Question #	Question Reference (RFP #, PWS #, etc.)	Question	Response
1	L.5.1.9	Pre-Award Safety Responsibility: Please clarify what "evidence" the Government is seeking in response to paragraph L.5.1.9.1(s).	RFP Section L.5.1.9 has been revised in Amendments 0001 and 0002 to clairfy Pre-Award Safety Responsibility information.
2	L.5.1.9.1(b)	Please clarify what documentation, if any, the Government is seeking in response to the requirement to provide "a history of accident experience". If Offerors have a "history" of zero accidents on contracts with ammunition or explosive related services, is a statement to that effect sufficient?	RFP Section L.5.1.9 has been revised in Amendments 0001 and 0002 to clairfy Pre-Award Safety Responsibility information.
3	L Section (L.5.1.9) and DoD 4145.26-M	Subpart 223.370 of the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (Reference (d)) requires contracting officers to incorporate this Manual in all AE procurement actions. C1.4.COMPLIANCE WITH MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS. The Department of Defense requires compliance with mandatory provisions of this Manual and applicable portions of Reference (c). In order to provide consistent and current information to all DoD AE contractors, quantity distance (QD) tables and formulae in Reference (c) are incorporated by reference in Chapter 5 of this Manual. The procuring contracting officers (PCOs) may grant contract-specific waivers to mandatory provisions of this Manual. For government-owned/contractor-operated facilities, requests for waivers of safety requirements shall be processed via the administrative contracting officer (ACO) or PCO through the explosives safety office of the Military Service that owns the facilities for review and approval in accordance with the Military Service requirements. For contractor-owned facilities, requests for waivers from mandatory provisions of this Manual shall be processed through the ACO to the PCO. C1.4.1.1. This requirement appears to apply to cintracts where the Government is procuring ammuntion & explosives (AE). Can the Government clrify this requirement?	DFARS SubPart 223.370-1 indicates the applicability of DFARS Clause 252.223-7002, parapgraphs (a)(5) and (a)(8) , at a minimum apply to this acquisition. DFARS Clause 252.223-7002 states: The Contractor shall comply with the requirements of the DoD Contractors' Safety Manual for Ammunition and Explosives, DoD 4145.26-M. The 4145.26-M requires compliance with mandatory provisions of the manual. If there is a situation where these mandatory requirements of the contract cannot be met for some reason, a waiver is requested by the contractor to the ACO-PCO for approval. For GOCO's- we (JMC Safety) would look at the waiver from an explosives safety standpoint and give our recomendation back to the ACO-PCO to approve.
4	FINAL RFP - Hunter Liggett - W52P1J15R0101 L.3.4, L.5.1.9	L.3.4 states, in part, "Filenames must be 40 characters or less and must not contain single quotes, spaces and pound or percent signs"; however, the naming convention associated with L.5.1.9.1(d) contains spaces, does not indicate the associated volume, and is very lengthy IAW with 40 character maximum length. Would the Government please review this filename and provide an update as required?	File name has been revised in Amendment 0002.

5	FINAL RFP - Hunter Liggett - W52P1J15R0101 L.5.3.5.2 Attachment 0003, Performance Questionnaire	L.5.3.5.2 states, in part, "In the event that the Offeror wishes to utilize a Major Subcontractor(s), the Offeror shall identify all recent and relevant contracts where its proposed Major Subcontractor(s) experienced any performance problems that occurred within five years prior to the closing date of this RFP"; however, Attachment 0003 states, in part, "For major subcontractors complete this form for the following timeframe: within 3 years prior to the closing date of this RFP." Would the Government please provide clarification and update the appropriate documents?	Attachment 0003 has been revised in Amendment 0002.
6	Attachment 0001, PWS, Section C-1 Page 23, Para 1.12.1	Are Steel Toe Boots considered a specialty item in accordance with OSHA requirements for particular personnel under this contract, to include but not limited to Mechanics and ASP personnel, and considered a reimbursable item, as individual protective equipment, in accordance with PWS Para 1.12.1, Other Direct Costs?	The Government would furnish the steel toe boots or, subject to PCO approval, reimburse the contractor purchase. Steel toed boots are considered individual protective equipment.
7	Attachment 0001, PWS, Section C-5 Page 5, Para 5.5.2-5.5.3 Exhibit G TE 3G-002 Government Furnished Equipment	During review of the PWS requirements outlined in Paragraphs 5.5.2-5.5.3, we noted there is no supporting equipment to perform NDT inspections listed in Exhibit G. Would the Government please provide a listing of equipment available to support the NDT work load?	No specific NDT equipment is available at this time, however proper NDT equipment or supplies will be provided as required. Additionally, for proposal purposes, there is no NDT workload; therefore, the Offerors do not need to propose to this requirement.

8	RFP Section L .5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xii) and Attachment 0002	Section L .5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xii) requires offerors to use the ROUND function in Attachment 0002 and we are restricted to the hundredth decimal (two decimal places to the right of the whole number). There is an issue with EXCEL calculating an ultimate FTE shortage even when the offeror places the proper number of minimum productive hours into a cell. For example, in a functional area where the minimum productive hours of 16920 add up to 9.00 FTE but EXCEL calculates and displays only 8.99 FTE, when the Government utilizes their evaluation method as stated in Section M.3.b.(1)ii), the 8.99 FTE multiplied by the offeror-provided number of hours per year by employee type (1880 in this example) will result in an UNDERSTATED number of hours. Specifically, 8.99 x 1880 = 16901.20 rather than 16920, which is the calculated result of 9.00 x 1880. This will cause the offeror to be determined to be non-compliant with the minimum productive hours. We have experienced this issue also when adding numbers in different spreadsheets - while one spreadsheet totals the various whole and fractional numbers of FTE to 8.99, another spreadsheet totals the exact same numbers as 9.00.	The government recommends that the offeror enter the number into the excel document as intended. For example, if you intend to propose 9.00 FTEs, then ENTER the number 9.00 FTEs, do not use the round function. If the FTE count cell is clicked (in the offeror's attachment 0002) and the "fx" window at the top toolbar shows more than two decimal places, the government will apply the Microsoft formula as stated in L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xii). The government does not require the contractor to use the ROUND formula in L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xii). The government only states, " The Offeror's staffing must be rounded to the nearest hundredth decimal (i.e. two decimal places to the right of the whole number)." If in the event, an offeror uses more than two decimal places, then the Government will round the numbers to two decimal places, prior to performing the compliance check utilizing the ROUND formula. L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(xii) The Offeror must insert number of FTEs (or less than full time equivalents expressed as FTEs) within the applicable FTE Count column. The Offeror's staffing must be rounded to the nearest hundredth decimal (i.e. two decimal places to the right of the whole number). Formatting the cells to display only two decimal places is not considered rounding; the values entered in each cell should only contain two decimal places. FTEs entered by the Offeror with greater than two decimal places will be rounded by the Government to the nearest hundredth decimal (two decimal places to the right of the whole number) using the Microsoft Excel formula "=ROUND(number,num_digits)" in accordance with generally accepted rounding methods, i.e. numbers 5 through 9 are rounded up to the next whole number; numbers 1 through 4 are rounded down to the next whole number. Additionally, the government recommends that the Offerors use formulas to total up the minimum FLC1 hours in lieu of entering the numbers. This will help identify if the offeror would be non-compliant prior to submission.