has asked us to price freight as FOB destination. We cannot do an accurate job of pricing freight costs without actual destination and quantity at each destination. Freight costs are significant as percentage of the total price for this solicitation. Without actual shipping destination and quantity, proposal prices may be unfairly evaluated.

ANSWER: See Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd dated 24 June 2002.

20. QUESTION: Addendum 7, Para 3.2.1, Breaker. The last sentence dictates design approach and eliminates competition.

ANSWER: The last sentence is not a design approach, but it is an approach whose intent is to eliminate a weak point with potential for failure. We would be willing to accept a non-welded two-piece design if it can be demonstrated that it has the same or better performance and durability as a one-piece forged tool and the manufacturer were to warrant it against breakage.

21. QUESTION: Addendum 7, Para 3.2.1, Breaker. This paragraph states: "that the impact energy shall be no less than 300 ft-lb (407 joules)". We believe this has been transposed with "impact energy **class**"? We respectfully suggest PD415 be changed to reflect a certifiable tool energy rating rather than impact energy or impact energy **class**.

Impact energy **class** is a marketing figure that cannot be verified by testing, which is a requirement under this solicitation. Therefore, impact energy **class** is not an accepted industry standard. Rather, the Mounted Breaker Manufacturers Bureau of the Construction Industry Manufacturers Association (CIMA-MBMB) has developed a CIMA Measuring Guide for Tool Energy Rating for Hydraulic Breakers.

ANSWER: The requirement is not impact energy **class**, but impact energy at the loader's rated hydraulic pressure and flow.

The Government contacted CIMA-MBMB (AEM) for more information on the tool energy rating. AEM replied, "AEM by agreement with its members, maintains a library of Breaker Test Data, supplied by our member companies. This data cannot be shared with individuals outside the association, or even with other members."

Reluctance by an industry group to share its data and methodology for deriving an alleged standardized rating makes it suspect and meaningless. Therefore, since the information is an industry "secret", without knowledge of how the energy rating is derived, there is no meaningful basis for comparison, nor can we confirm that the Tool Energy Rating will give us an adequate breaker. Additionally, not all breaker manufacturers subscribe to the Tool Energy Rating.

22. QUESTION: Addendum 8, Para 2.1 is worded as follows: "The government will consider the contractor's Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) manual with supplementation for the skid loader all available COTS literature for the skid loader's component items. The system manual shall be prepared in accordance with government guidance."

a. Is there a word or phrase missing between "skid loader" and all available COTS literature" in the first sentence?

b. What is referenced by the phrase "skid loader's component items"? Are you referencing the attachments?

c. Does the phrase "system manual" in the second sentence mean the manual for the skid steer loader and all attachments?

d. In the first sentence you seem to be asking for a COTS manual. In the second sentence you state that "the manual shall be prepared in accordance with government guidance". The second sentence conflicts with the first. If something other than COTS is required, better definition is requested for the phrase "in accordance with government guidance".

ANSWER: The addendum you are referring to is Addendum 9. Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

23. QUESTION: Addendum 8, Para 2.4 references "(encl 2)". What is encl 2? It was not included in the solicitation. Is there an enclosure # 1?

ANSWER: The addendum you are referring to is Addendum 9. Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

24. QUESTION: Addendum 8, Para 2.5 references "(encl 3)". What is encl 3? Is enclosure #3 a copy of DA Form 2028? If yes, please provide.

ANSWER: The addendum you are referring to is Addendum 9. Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

25. QUESTION: Addendum 8, Para 4, Quality Assurance Provisions references "paragraphs 3 and 5 of this SOW". Is paragraph 3 missing or should this be reworded?

ANSWER: The addendum you are referring to is Addendum 9. Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

26. QUESTION: Addendum 1 paragraph 1(b)(8). This paragraph delineates Contractor submittal requirements to the contracting officer that will be used for SSEB evaluation. It lays the foundation for the SSEB to apply the evaluation criteria listed in Addendum 2, paragraph 1(a)(2) Global Commercial Logistical Support.

Based on our interpretation of the Addendum 1, Instructions to Offerors, there is no credit given to manufacturers that have demonstrated the ability to provide global parts and service support to isolated areas of the world and/or contingency deployment locations in which the Army is most likely to deploy. In other words, it appears that someone that has a toll-free phone number and email address will be rated equally to someone that has demonstrated Global Commercial Logistical Support in isolated areas. Due to the lack of required

DAAE20-02-R-0118
Questions & Answers
24 June 2002

proposal submittal requirements for demonstrated, or as a minimum, proposed support in isolated areas of the world, we believe several offerors could be incorrectly be rated as meeting the written definition of "Excellent" described in Addendum 2, Para 1(a)2.

Is this your intent? Can you clarify this point for us please?

ANSWER: The proposal requirements for global support identified in Addendum 1, paragraphs 1(b)(8)(i) through (iv) essentially require offerors to (1) describe the extent and duration to which they will provide worldwide repair and replacement parts and service and (2) provide evidence of their ability to do so. Addendum 2, paragraph 1(a)(2) is structured to evaluate this information. It generally states that the Government will evaluate the "**extent and duration** to which the offeror **promises and is able to provide** worldwide support." Under this criteria, an offeror can certainly get "credit" for its **promise and ability** to provide global parts and service support to isolated areas of the world and/or contingency deployment locations in which the Army is most likely to deploy. Also, an offeror with a toll-free number and an email address who simply promises to provide for worldwide support without having demonstrated an ability to do so would not get an Excellent rating since the perceived risk of performance would be too high. See rating criteria for Excellent, "...the perceived risk of nonperformance associated with the offered support is very low."

As to whether the proposal requirements are adequate, we believe the proposal requirements adequately require offerors to demonstrate their ability to provide for global support. See, for example, Addendum 1, paragraph 1(b)(8)(iv), "Provide evidence that substantiates the offeror's ability to perform as promised..." or paragraph 1(b)(8)(iii), which asks offerors to describe their current structure and location of support.

See too, Addendum 2, paragraph 1(a)(3), Price, regarding the Government's willingness to pay premium for global support. Be advised, however, that price can become the controlling factor in a source selection if it turns out that global support proposals are approximately equal. Similarly, global support could become the controlling factor if prices are approximately equal.

27. QUESTION: DAAE20-02-R-0118, Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd, CLIN 0006 - Training paragraph states: "Upon the Contracting Officer's approval, the Contractor shall deliver one each Training Kit, Instructional Video, and Instructor's Manual for every unit delivered." Does this mean we need to provide one Training Kit to each Army Engineer unit or one Training Kit for every skid steer loader?

ANSWER: Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd has been withdrawn and replaced with Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd dated 24 June 2002.

28. QUESTION: DAAE20-02-R-0118, Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd, CLIN 0006 - Training. Should we price the cost of each Training Kit into our machine price for each year using the minimum quantity for each range?

ANSWER: The Government is only obligated to order the guaranteed minimum stated in the solicitation. Given this information, it is up to the offeror to decide how to price the requirements.

29. QUESTION: Addendum 8, Para 3.2.b. Government Responsibilities. Since the machine and work tools will have been delivered to the Army unit prior to training, can you specify that the Government will also provide the skid steer loader and all of its work tool attachments? This will reduce the cost of a Contractor being required to cost in transportation and usage of machines and work tools. It will also give the Government an additional opportunity to check out the machines and work tool attachments.

ANSWER: Addendum 8 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 8 dated 24 June 2002.

30. QUESTION: From what we read in the solicitation we do not think 5.9.3.4 - Bar Coding in Addendum 7 is applicable. Please comment.

ANSWER: Bar coding is required.

31. QUESTION: On page 3 of the Synopsis/Solicitation section, it mentions "possible shipping destinations outside the Continental US". If we are to ship overseas, there will be additional freight and shipping costs incurred. How do you want us to indicate those on our proposal, or will those be an add-on later.

ANSWER: Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd has been withdrawn and replaced with Synopsis/Solicitation Cont'd dated 24 June 2002.

32. QUESTION: RE Addendum 9, Para 2.3. The requirement for tech manuals, electrical schematics & wiring diagrams is unclear to me. These documents are huge, would be a pile of paper a foot high. I also question if these documents would be of much value to the user unit as the repair and diagnostics procedures in these would normally be performed at the Direct Support level, not at the Dash 10/20 level. Our standard COTS technical manual would be of definite value to any unit performing second echelon maintenance, and we can certainly provide those, but is it necessary to provide two (2) hard copies with each machine?

ANSWER: Yes. Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

33. QUESTION: RE Addendum 9, Para 2.3. Our standard COTS operator's manual does contain all lubrication instructions, service schedules, operator (first echelon) maintenance procedures and troubleshooting procedures - would this be sufficient for your needs, and meet the requirements for this solicitation?

ANSWER: Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

34. QUESTION: RE Addendum 9, Para 2.3 asks for "remove and replace instructions for all components".

DAAE20-02-R-0118
Questions & Answers
24 June 2002

ANSWER: Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

35. QUESTION: RE Addendum 9, Para 4.2 states: "Failure to fulfill requirements of paragraph three (3) shall be cause for rejection of the skid loader". I am unable to find a paragraph three (3). I show 2.5, then jumping to 4.0. Please clarify.

ANSWER: Addendum 9 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 9 dated 24 June 2002.

36. QUESTION: Addendum 8, Para 3.2.1.

1- Is the impact energy figures actual new CIMA ratings that are "voluntary" ratings that not all manufacturers adhere to yet?

ANSWER: Addendum 8 has been withdrawn and replaced with Addendum 8, dated 24 June 2002.

2- Is the Picket driver the commonly referenced Post driver, and if so, what diameter is needed to accommodate the pickets to drive?

ANSWER: The picket driver is the post driver. It shall be capable of driving standard T-posts, which are typically 1-3/8 inches wide and 1-3/8 inches deep, and U-shaped posts that are 3.06 inches wide and 1.44 inches deep. Refer to Commercial Item Description A-A-55523.