

## *Completed Responses to FTTS ACTD Questions*

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
5	Attachment 1 MSV spec	3.2.4.7	5. In paragraph 3.2.4.7 of the MSV Draft Performance Specification, there is a requirement for the vehicle to be compatible with the heavy-duty tow bar, DWG 12322663. Is it possible to obtain the drawing set for the tow bar? As an alternative, can it be posted to the website for the FTTS ACTD solicitation?	Yes, drawing Number 1232263 is an assembly drawing of the heavy duty tow-bar and will be made available after award.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
7	SOW	C.8.1	18. Reference: Section C Draft SOW, Page: 20, Paragraph: C.8.1., Title: Operations Security (OPSEC) Plan Statement: Normally when a person requests access to a government database that is considered unclassified but sensitive, only a background check (SF85P) is required. Question: Will the ACE contain classified or unclassified but sensitive information? What level of security clearance will be necessary to obtain access?	The ACE will not be cleared for access to classified information. It is and will be used for information up to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) and Proprietary information. Classified information will be handled separately in accordance with the DD254. The level of security clearance that is required is "SECRET" to obtain information. Refer to ID 326

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
8	SOW	C.3.7.2/C.4.4.1	20. Reference: Section C Draft SOW, Page: 14, Paragraph: C.3.7.2., Title: R/M Failure Reporting Analysis Corrective Action Program Reference: Section C Draft SOW, Page: 16, Paragraph: C.4.4.1., Title: TIR Response Times Statement: C.3.7.2. indicates that TIR responses are not required unless the COR specifies this in writing. C.4.4.1., with respect to 'Critical' TIRs does not indicate that COR direction for a TIR response is required. Question: For 'Critical' TIR response, will COR written direction be required or not?	See C.3.7.2. Response times will be clarified in the final solicitation. The Contractor will be notified telephonically by the COR when a critical test incident occurs. The Contractor will be required to respond within 24 hours. Final response will be required in 30 days. Access to the test incident reports will be defined in the statement of work and further clarified during the start of work meeting.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
14	SOW	C.1.1	26. Section 3, Draft Scope of Work: C.1.1 Program Objective. This section indicates that each contractor would have to bid on both the MSV and UV trucks. This requirement flies in the face of the structure of both the current military and domestic truck industries and could have an adverse long-term impact on future military truck competition.	Contractors shall be allowed to submit proposals on either the MSV or the UV or both.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
15	SOW	C.1.1	27. Section 3, Draft Scope of Work: C.1.1 Program Objective. The vehicles required under this solicitation demand that a single contractor provide the equivalent of both a heavy duty and light duty truck. There is currently no domestic commercial or military truck manufacturer with a product line that encompasses both light and heavy-duty vehicles. Commercially, the domestic Big Three, which had one time sold both light and heavy-duty trucks, have divested themselves of the heavy truck business and currently sell only light and medium duty trucks. Also, no current military truck manufacturer has recent experience manufacturing both light and heavy-duty vehicles. Since military vehicles have historically been based on commercial technology, this means that the government is in effect dictating that truck firms enter into business agreements to compete for this contract. This is a decision that should be made by industry, and the government should not be presupposing the manner in which industry should structure itself to compete for this program. Industry should be able to respond to one or both vehicles and the submission on either or both should stand on its merits.	Contractors shall be allowed to submit proposals on either the MSV or the UV or both.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
16	SOW	C.1.1	28. Section 3, Draft Scope of Work: C.1.1 Program Objective. The government will also be jeopardizing its flexibility by having to choose between teams in which it had no say in structuring. Once again it presupposes that the team it selects will have the strongest solution for both platforms. If this is not the case the government will have to make a decision between selecting a contractor with either the best MS or the best Utility solution and compromising on the other platform.	Contractors shall be allowed to submit proposals on either the MSV or the UV or both.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
17	SOW	C.1.1	29. Section 3, Draft Scope of Work: C.1.1 Program Objective. The government is potentially limiting competition on the ACTD simply because a firm with capability in only one size platform can be precluded from competing simply because it cannot find a suitable partner. This strategy also pre-supposes that there is an even match of firms with capability in the heavy and light truck areas.	Contractors shall be allowed to submit proposals on either the MSV or the UV or both.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
18	SOW	C.1.1	30. Section 3, Draft Scope of Work: C.1.1 Program Objective. Given that this requirement forces truck firms to team for this technology program, this may have a long-term negative impact on future competition. This program is a technology program with no production directly tied to it. The government has not yet determined when production may occur, yet alone whether a new start will be the solution for supporting the FCS UA. Yet this requirement to team will impact a firms ability to compete on future production contracts. Any two firms teaming on this program will require agreements on technology transfer and will limit the ability of both firms to enter into an expanded market. The government once again is presupposing that a firm currently only in either the light or heavy market might not in the future desire to expand into the other market. Even though the government has made no decisions on a future FTTS procurement strategy, this technology program strategy can have a major impact on competition on procurement programs many years in the future.	Contractors shall be allowed to submit proposals on either the MSV or the UV or both.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
19	SOW	C.1.1	31. Section 3, Draft Scope of Work: C.1.1 Program Objective. The government is also failing to take into account the fact that some firms are both in the military and commercial truck business. The fact that the firms compete in the commercial market may preclude them from teaming on the military program. This restricts the flexibility of firms to form teams which other wise might make sense. If such firms could bid on the individual platforms, there may be agreements that could be made which would allow cooperation without having one or the other bid as a prime.	Contractors shall be allowed to submit proposals on either the MSV or the UV or both.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
21	SOW	C.1.2	33. Section 3, Draft Scope of Work: C.1.2 Program Plan. The requirement to have a program plan, which addresses not only the requirements of this solicitation but also a future as yet undetermined solicitation, within 30 days after contract award seems both burdensome and inappropriate. According to the timing in the solicitation a Preliminary Design Review does not occur until Oct 04. The plan to fabricate and test demonstrators should not be required before this point and probably not until the CDR in Feb 05. And certainly, a plan to mature the demonstrator should not be required before the CDR when technology decisions, upon which this maturing would be based, have been made. XXXXXXXX recommends that the Program Plan be broken into sections which would be delivered at reasonable and necessary points during the program.	Nonconcur. Sufficient data, culled from the solicitation, should exist early on to establish a program plan describing the contractor's approach to executing this program. Due to the time available between contract award date and required demonstrators delivery date and potential long lead items, it is estimated that a contractor must have his approach detailed at the earliest feasible date to ensure program success. It is acknowledged the fidelity of the approach to the fabrication and test program plan sections will not be as well developed as that for the modeling and simulation.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
28	SOW	C.1.2.2.1.7	40. Section 3, Draft Scope of Work: C.1.2.2.1.7 Log Demo. This sub-paragraph of Initial M&S appears to imply that this Log Demo analysis is to be complete by the PDR. Is this the government's intention? If so, is this not too early in the program to complete such a costly effort? Is not the CDR a more appropriate time, after the design has been solidified? When will the Government Log Demo take place? Is this something which will occur after the down-select on actual demonstration hardware? If so this should be moved to C.4.4.	Log Demo in Section C.1.2.2.1.7 has been moved to Section C. 4.4.2.1 under Demonstrator Delivery. The actual demo will take place after hardware delivery sometime before the MUA for a two to three week period.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
33	Attachment 2 UV spec	1.3	45. Attachment 2, FTTS UV Performance Specification: 1.3 Vehicle Variants There are no specific requirements identified in Annexes A and B. Does this indicate that there are none?	At this time much of the FTTS variant specific requirements cannot be defined because they are derived requirements from the specific FTTS roles in the Unit of Action. Many of the specific interfaces and detailed requirements from the supported UA systems are not well defined at this time. To address this issue, the SOW C.1.2.2.1. Initial Contractor M&S refers to the FTTS MSV Distribution variant and the FTTS UV Support variant which we estimate will have no significant, unique variant requirements and form the most common platform. It is also partially the reason that the delivered demonstrators are those specific variants (MSV Distribution and UV Support respectively). For FTTS variants having unique requirements, the SOW includes C.1.2.2.2. (Contractor M&S for post-CDR Government Analysis) - which requires the downselected contractor(s) to deliver additional variant specific M&S to the government commensurate with the amount of detailed information available.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
35	Attachment 2 UV spec	3.1.1.1	47. Attachment 2, FTTS UV Performance Specification: 3.1.1.1 Curb Weight (CW). What is the meaning of "integral survivability?" Will it be explained in classified Annex D?	Integral survivability means that the protection for the crew is designed as part of the standard vehicle platform as opposed to applique armor or kits, which are removable. Further detail is provided in classified Annex D.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Docurment</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
42	Attachment 2 UV spec	3.2.1.16.6	54. Attachment 2, FTTS UV Performance Specification: 3.2.1.16.6 Energy Storage. What is meant by the statement: " The battery management system shall allow for the replacement of a single battery module at field level maintenance without power degradation or special tools.	Early prototype HE vehicles have had problems with battery matching. Specification outlines the requirement for any single battery (if batteries are used) to be replaceable at "field" level without special tools or TMDE. In multi battery packs, the vehicle shall have a system for identifying the defective battery replaceable in the field without power degradation or special tools. ( Designed for Easy Maintenance) Removal of total pack to replace one battery or storage device is unacceptable.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Docurment</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
198	Attachment 1 MSV Spec	3.2.1.15	210. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 20, Paragraph: 3.2.1.15, Title: Power Take-Off (PTO) Openings. Statement: "The PTO locations shall be of sufficient capacity to deliver a minimum of 150 hp." On a Hybrid Electric Vehicle with multiple electrically driven motors, a PTO at a single motor may not be capable of 150 hp. Question: Is a Power Take-Off required on a Hybrid Electric Vehicle? If so, can more than one PTO (with less than 150 hp capacity each) be provided that add up to a minimum of 150 hp?	The PTO will be used for mission modules (variants) and to slave the power to the legacy systems. There shall be at least one PTO. Any additional PTO's shall be determined by the proposer.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Docurment</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
199	Attachment 1 MSV Spec	3.7.2.1	211. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 41, Paragraph: 3.7.2.1, Title: Ca b. Statement: "The FTTS MSV shall provide capability (objective) for a crew of up to 4 personnel (2 crews) to conduct 24-hour operations." The threshold crew size capability is not specified. Question: What is the threshold crew size that must be provided for?	The threshold crew size is 2. The MSV specification shall be updated.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Docurment</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
205	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.2.1.18.2/3.2.1.16.2	217. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 20, Paragraph: 3.2.1.18.2, Title: AC Power Source. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 20, Paragraph: 3.2.1.18.2, Title: AC Power Source. Statement: Normally, describing AC power source at least requires voltage and frequency defined factors. Question: What is the voltage and frequency of the AC power source?	The section referred to in both MSV and UV for this question has been removed from the spec. The voltage, and frequency will be up to the proposer to determine through analyses of the loads.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
206	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.2.1.19 (MSV)/3.2.1.17.2 (UV)	218. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 21, Paragraph: 3.2.1.19, Title: Silent Watch Capability. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 21, Paragraph: 3.2.1.17.2, Title: Silent Watch Capability. Statement: A power requirement usually includes frequency and voltage. Question: a) What kind of power is the 1.5 kW (MSV), DC or AC? b) What is the voltage level of the 1.5 kW MSV? c) What kind of power is the 1 kW (UV), DC or AC? d) What is the voltage level of the 1 kW UV?	The power is DC. The voltage levels are established by the proposer based upon the analysis of equipment operating during silent watch.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
216	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.1.4.1/3.10.14.2 (MSV and UV)	228. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 13, Paragraph: 3.1.4.1, Title: Operating Temperatures. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 57, Paragraph: 3.10.14.2, Title: Engine Cooling System. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 13, Paragraph: 3.1.4.1, Title: Operating Temperatures. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 54 Paragraph 3.10.14.2, Title: Engine Cooling System. Statement: MSV Performance Specification 3.1.4.1 requires the vehicle to operate in a temperature range from -25° to +125° F without kits. Paragraph 3.10.14.2 describes a 0.60 Tractive Effort to Gross Vehicle Weight cooling test to be run at 120° F. The hardware differences between a 120° F and a 125° F requirement are quite significant in both the powertrain cooling and cab interior climate control systems. It should also be noted that both the current HEMTT and FMTV specifications identify an upper ambient operating temperature of 120° F, which is typical for Army vehicle operations. Question: Can the Government confirm that the upper ambient operating temperature is 120° F and advise if paragraph 3.1.4.1 will be amended accordingly?	The specification has been changed to an operating temperature range of -25 to 120 F without special kits. The upper limit for the ambient operating temperature for the cooling test is 120 F. However, past experience in the Middle East has shown that temperatures can exceed 120 F.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
227	Attachment 2 UV Spec	3.8.1/3.1.3.1	239. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 45, Paragraph: 3.8.1, Title: FTTS UV Crane. Statement: The crane for road and air transportability shall not exceed 86 inches width? (para 3.8.1) The vehicle width requirement is less than 96" (para 3.1.3.1). Question: Please explain why the crane width should have to be less than the vehicle width requirement?	The crane width can be 96". This has been updated in the UV specification.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
231	Attachment 11 WBS		243. Reference: Attachment 11 (WBS), Page: N/A, Paragraph: N/A Question: In some places the WBS may not be consistent or compatible with current truck manufacturer's bill of materials structure. Would the Government accept a contractor version or contractor format for the WBS if it provided sufficient detail to perform detailed analysis of the ACTD variants?	The Government requires that all offerors and awardees use the minimum WBS elements and format included in Attachment 11. The offeror is not prohibited from including additional information or importing the data from their own existing databases or software programs.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
232	Attachment 15 Production Quantities		244. Reference: Attachment 15 (Production Quantities), Page: N/A, Paragraph: N/A Statement: In order to provide meaningful information for a production price estimate (as seems to be implied via the inclusion of an attachment titled "Production Quantities" it is imperative that the following items be considered: 1. Overall quantity by variant 2. How N/R (Engineering and ILS) charges are to be considered (part of the unit price or separate?) 3. The payment terms of any future contract (PBP allowed?) 4. The acceptance process for future trucks 5. Anticipated training requirements 6. ILS manual requirements Question: If a production price estimate is required, will sufficient ground rules be laid out that provide clear guidance as to the assumptions a contractor is to make in building up that production price?	Attachment 15 will be provided in the final solicitation.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
234	Attachment 1 MSV Spec	3.2.1.10.1	246. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 17, Paragraph: 3.2.1.10.1, Title: 60% Grade(30.96 degree slope). Statement: This paragraphs defines a threshold requirement of 60% grade capability at GVW. It also calls for a performance of the 60% grade capability at GCW, but does not define this as threshold or objective. Question: Is the requirement for 60% grade capability at GCW to be considered an Objective requirement?	60% is a threshold requirement at GVW. For the GCW, 60% is objective requirement. The threshold for GCW is 30%. The MSV Specification has been updated.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Docurnent</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
235	Attachment 1 MSV Spec	3.2.1.10.4	<p>247. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 17, Paragraph: 3.2.1.10.4, Title: 5% Grade. Statement: This paragraph specifies "MSV and its companion trailer both at GVW shall be capable of continuously ascending a 5-percent grade at 55MPH." This sort of performance point would require approximately 1000Hp total for both systems. The requirement states "both at GVW" vs. "the MSV at GCW" which would lead one to believe that they bot h separately have to meet this requirement. Since this is a continuous requirement one could not rely on stored energy to meet this requirement. This would also dictate an engine horsepower for the MSV (at GVW) that would likely be greater than what is available and still meet EPA on-road regulations. This statement would also lead one to believe that the MSV CT at GVW would have to ascend a 5% grade at 55mph by itself, which would drive this vehicle to become something that would resemble an MSV and all the related laws required of a driven vehicle vs. just a trailer and its requirements. It should be noted that U.S. Military vehicles more traditionally are required to operate at either 50 or 55 mph on a 2% grade at GVW and 45 mph on a 3% grade at GCW.</p> <p>Question: a) Is the 5% grade correct? b) Can the contractor use stored energy to meet this requirement as a peak condition? c) Can the Contractor use EPA non-certified engines to meet this requirement? d) Is it the intent of the Governm ent to have the MSV CT capable of speeds of 55 mph on 5% grade as a stand alone system?</p>	Paragraph 3.2.1.10.4, in the MSV Specification-has been revised.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Docurnent</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
237	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.2.1.3	<p>249. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 14, Paragraph: 3.2.1.3, Title: Late ral Stability. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 14, Paragraph: 3.2.1.3, Title: Lateral Stability. Statement: Since this is to be a 1 to 1 payload to weight ratio vehicle, the configuration of the payload is critical in assessing many of the vehicle dynamic performance criteria defined in the purchase description. Question: Can the Government please define the payload configuration for this test in reference to weight and CG (vertical, horizontal and lateral from a common data point)?</p>	Section 3.2 describes the payload as "All performance requirements shall be met with the vehicle at Gross Vehicle Weight (GVW) with uniformly distributed payload whose CG is 24 inches above the cargo bed, unless otherwise specified. If Gros s Combination Weight (GCW) is specified, the CT (Companion Trailer with uniformly distributed payload whose CG is 24 inches above the cargo bed) shall be the trailer for all Mission Vehicles, unless otherwise specified. Minimum payload requirements are 5,100 pounds (see paragraph 3.1.2 in the UV specification.). The MSV has a payload 11 ST plus 2 ST flatrack (threshold), 12 ST plus 1 ST (objective) (refer to section 3.1.2).

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
242	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.2.1.3	<p>254. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 14, Paragraph: 3.2.1.3, Title: Lateral Stability. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 14, Paragraph: 3.2.1.3, Title: Lateral Stability. Statement: The intent of the 0.5g lateral stability capability is to improve overall side slope capability and increase the safe speed at which turns can be negotiated. Limiting the vehicle width to 96 inches prevents any improvement in stability via an increase of vehicle width or stance. The next approach is to lower the combined vertical Cg of the vehicle/payload by tire selection, vehicle ride height, or overall design. It may not be possible to meet this and other required performance objectives given the requirement for reduced vehicle weight, quicker maintenance, and the opposing requirement of a greater fording capability. A fluid payload such as water or fuel can shift during lateral acceleration resulting in a reduced capability. This condition is amplified if only a partial or half payload is present in the tank due fluid sloshing inside the tank.</p> <p>Question: a) What will be the payload utilized to conduct this performance testing and will it be rigid or a fluid payload? b) Would it be permissible to utilize vehicle ride height control to improve overall stability? c) Could suspension adjustments be made to improve stability if it were to degrade overall ride quality or ground clearance on a limited basis?</p>	A) The proposer has to design for both a static load and fluid dynamic payload. B) Yes. C. Adjustments can be made as long as the ride quality and ground clearance requirements are met.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
243	Attachment 1 MSV Spec	3.2.1.10.3	<p>255. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 17, Paragraph: 3.2.1.10.3, Title: 40% Side Slopes. Statement: The payloads that can be carried on the MVS/MSV CT range from bulk cargo/ammunition on either a flatrack or ISO container to liquids such a fuel or water. The dynamics of liquid in a partially full container will result in a reduced side slope capability due to the fluid shifting to the downhill side of the vehicle changing the lateral center of gravity for the vehicle. Question: a) Is the 40% side slope requirement to be met with a partial load of fuel or water? b) If the requirement must be met and the storage device is either a Modular Fuel Farm (MFF) or HIPPO (Potable water carrier), who is responsible for any upgrades required in the tank such as horizontal baffles to minimize fluid movement? c) Could vehicle ride height be reduced on side slopes to improve vehicle stability?</p>	A) Yes the mobility requirement stands for all operations for partial/full load of fuel and/or water. B) This is the same requirement as in existing liquid transportation. The contractor must propose a design that meets the requirement. C) Yes, this is up to the proposer to design.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Docurnent</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
244	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.2.1.17 (MSV)/3.2.1.15 (UV)	256. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 20, Paragraph: 3.2.1.17, Title: Emissions. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 19, Paragraph: 3.2.1.15, Title: Emissions. Statement: This paragraph states "New production vehicles shall comply with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) emissions? in effect at time of production". With production of these vehicles happening most likely beyond the 2007 timeframe where low sulfur fuel will be specified by the engine companies to meet emissions standards for on-road vehicles. This is in contrast with the request that the system be able to operate and meet its performance requirements using JP8 fuel. Use of this fuel will most likely immediately cause the emissions devices on these new engines to become permanently inoperative and negate the ability of that engine being compliant with EPA regulations. The other issue of concern is the continuous performance requirements (e.g. 5% grade at 55mph at GVW) will likely dictate an engine HP range for MSV greater than what would be available in EPA certified configurations. Question: a) Will the government allow EPA non-certified engines as an option if the continuous performance requirements would force the design outside of the available certified engine options? b) Will the government change the applicable continuous performance requirements (5% grade at 55mph at GVW) to a peak performance requirement for MSV so it can be met temporarily with some form of stored energy? c) Will the government require that the engines be certified by EPA on JP8 fuel? d) Will the government allow for the fact that many of the emissions devices anticipated on 2007 engines and beyond to fail due to the use of JP8 fuel (not necessarily degrade engine performance)?	A) The Government Tactical Wheeled Vehicle PEO will, at the time of releasing the production solicitation, define the emissions standards for FTTS. B) The performance requirements have been changed from 5% to 2% and both specifications have been updated. C) No. The military at this time will not require the engines to be certified on JP-8. D) The Governm ent is aware of the failure that will occur if using a fuel with sulfur levels higher than the 15ppm required in 2006 and beyond. The Government is also aware that host provided fuels will likely have sulfur higher than the 15ppm sulfur (perhaps closer to 0.5% and higher).

<i>ID</i>	<i>Docurnent</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
245	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.2.2.1	257. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 21, Paragraph: 3.2.2.1, Title: Range. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 21, Paragraph: 3.2.2.1, Title: Range. Question: Will the government include as an attachment the "FTTS drive cycle" as called out in this paragraph to properly design the vehicle for these requirements?	The drive cycle will be added to the solicitation as Attachment 19.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Docurnent</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
247	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.4.10	259. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 25, Paragraph: 3.4.10, Title: Water Transport. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 24, Paragraph: 3.4.10, Title: Water Transport. Statement: Many of the Navy and Marine Corp vessels have limitation in heights of 98 inches. The C-130 requirement is 102 inches. Question: Is it the intent of the government to use this requirement to limit the transport height of the vehicle to 98inches vs the normal Army standard of 102 predicated by the C130 transportation requirements?	We are unaware of any Navy and Marine height limitations of 98". If the 98" requirement does exist, please provide the information.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
248	Attachment 1 MSV Spec	3.4.3.1	260. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 24, Paragraph: 3.4.3.1, Title: Lifting Eyes. Statement: This paragraph does not seem to provide enough detail regarding Lifting Eyes. The requirements sound like they relate to front and rear tiedowns, not lifting provisions. The definition of the expected angles does not define very well the expected applications. It would seem more load case information would be needed to fully understand what is being attempted here. Question: Can the government please provide more detail regarding this requirement and define if it is a lifting or tiedown requirement?	Refer to section 3.4.3, which references MIL-STD-209. All details required to design and test lift and tiedown provisions are contained in MIL-STD-209.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
249	SOW	C.7.0	261. Reference: Section C (Draft SOW), Page: 19, Paragraph: C.7.0., Title: Safety Program. Statement: Paragraph C.7.0 references "DI-SAFT-????, Safety Assessment Report" but does not reference the DI-SAFT number. Question: Should the DID number be referenced as "DI-SAFT-80102"?	The SOW has been updated to state the Safety Assessment Report to be DI-SAFT-80102B.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
251	Attachment 1 MSV Spec	3.2.1.11.4	263. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 18, Paragraph: 3.2.1.11.4, Title: Central Tire Inflation System (CTIS). Statement: The MSV would be able to automatically change tire pressure from the cab of the vehicle through the use of a CTIS system. The current approach used for military trailers is to manually inflate or deflate the tires to the required settings. It appears the intent is to provide a similar CTIS capability on the MSV companion trailer either powered/controlled or controlled by the MSV. Given the size of the tires utilized for desired off-road mobility, a large volume of air is required to make large tire pressure changes. If the MSV were also required to provide air to the trailer to adjust tire pressures there would need to be either a much larger/multiple air compressors, the inflation times would significantly increase, or a large air reservoir would be required on the truck or trailer. Question: a) Is it a requirement to automatically adjust the tire pressure on the companion trailers from the cab of the MSV? b) If automatic tire pressure adjustment is required on the trailer, would the inflation times be increased for a truck/trailer combination when compared against the truck only? c) Would it be permitted to add an additional compressor on the companion trailer to supply the required air to inflate tires on the trailer if the inflation times contained in paragraph 3.2.1.11.4.6 are not increased?	<p>A) Yes, that is the correct interpretation of the requirement.</p> <p>B) No, the inflation times given are for the entire system.</p> <p>C) Yes, an MSVCT compressor would be permitted. An additional compressor is only one possible technical solution. Offerors are encouraged to propose innovative solutions to the requirements.</p>

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
253	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.2.3.1	<p>265. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 21, Paragraph: 3.2.3.1, Title: Vertical Step. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 21, Paragraph: 3.2.3.1, Title: Vertical Step. Statement: The basic MSV and companion trailer, while connected is required to be able to climb or descend a 24-inch (threshold) /32-inch (objective) step in the forward and reverse directions without preparation or modification of the vehicle. It is assumed that the truck/trailer are at normal ride height and either cross-country or highway tire pressure. Most current vehicles require that the rear mud flaps be secured in a raised position to prevent them from being ripped off when a vehicle climbs the vertical step in the rearward direction. The need to perform an ascent or descent to/from the vertical step when the truck and trailer are connected presents a problem due to the fixed drawbar between the truck and trailer. Unless the drawbar is collapsed it will contact the upper lip of the step prior to the trailer axle climbing the wall that could damage the drawbar or attaching structure. Question: a) If the vehicle ride height were raised in obstacle avoidance mode for operation, would this be considered preparation since it would be controlled from the cab and would be a standard part of off-road operations as required? B) If the ability to climb a 32-inch vertical step were only possible with tires so large that they (ex. 16.00R20) would compromise other height requirements, would the other operational characteristics be reconsidered? c) If it were only safe to climb a 24-inch vertical step with a loaded truck trailer combination from the forward direction due to limited control of the trailer, could the rearward portion of the requirement be eliminated? d) Has the ability to climb a 24-inch vertical step with a truck trailer combination been demonstrated and if so, would details be provided to the material developers?</p>	<p>A) No.  B) The requirements apply. See SOW Section C.1.2.1.1  C) The specification shall be updated.  D) At this time, there has been no demonstration on the 24-inch vertical step with a truck/trailer combination.</p>

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
254	Attachment 1 MSV spec/Attachment 2 UV spec	3.2.3.2	<p>266. Reference: Attachment 1 (MSV), Page: 21, Paragraph: 3.2.3.2, Title: Trench Crossing. Reference: Attachment 2 (UV), Page: 21, Paragraph: 3.2.3.2, Title: Trench Crossing. Statement: The MSV truck/trailer combination is required to be able to ford 48-inches of water without kit and up to 60-inches with/without an optional fording kit. To prevent contamination or water ingestion, it will be necessary to route breathers significantly above the fording line or provide a means to seal them when submerged. Question: a) Is water intrusion in the cab permitted while fording providing it does not affect vehicle operation or crew safety? b) Would it be possible to operate the vehicle at an elevated ride height while fording to minimize the water in the cab?</p>	<p>A&amp;B) Yes as long as all other requirements are met.</p>

ID	Document	Paragraph/Section	Question/Comment	Answer/Update
285	SOW	C.8.0	<p>297. Reference: Draft SOW (Section C), Page: 19, Paragraph: C.8.0., Title: Environmental Assessment. Statement: The RFP Paragraph C.8.0. reads: "The Contractor shall not use cadmium, hexavalent chromium, asbestos or Class I or Class II Ozone-Depleting Substances, or other highly toxic or carcinogenic materials without Governmental approval. The contractor shall not use materials that are identified in the Registry of Toxic Effects of Chemical Substances, published by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, as materials that will produce toxic effects via the respiratory tract, eye, skin or mouth. Moderately toxic materials may be used provided the design and control preclude personnel from being exposed to environments in excess of that specified in 29 CFR 1910, Occupational Safety and Health Standards." Comment: The current RFP language seems to unnecessarily preclude the Contractor from using chemicals commonly used in the truck manufacturing environment. The Registry of Toxic Effects of Chemical Substances (Registry) references toxicity data for approximately 133,000 chemical substances. Common substances used in truck manufacturing that are included in the Registry include: polyurethane foam, aluminum, iron, manganese, copper, ethylene glycol (antifreeze), lubricating grease, motor oil, diesel fuel, etc. Many common chemical substances used in households and work environments are included in the Registry. Therefore, it is not possible to manufacture a vehicle without using substances included in the Registry. One interpretation is that inclusion of a chemical in the Registry does not imply there is no safe exposure level for the chemical, and that the data in the Registry is used by OSHA in the development of its employee exposure regulations which manufacturers are subject to. In addition to the concerns about the reference of the chemicals in the Registry, the definitions of "highly toxic" and "moderately toxic," terms currently included in C.8.0., vary between agencies and publications. Therefore, it is unclear as to what definitions for "highly toxic" and "moderately toxic" are being used in the RFP. Question: a) Given the above, what is the definition of "highly toxic" and "moderately toxic" as they are used in the existing RFP language in Paragraph C.8.0.? b) Considering that manufacturing environments are regulated by OSHA Workplace Standards for employee exposure to chemicals, as well as State and Federal environmental standards, clarification is requested on the Government's reference to the Registry in our chemical review/usage process as part of our Hazardous Materials Management Plan. To address the issue and also to avoid unnecessary costs to the Government, would the Government be in agreement to change paragraph C.8.0. to read as follows?: "The Contractor shall not use cadmium, hexavalent chromium, asbestos or Class I or Class II Ozone-Depleting Substances, or other materials included in OSHA's 29CFR1910.1200 definition of highly toxic or carcinogenic materials without Governmental approval. Moderately toxic materials may be used provided the design and control preclude personnel from being exposed to environments in excess of that specified in 29 CFR 1910, Occupational Safety and Health Standards."</p>	<p>The intent of this language is not to preclude the use of all substances that may contain data in the Registry, but only those that are considered highly toxic. A) "Highly toxic" as defined in 29 CFR 1910.1200, Appendix A, Moderately toxic-- an oral LD50 in rats of 500-5000 mg/kg. This translates to a human dose of 1 ounce to 1 pint. B) The contractor is prohibited from using highly toxic substances listed in the Registry, due to the fact that the processes that are used during manufacturing, will result in similar process/requirements in the Technical Manuals for system sustainment operations at Army Depots, and other sustainment sites. To review data in the Registry of Toxic Effects of Chemical Substances is an extensive effort on the part of the contractor, I agree with revision of this language as follows: " The Contractor shall not use cadmium (electroplating processes), hexavalent chromium (electroplating, and coatings processes), asbestos, Class I or Class II Ozone-Depleting Substances, or other highly toxic or carcinogenic materials as defined in 29 CFR1910.1200 without Governmental approval."</p>

---

---

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document</i>	<i>Paragraph/Section</i>	<i>Question/Comment</i>	<i>Answer/Update</i>
326	SOW	C.8.1	<p>19. Reference: Section C Draft SOW, Page: 20, Paragraph: C.8.1., Title: Operations Security (OPSEC) Plan</p> <p>Statement: Normally when a person requests access to a government database that is considered unclassified but sensitive, only a background check (SF85P) is required.</p> <p>Question: Will the ACE contain classified or unclassified but sensitive information? What level of security clearance will be necessary to obtain access?</p>	<p>The ACE will not be cleared for access to classified information. It is and will be used for information up to Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) and Proprietary information. Classified information will be handled separately in accordance with the DD254. The level of security clearance that is required is "SECRET" to obtain information. Refer to ID 7.</p>