



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY  
ACQUISITION LOGISTICS AND TECHNOLOGY  
103 ARMY PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0103



SAAL-PA

MEMORANDUM FOR PRINCIPAL ASSISTANTS RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING

SUBJECT: 2Q2001 Quarterly Bid Protest Analysis Reports

The quarterly reports for GAO and interagency level protests for the period January 1 through March 31, 2001 (2Q01) is provided in accordance with AFARS 33.190. Additional information related to a GAO protest decision noted on the lessons learned portion of this report can be obtained on GAO's web site [http://www.access.gpo.gov/su\\_docs/aces/aces170.shtml](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/aces/aces170.shtml). GAO does not provide a decision on GAO protests that are dismissed or are academic. The interagency's level protest reports are not posted on a web site.

Dan L. Adams, Jr.  
LTC, GS  
Director for Contracting/Information  
Management and Assessment  
ASA(ALT)

**DISTRIBUTION:**

**PRINCIPAL ASSISTANTS RESPONSIBLE FOR CONTRACTING**

HQ, U.S. Army Materiel Command, ATTN: AMCRDA-AC (PARC), 5001  
Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-0001

U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command, ATTN: AMSAM-AC, Building 4488,  
Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000

U.S. Army Materiel Command Acquisition Center, ATTN: AMSSB-AC, 4118  
Susquehanna Avenue, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005-5002

U.S. Army Communications-Electronics Command, ATTN: AMSEL-AC, Building  
1208E, Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5000

U.S. Army Industrial Operations Command, ATTN: AMSIO-AC, Building 350, 5th  
Floor, N. Wing, Rock Island, IL 61299-6000

U.S. Army Tank-automotive and Armaments Command, ATTN: AMSTA—AO,  
Building 231, Warren, MI 48397-5000

Defense Supply Service - Washington, 5200 Army Pentagon, Washington, D.C.  
20310-5200

Headquarters Forces Command, ATTN: AFLG-PR, 1777 Hardee Avenue SW.,  
Fort McPherson, GA 30330-1062

Third United States Army/U.S. Army Forces Central Command, 1301 Anderson  
Way S.W., Fort McPherson, GA 30330-1064

U.S. Army Medical Command, ATTN: MCAA, 2107 17th Street, Suite 69, Fort  
Sam Houston, TX 78234-5069

U.S. Army Intelligence & Security Command, ATTN: IAPC, 8825 Beulah Street,  
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5246

U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, ATTN: MCMR-AAZ-A,  
820 Chandler Street, Fort Detrick, MD 21702-5014

U.S. Army Military District of Washington, Fort Lesley J. McNair, ATTN:  
ANFC, 103 Third Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20319-5058

Military Traffic Management Command, ATTN: MTAO, 5611 Columbia Pike,  
Falls Church, VA 22041-5050

U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, ATTN: SMDC-CM (PARC),  
P.O. Box 1500, Huntsville, AL 35807-3801

U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, DCSBOS, ATTN: ATBO-A 5 North  
Gate Road, Building SF, Room 306, Fort Monroe, VA 23651-1048

U.S. Army Contracting Command, Europe, ATTN: AEAPR-PA (PARC), Unit  
29331, APOAE 09266

Headquarters, Eighth United States Army, ATTN: FKAQ/EAAO, Unit 15237,  
APOAP 96205-0010

U.S. Army, Pacific, ATTN: APAM, B Street, Building T-115, Fort Shatter, HI  
96858-5100

U.S. Army South, ATTN: PARC, Building 218, Fort Buchanan, PR 00934, U.S.  
Army Corps of Engineers, ATTN: CEPR-ZA, 20 Massachusetts Avenue,  
N.W., Washington, D.C. 20314-1000

National Guard Bureau, ATTN: NGB-AQ, Suite 8300, Jefferson Plaza 1, 1411  
Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202-3231

**QUARTERLY REPORT FOR GAO PROTESTS  
FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2001 (2Q01)**

1. Number of protests filed:

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>62</b>
o AMC	17	20	20
o USACE	17	19	23
o DA Other	29	25	19

Please refer to listing of protests by MACOM at end of this report.

2. Number of protests sustained/granted:

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>
o AMC	0	0	1
o USACE	1	0	0
o DA Other	2	1	3

3. Costs:

a. Costs and fees awarded by GAO to protester:

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$4,157</b>	<b>\$26,016</b>
o AMC	\$0	\$0	\$0
o USACE	\$4,597	\$0	\$0
o DA Other	\$99	\$4,157	\$26,016

b. Estimated preaward value of requirement or postaward contract cost/price:

(1) Preaward proteste (estimated value of requirement):

	2Q01	1Q01	4Q00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$295,610,074</b>	<b>\$118,465,695</b>	<b>\$193,349,000</b>
o AMC	\$29,889,840	\$19,723,133	\$168,328,618
o USACE	\$154,006,550	\$54,132,471	\$24,078,000
o DA Other	\$111,713,684	\$44,610,091	\$942,382

(2) Postaward protests (contract cost/price):

	2Q01	1Q01	4Q00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$208,076,434</b>	<b>\$221,736,448</b>	<b>\$305,982,499</b>
o AMC	\$36,957,033	\$48,606,977	\$165,263,409
o USACE	\$27,649,817	\$61,545,901	\$56,018,983
o DA Other	\$143,469,584	\$111,583,570	\$84,700,107

c. Total government personnel costs resulting from protests:

	2Q01	1Q01	4Q00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$183,178</b>	<b>\$256,355</b>	<b>\$221,123</b>
o AMC	\$96,654	\$90,938	\$176,942
o USACE	\$33,987	\$126,164	\$37,478
o DA Other	\$52,537	\$39,253	\$6,703

4. Lessons learned, issues and trends:

a. **AMC Lessons Learned:**

**(1) J.G.B. Enterprises, Inc., B-286915, Withdrawn**

Ensure that the pas performance information is for “similar” items.

Carefully document all communication regarding efforts to determine whether the offered items comply with the specification.

Ensure that the solicitation language is consistent between and within section.

**(2) Pioneer Aerospace Corporation, B-286685.2, Dismissed**

Early responsive corrective action will avoid any liability for protest costs, including attorney fees.

**(3) Midland supply, Inc., B-286989.2, Withdrawn**

Procurement integrity complaints have to be treated seriously and investigated appropriately.

**(4) Caswell International Corp., B-282511.13, B-282511.14, Withdrawn**

Make sure our evaluations, even if they're contractors, knows the basis of source selection and how important it is to keep an open mind and not make comments about proposed technical solutions in advance of or during evaluation.

**(5) Danaher Tool Group, B-2866774.2, Withdrawn**

Prior contract administration decision must be documented, because they may become important in past performance evaluations of future acquisition.

**(6) Hernandez Enterprise, Inc., B-2986774.2, Dismissed**

Each evaluation factor in section M must be evaluated before you can eliminate an offeror from the competitive range. Any attempt to eliminate an offeror from the competitive range before all evaluation factors are evaluated will result in a sustained protest.

**(7) ISLIP transformer & Metal Co., B-287042.1, Dismissed**

One should keep an table of evaluated rating and prices for each offeror, for each revision for the proposal so one can compare them for significant changes form one stage to the next and follow up regarding those changes.

There is little point in evaluation criteria for which we are only going to accept whatever the offeror writes down, with any objective verification.

Simplest is best in the development of evaluation factors.

Make it clear just what we are looking for in a proposal.

**b. USACE Lessons Learned:**

**(1) Ocuto Blacktop and Paving, B-286800, Denied**

GAO held USACE's issuance of a solicitation for environmental remediation work at the former Griffiss AFB as competitive 8(a) set aside was consistent with Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) subpart 226.71, where there was reasonable expectation that offers would be received from 8(a) eligible concerns located in the vicinity of the work. DFARS 26.71, which implements 10 U.S.C. 2687, established a preference for local, small, and small disadvantaged business, but does not establish a priority among the three. Ocuto protested the corrective action measures USACE implemented in response to the GAO's sustainment of a protest buy Ocuto last year. Specifically, Ocuto, a local small business but not a member of the 8(a) program, challenged USACE's decision to nationally compete the 8(a) set aside contract (one of three contracts being awarded for the BRAC work). GAO held USACE's corrective action measures were reasonable. Notably, GAO also commented that the relevant DFARS section was poorly worded and stated that it would recommend the DFARS Council issue a clarification. The Comptroller general agreed with USACE's interpretation that the regulation was intended to determine whether the procurement could be placed under the 8(a) program, not to limit or designate which part of the 8(a) program, competitive or noncompetitive, could be utilized. The lesson learned in the protest that it is important bring to GAO's attention any ambiguities in the relevant statues and regulations. The lesson

regarding DFARS 226.71 is that until the DFARS council issues a clarification, protest parties will have to rely on the GAO's interpretation of regulation.

**(2) Newfield Construction Inc., B-286912: SUSTAINED.**

The protest arose out of USACE's decision to award a contract for a construction project at the Berry-Rosenblatt U.S. Reserves Center in Connecticut to the low bidder, Tri-State design Construction Company, Inc. Award was made upon determination that Tri-State's failure to fill in all the bid items on its bid schedule was only a clerical error. In defending its actions, USACE asserted the error was correctable because the price of the omitted bid item could be determined from the initial bid schedule, based on the sum of the bid prices listed on the face of the document. The Comptroller General held USACE's reliance on an earlier GAO decision was misplaced because in the instant case Tri-State's bid schedule contained two mistakes, such that the intended bid was not apparent from the document itself. The Comptroller General further noted that USACE had used Tri-State's posted bid opening statements and explanations to find clearer intent in the bid document than was evident on its face. GAO recommended USACE reject Tri-State's bid as nonresponsive and award the contract to Newfield as the next-low bidder, if otherwise acceptable. The lesson learned in this case is that there are very strict criteria required for correction of mistakes. Thus, omission of a price for a certain line item can only be corrected in the very rare circumstance where the price of the omitted item is plainly determinable on the face of the original bid based on the difference between the total bid price and the sum of the line items prices.

**(3) Community partnership, LLC, B-285980, B-285980.2: DENIED:**

The community Partnership LLC filed a GAO protest challenging its elimination from the competitive range of the solicitation for improvement of military housing at Fort Meade, MD, pursuant to the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. CP alleged that the evaluation team improperly applied the evaluation criteria citing a laundry list of weaknesses and disputing them individually. CP also alleged that the evaluation team applied unstated criteria to the evaluation of its submission. The GAO found that the evaluation team applied the evaluation factors reasonably and denied the protest. In addition, the GAO accepted the Corps argument that the evaluation team could consider matter specifically related to an evaluation factor that were not expressly identified in the solicitation. By the time GAO resolved the protest, the USACE evaluation team had finished evaluations. The net effect was that the \$3.5 billion housing privatization effort was able to proceed to award immediately upon resolution of the protest.

**c. DA Others – Lessons Learned:**

**(1) Johnson Controls world Services, Inc., B-286714.1 & .2**

JCWSI protested an A-76 contract award for DOL and DPW services at Ft. Benning, GA. JCWSI contended that the awardee, IT Corp., had an organizational conflict of interest ("OCI") based upon the activities of its subcontractor, INNOLOG. INNOLOG had for years served as an Army support contractor operating a database that tracked maintenance activity at Army Installations around the world and made maintenance-related recommendations to the Army based upon that data. JCWSI contended that (1) this gave the ITR/INNOLOG team access to non-public information that would have been useful in proposing for the Ft. Benning contract, and that (2) INNOLOG's on-going support contract placed it in the position of essentially evaluating itself at Ft. Benning.

The Army defended by showing (1) none of the data had ever been used by INNOLOG or IT for A-76 purposes, (2) the data in any event was not particularly useful, and (3) INNOLOG's activities under its on-going support contract could be modified to avoid even the appearance of an OCI. The GAO sustained the protest. Although never finding that data had been actually used for A-76 purposes, it determined that the lack of an internal INNOLOG firewall to protect the data, coupled with the involvement of an internal INNOLOG personnel having access to the database in the company's A-76 effort, constituted the

appearance of an OCI that required corrective action. Also, the GAO was unconvinced that the Army's proposed mitigation regarding the on-going INNOLOG support contract completely avoided the appearance of an OCI.

Lessons Learned. OCIs are lurking danger in the world of A-76 competitions where contractor routinely team to compete. These teaming arrangements raise a host of issues related to the contractual connections of each team member to the Army. Ocls must be identified early in the award cycle. Contractor should be required to identify in their proposals any potential OCI's arising from their A-76 teaming arrangements. The Army should act on these disclosures – as well as any other relevant information from available sources – to anticipate an address potential OCIs. Per FAR subpart 9.5, contracting officers have an affirmative duty to avoid, mitigate or neutralize OCIs.

### **(2) Si-Nor, Inc., B-286910.1**

Si-Nor, Inc. protested the award of a contract for refuse collection and disposal services for family housing areas located Schofield Barracks, Fort Shafter, Hawaii. After bid opening, the Army realized that FAR clause 52.219-23, Notice of Price evaluation Adjustment for Small Disadvantaged Business (“SDB”) Concerns” was erroneously included in the IFB. A FAR deviation precluded use of the preference during the period in which the solicitation was issued. The Army thus notified all bidders that their bids would be evaluated without application of the 10% adjustment. Two SDBs submitted bids lower than Si-Nor's and award was made to the SDB that submitted the lowest bid.

Si-Nor contended that the Army improperly failed to apply the 10% price evaluation adjustment contrary to the terms of the IFB and claimed it could have priced its proposal more competitively had it known that the preference would not be applied. In denying the protest, GAO concluded that Si-Nor was not prejudiced by the Army's failure to apply the preference because in deciding to inflate its bid without knowingly taking the risk that it would be underbid by other SDBs.

Lesson learned. Before including a solicitation clause implementing a price adjustment for SDB's IAW FAR Subpart 19.11, check to see whether a DOD –wide FAR deviation suspending FAR Subpart 19.11 price adjustment had been issued pursuant to 10 USC 2323(e). Such deviations are issued in each year where in the preceding fiscal year DOD meets its SDB goal established in 10 USC 23223(a).

### **(3) Inventory Accounting Service, B-286814**

The protest involved an IFB for an indefinite-delivery/ indefinite-quantity type contract for a period of 1 base year, with 4 option years, to provide, install, and maintain washers and dryers at various locations at Fort Benning. The IFB specified that all machines installed in one area of the installation must be no more than 2 years old from the date of their purchase as new, and that all other machines must be no more than 3 years old. These requirements were based on the Army's experience that machines older than specified required too many service calls and resulted in too much downtime. Protester asserted that the age limitation and replacement requirement overstated the agency's needs. The GAO found that the agency's 3-year limitation to be a reasonable means of minimizing the breakdowns that occurred with increasing frequency as the machine aged. Likewise, the 2-year age limitation/replacement requirement for one area of the installation was reasonably based on the increase in service calls and downtime for those machines. Moreover, machine downtime adversely affected soldier morale and welfare in that the numerous soldier complaints made the machines' condition a matter of concern to the command structure.

Lesson learned. Age limits on contractor-furnished equipment will be upheld when reasonably based upon an agency's needs. Be prepared to prove those needs with historical data.

**GAO PROTESTS FILED BY MAJOR COMMANDS (HCAs)**

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>AMC TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
ACLAL	0	0	0
ANDA	0	0	0
ARDEC	0	0	0
ARL	0	2	0
ATCOM	0	0	0
AMCOM	5	4	7
AMCOM (AATD)	0	0	0
BELVOIR	0	0	0
BGAD	0	0	0
CACWOO	0	0	1
CCAD	0	1	0
CBDCOM	0	0	0
CECOM	2	6	4
DESCOM-Letterkenny	0	0	0
DPG	0	0	0
IOC	0	0	1
LEAD	0	0	0
MCALESTER	0	0	0
MICOM	0	0	0
NATICK	0	0	0
OSC	1	1	0
PBA	0	0	0
RMA	0	0	0
RRAD	0	0	0
SBCCOM	0	1	0
SSCOM	0	0	0
TACOM	8	3	7
TECOM	0	0	0
TECOM-OPTEC	0	0	0
TECOM-Dugway	0	0	0
TECOM-Yuma Proving Group	0	0	0
USMA	2	2	0
VHFS	0	0	0
WSMR	0	0	1
WVA	0	0	0

## GAO PROTESTS FILED BY MAJOR COMMANDS (HCAs)

	2Q01	1Q01	4Q00
<b>USACE TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>U.S. Army Engineer District</b>			
Alaska	0	0	0
Baltimore	0	0	5
Buffalo	0	0	0
Charleston	0	0	0
Chicago	0	0	0
Detroit	0	0	0
Europe	1	1	0
Fort Worth	0	0	0
Galveston	1	0	0
Headquarters	1	1	1
Humphreys Eng. Center	0	0	0
Huntington	0	0	0
Huntsville	1	4	0
Jacksonville	0	0	0
Japan	2	0	0
Kansas City	1	0	1
Little Rock	0	0	0
Los Angeles	0	0	0
Louisville	1	1	4
Memphis	2	1	1
Mobile	3	3	3
Nashville	0	0	0
New England	0	0	0
New York	1	0	0
New Orleans	0	2	2
Norfolk	0	0	0
Omaha	1	0	0
Pacific Ocean Division	0	0	0
Philadelphia	0	3	0
Pittsburgh	0	1	0
Portland	0	0	0
Rock Island	0	0	0
Sacramento	0	0	1
Savannah	2	1	4
Seattle	0	0	0
St. Louis	0	1	0
St. Paul	0	0	0
Transatlantic	0	0	0
Transatlantic (Europe)	0	0	0
Tulsa	0	0	0

**GAO PROTESTS FILED BY MAJOR COMMANDS (HCAs)**

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>DA OTHER TOTAL</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>19</b>
Defense Supply Service - Wash	0	3	0
HQ Military Traffic Mgmt Cmd	4	0	1
Mil District of Wash	0	0	2
MEDCOM	6	6	2
National Guard Bureau	3	0	3
Ofc Dep Cdr for Health Care	0	0	0
USA Contracting Sys Cmd	0	0	0
USA Force Command	4	5	2
USA Information Sys Cmd	0	2	2
USA Intel & Security Cmd	1	0	0
USA Medical Res. & Mat Cmd	0	0	0
USA Pacific	3	1	0
USA South	3	0	0
USASDC	0	0	0
USA Space & Missel Def Cmd	0	0	0
USA TRADOC	2	6	2
8th USA - Korea	0	0	4
USSOC	0	0	1

**QUARTERLY REPORT FOR AGENCY LEVEL PROTESTS  
FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1 THROUGH MARCH 31, 2001 (2Q01)**

5. Number of protest filed:

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>28</b>
o AMC	5	8	4
o USACE	15	6	17
o DA Other	2	10	7

Please refer to listing of protests by MACOM at end of this report.

6. Number of protest sustained/granted:

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
o AMC	0	2	0
o USACE	0	0	0
o DA Other	0	1	0

7. Costs:

a. Costs and fees awarded to protester:

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$4,827</b>	<b>\$4,616</b>
o AMC	\$0	\$0	\$0
o USACE	\$0	\$0	\$0
o DA Other	\$0	\$4,827	\$4,616

Estimated preaward value of requirement or postaward contract/price:

Preaward protest (estimated value of requirement):

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$20,130,600</b>	<b>\$10,508,556</b>	<b>\$88,859,984</b>
o AMC	\$4,500,000	\$5,961,046	\$50,743,500
o USACE	\$115,130,600	\$1,742,435	\$25,695,976
o DA Other	\$500,000	\$2,805,075	\$12,420,508

Postaward protests (contract cost/price):

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$34,828,433</b>	<b>\$773,322,809</b>	<b>\$204,262,727</b>
o AMC	\$14,247,367	\$690,121,580	\$1,963,886
o USACE	\$20,577,188	\$6,205,797	\$29,446,373
o DA Other	\$2,868	\$767,995,432	\$172,852,468

Additional government personnel costs resulting from protests:

	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$64,471</b>	<b>\$44,610</b>	<b>\$58,431</b>
o AMC	\$36,698	\$33,472	\$17,785
o USACE	\$25,973	\$4,505	\$33,450
o DA Other	\$1,800	\$6,633	\$7,196

8. Lesson learned, issues, and trends:

**a. AMC:**

**(1) Varce N.V., 0061100, Denied**

Contract specialists have been reminded to continue coordination with transportation Specialists. They will provide references to the unit prices in the proposals, particularly when the price changes have been made on amendments.

Contract Specialist should request copies of the transportation worksheets so that they can be assured that the evaluation was performed in accordance with the Section M provision of the solicitation.

**(2) Dieta Products and Dev. Corp., 0090101, Withdrawn**

It is important to attempt to convince the protester to withdraw the protest if there is a reasonable argument that its protest will be ineffectual. In this case, we were able, to by informal discussion, to convince

the protester to withdraw the protest based on the unavailability of the remedy sought. The protester sought termination of contracts awarded on an urgent basis.

**b. USACE Lessons Learned:** No significant information to report.

**c. Other DA Lessons Learned:** No significant information to report.

**AGENCY LEVEL PROTEST FILED BY MAJOR COMMANDS (HCAs)**

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>AMC TOTAL</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>
ACLAL	0	0	0
ANDA	0	0	0
ARDEC	0	0	0
ARL	0	0	0
ATCOM	0	0	0
AMCOM	1	1	0
AMCOM (AATD)	0	0	0
BGAD	0	0	0
CACWOO	0	0	0
CCAD	0	0	0
CBDCOM	0	0	0
CECOM	1	3	0
DESCOM-Letterkenny	0	0	0
DPG	0	0	0
IOC	0	1	1
LEAD	0	0	0
MCALESTER	0	0	0
MICOM	0	0	0
NATICK	0	0	0
PBA	0	0	0
RMA	0	0	0
RRAD	0	0	0
SBCCOM	0	0	0
SSCOM	0	0	0
PM SANG - Saudi	0	0	0
TACOM	3	4	3
TECOM	0	0	0
USMA	0	0	0
WSMR	0	0	0
WVA	0	0	0
YPG	0	0	0

**AGENCY LEVEL PROTEST FILED BY MAJOR COMMANDS (HCAs)**

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>USACE TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>U.S. Army Engineer District</b>			
Alaska	0	0	0
Baltimore	6	1	0
Buffalo	0	0	0
Charleston	0	0	0
Chicago	0	2	0
Detroit	0	0	0
Europe	1	0	0
Fort Worth	0	0	4
Galveston	0	0	0
Headquarters	1	1	0
Humphreys Eng. Center	1	0	0
Huntington	0	0	1
Huntsville	0	0	0
Jacksonville	0	0	0
Japan	0	0	0
Kansas City	1	0	0
Little Rock	0	0	0
Los Angeles	0	0	4
Louisville	1	1	1
Memphis	1	0	0
Mobile	1	0	0
Nashville	0	0	0
New England	0	0	3
New York	1	0	1
New Orleans	0	0	1
Norfolk	1	1	1
Omaha	1	0	0
Pacific Ocean Division	0	0	0
Philadelphia	1	0	0
Pittsburgh	0	1	0
Portland	1	0	0
Rock Island	0	0	0
Sacramento	1	0	0
Savannah	2	0	1
Seattle	1	0	0
St. Louis	0	0	0
St. Paul	0	0	0
Transatlantic	1	0	0
Transatlantic (Europe)	0	0	0
Tulsa	0	0	0
Vicksburg	0	0	0

**AGENCY LEVEL PROTEST FILED BY MAJOR COMMANDS (HCAs)**

	<b>2Q01</b>	<b>1Q01</b>	<b>4Q00</b>
<b>DA OTHER TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
Defense Supply Service - Wash	1	0	0
HQ Military Traffic Mgmt Cmd	0	0	0
Mil District of Wash	0	0	0
MEDCOM	0	0	0
National Guard Bureau	0	3	0
Ofc Dep Cdr for Health Care	0	0	0
USA Contracting Sys Cmd	0	0	0
USA Force Command	0	0	0
USA Information Sys Cmd	0	0	0
USA Intel & Security Cmd	0	0	0
USA Medical Res. & Mat Cmd	0	0	0
USA Pacific	0	0	0
USA South	0	0	0
USASDC	0	0	0
USA Space & Missel Def Cmd	0	0	0
USA TRADOC	0	0	0
8th USA - Korea	1	7	7
USSOC	0	0	0