Engine Water Wash
Industry Questions and USAF Reponses

As of 14 April 2026

1. Are there any limitations on the form/function of the Proposed Response to the Government?

   USAF Response: Proposals must comply with the requirements set forth in accordance with FAR 52.212-1 and the 52.212-2 Addendum attachment posted with the original solicitation. The solicitation was amended to specify that font size shall not be smaller than 12-point font. Margins shall be 1 inch on all sides. Spacing may either be single or double-spaced.

   We encourage offerors to submit their proposals in the format that best demonstrates their approach to meeting the requirements, while ensuring strict adherence to the instructions detailed in the Addendum attachment.

2. Volume 1. Page limit is stated as 20 pages. Is this for all Volume I or just subfactor 1?

   USAF Response: The 20-page limit is for all of Volume I.

3. **Access to Technical Data and Engine-Specific Procedures**
   The PWS requires the contractor to perform washes across various Mission Design Series (MDS). Currently, the solicitation does not provide the specific Air Force Technical Orders (TOs) or procedures required for each engine type.
   - **The Risk:** Without access to these Government-controlled procedures during the proposal phase, non-incumbents must estimate labor and equipment based on commercial standards, which may deviate from specific Air Force requirements.
   - **Inquiry:** If the Government is unable to provide these TOs as Government Furnished Information (GFI) during the solicitation phase, does the Government consider this an unfair advantage to the current contractor? Would the US government want to provide an equal amount of information to maximize its ability to choose the best value and this information provided after contract award would take 60-90 days to promulgate to the 33 sites with approved procedures and tooling? This would protect both parties while the contractor works to integrate official Air Force procedures at all 33 sites.

USAF Response:

Due to the distribution statements on each Technical Order, the government cannot publicly release the TO's on this solicitation. The Government does not consider access to the TOs an unfair advantage to the current contractor because access to the TO's is not necessary to perform this requirement. Based on this, the PWS has been amended to remove the reference to the TO's.

4. **Observations on the Mobilization Timeline**

The current requirement to support two locations per region within 14 days, and 33 sites within 30 days from contract award, is a significant undertaking. For a new partner, finalizing local staffing and securing base access (including Anti-Terrorism training per PWS 1.9.5) typically exceeds this window.

• **The Risk**: Without access to these Government-controlled procedures during the proposal phase, non-incumbents must estimate labor and specialized equipment based on commercial standards.

• **Suggested Approach**: To ensure the Air Force does not experience service gaps, would the Government consider a 90-day mobilization period or a phased rollout? This would ensure that all sites are stood up with 100% compliance and safety.

USAF Response: The Government concurs with the suggested phased rollout. After further review, but still keeping in mind government need for this engine wash effort, the mobilization requirement will be amended to the following schedule:

- Within 30 days of award: The contractor shall support six (6) locations per region.
- Within 60 days of award: The contractor shall support 100% of all regions on contract

5. **Proposal-Stage Documentation (HAZMAT)**

The requirement for site-specific HAZMAT plans for 33 locations by the April 10 deadline is a massive hurdle for any firm not currently on-site. These plans require granular knowledge of local facility drainage and storage and Base Environmental familiarity plus their approval and local base practices.

• **Suggested Approach**: To ensure the Government receives the most accurate and compliant safety documentation, would you consider moving these site-specific plans to a post-award deliverable (CDRL)? A 90-day post-award deadline would allow the winning contractor to perform the necessary site visits/coordination to ensure environmental compliance with the base. Otherwise,

each base Is going to receive multiple business enquiries to complete a plan to your requirement which is pass / fail for this competition.

USAF Response: After review, the solicitation still requires a preliminary HAZMAT plan for the proposal-stage as this is part of the evaluation criteria. The awardee will then submit CDRL A007 as a final deliverable within 7 days of contract award. This will allow time for the government to review before engine washes begin to commence. The solicitation preliminary plan and the final CDRL deliverable requires a single, overarching HAZMAT plan that can be implemented at all specified locations, not 33 unique, site-specific plans. Individual site visits are not necessary.

6. **Pricing Unit, Per Aircraft or Per Engine?**
   The Pricing Matrix (Attachment 6) designates each SLIN unit as "Each." Please confirm whether "Each" represents one complete aircraft wash event (all engines on the aircraft) or one individual engine wash. For example, does a single KC-135 wash event, which involves four engines, generate one (1) invoicing unit or four (4) invoicing units?
   Reference: Attachment 6, Pricing Matrix; PWS §1.3.3.3

   USAF Response: The unit of pricing, "Each," as designated in the Pricing Matrix (Attachment 6), represents a single, individual engine wash. The quantities listed for each SLIN are the total estimated number of individual engine washes for that engine type, within that region, for that year. The Year 1 estimated quantity of 76 for the F108-CF-100/200 engine in the West Region represents an estimated 76 individual engine washes. For example, if four (4) engines were washed on one (1) KC-135, the invoice would show a total quantity of four (4) washes.

7. **Pricing Matrix CLIN Structure, Regional Aggregation vs. Individual Base**
   The Pricing Matrix (Attachment 6) and Attachment 2 appear to aggregate some CLINs by region rather than by individual installation. Please confirm: (a) whether CLINs such as X005AA (KC-135, Northeast) represent aggregate wash requirements across multiple installations; and (b) whether pricing should reflect regional aggregated rates or installation-specific rates, and if the latter, whether installation-specific breakouts are required in the proposal.
   Reference: Attachment 2; Attachment 6 Pricing Matrix; PWS §1.0

   USAF Response: Each CLIN represents the aggregate wash requirements for that specific engine type across all installations within the designated region. For

example, CLIN X005AA represents the entirety of KC-135 washes within the Northeast region. Pricing shall be submitted as a single, regionally aggregated price for each CLIN. Offerors shall follow the structure provided in Attachment 6, Pricing Matrix, as this will be the final CLIN structure on the awarded contract. Installation-specific price breakouts are not requested.

8. **Historical Wash Quantities by Installation**
   Can the Government provide actual engine wash quantities by installation for the previous three fiscal years, including the number of scheduled washes that were missed or deferred due to maintenance or operational issues? This data would allow offerors to optimize the estimated quantities in Attachment 2 and price volume and schedule risk more accurately.
   Reference: Attachment 2; PWS §1.0

   USAF Response: The estimated quantities provided in Attachment 2, Estimated Wash Requirements, are derived from historical workload data and represent the most accurate information available for this solicitation. These estimates were used as the basis for the Attachment 6 Pricing Matrix. As for missed or deferred scheduled washes; the Government does not actively track or maintain historical data. Therefore, no additional data will be provided. Offerors must base their proposals on the estimated quantities furnished in the solicitation documents.

9. **Planned Wash Interval and Duty Cycle by Engine Type**
   What is the planned wash interval or duty cycle for each aircraft and engine type under this contract, specifically KC-135/F108, KC-46/F139, B-52/TF33-P-103, C-5M/F138, and E-3/TF33-P-100A? Understanding the scheduled frequency by engine type is required to optimize the quantities in Attachment 2 and develop an accurate operational schedule.
   Reference: Attachment 2; PWS §1.4

   USAF Response: Wash Intervals for each engine (and aircraft type) are provided below:
   F108-CF-100/201(KC-35R/T): Every 4 years
   TF33- P-100A (E-3B/G): Every 2 Years
   TF33-P-103 (B-52H): Every 1,000 cycles
   F138-GE-100 (C-5M): Every 1,000 cycles
   F139-PW-100 (KC-46A): Every 12 Months

10. **Repeat Wash Cycles, Included in FFP Unit Price or Separately Compensable?**
PWS §1.3.3.1 requires the contractor to repeat the wash cycle for any engine where effluent contamination exceeds 500 PPM total solids. Please confirm whether repeat wash cycles driven by high contamination are included within the firm-fixed-price unit price, or whether the contractor may request additional compensation for extended wash events caused by engine contamination conditions beyond the contractor's control.
Reference: PWS §1.3.3.1; PWS §1.4

USAF Response: The firm-fixed-price (FFP) for each wash event is inclusive of all work required to meet the performance standards outlined in the PWS. A wash event is considered complete only when the effluent contamination level is confirmed to be below 500 PPM. Therefore, any repeat wash cycles necessary to achieve this standard are considered part of the single FFP unit price. No additional compensation will be authorized for these required cycles.

11. **Effluent PPM Verification, Government QA Sampling or Contractor Testing?**
Table 2-1, SS-5 references 100% inspection of wash event logs (CDRL A004) as the method of surveillance for the less than 500 PPM requirement. Please confirm whether the PPM reading recorded in the wash event log is based on: (a) contractor-conducted field sampling at the time of the wash event; (b) independent Government QA sampling; or (c) another method. Please also clarify who is responsible for supplying the PPM field testing equipment.
Reference: PWS §1.3.3.1; Table 2-1, SS-5; CDRL A004

USAF Response: The contractor shall conduct and record the PPM reading using their own field-testing equipment after each wash event. The responsibility to furnish all tools and equipment, including the TDS testing device, rests with the contractor. The USG will not be providing Government Furnished Property for this effort. The Government's surveillance will be performed via review of the contractor's submitted wash logs by the Contracting Officer Representative (COR).

12. **Historical Engine Contamination Data (PPM)**
Does the Government have historical effluent PPM data for engines at the contract locations? Specifically: (a) what percentage of wash events historically required repeat cycles due to contamination exceeding 500 PPM; and (b) is this data available by location and/or engine type? If available, we respectfully request it be provided as a solicitation amendment.

Reference: PWS §1.3.3.1

USAF Response: The Government does not maintain historical effluent PPM data or statistics on the percentage of repeat wash cycles.

13. Government vs. Contractor Task Division During Wash Events

Please clarify the division of responsibilities between Government and contractor personnel for each of the following tasks during a wash event: (a) engine preparation and configuration prior to wash; (b) nozzle and probe installation; (c) any access panel opening required to access the engine core; (d) engine de-preparation and restoration following wash; and (e) AFTO Form 781 documentation and sign-off. Understanding the precise boundary of contractor-performed work is essential to staffing, scheduling, and pricing each event.

Reference: PWS §1.1.1.1; PWS §1.3.2.2

USAF Response: *The following table outlines the party responsible for each task during a wash event:*

Task	Responsible Party	Notes
(a) Engine Preparation and Configuration	Government	Government personnel shall prepare the engine prior to the contractor's arrival.
(b) Nozzle and Probe Installation	Contractor	The contractor shall install all necessary nozzles and probes using their own furnished equipment.
(c) Access Panel Opening	Government	Government personnel shall open any access panels required to perform the wash.
(d) Engine De-preparation and Restoration	Government	After the contractor has removed their equipment, Government personnel shall de-prepare and restore the engine to its original configuration.
(e) AFTO Form 781 Documentation	Government	All official aircraft documentation, including AFTO Form 781 entries, shall be handled exclusively by Government personnel.

14. **Access Panel Requirements Prior to Probe Installation**
PWS §1.3.2.2 requires the contractor to perform all necessary functions for installing and operating the engine wash system, including stopping fan rotation prior to probe installation. Please confirm whether any engine access panels must be opened prior to probe installation for any of the five engine types under this contract, and if so, whether opening those panels is the responsibility of the contractor or Government personnel.
Reference: PWS §1.3.2.2; PWS §1.1.1.1

USAF Response: The Government shall be responsible for opening and accessing engine panels. The Contractor shall be responsible for installing and removing contractor supplied equipment.

15. **Wash Location, Flight Line, Wash Bay, or Hangar?**
Are engine washes under this contract typically performed on the open flight line, in dedicated wash bays, or inside maintenance hangars at each installation? If this varies by installation, please identify which installations have wash bays or hangar capability and which require open flight line operations, as this affects effluent capture equipment design and environmental compliance planning.
Reference: PWS §1.1.1.2; PWS §1.6.1

USAF Response: The standard and primary location for all engine wash events is on the open flight line, with the engine on wing. While some installations may have wash bays or hangars, offerors should design their procedures, equipment, and environmental plans based on the operational constraints of the flight line, as this will be the required location in the vast majority of cases. The Government reserves the right to direct the specific location of the wash at any given time. The contractor's effluent capture system and overall process must be effective regardless of the location.

16. **Effluent Capture, Wastewater Disposal, and HAZMAT Requirements by Installation**
PWS §1.1.1.2 and §1.6.1.2 require the contractor to capture and dispose of all effluents in accordance with Federal, State, and local environmental regulations. Please provide, or direct offerors to, installation-specific effluent capture, wastewater disposal, and HAZMAT requirements for each of the 33 performance locations. Specifically: (a) does each installation have a designated disposal point or approved disposal contractor; (b) are there installation-specific environmental

permits or RCRA requirements the contractor must comply with; and (c) will the Government provide any environmental coordination support or must the contractor independently establish disposal arrangements at each base?
Reference: PWS §1.1.1.2; PWS §1.6.1.2; PWS §1.6.2; CDRL A007

USAF Response: The PWS requires the contractor to manage all aspects of effluent disposal. This disposal must occur at a contractor-arranged, off-site facility. It is solely the contractor's responsibility to ensure their disposal methods comply with all Federal, State, and local regulations for each performance location. The Government will not provide disposal sites or coordination support.

17. **Potable Water Availability and Filling Station Locations at Each Installation**
Will each installation provide access to potable water at a minimum flow rate of 10 gallons per minute for use by the contractor during wash operations? If so, when was the last time this flow rate was verified at each location? Additionally, given the requirement to commence wash operations within 30 calendar days of contract award, will the Government provide the specific potable water filling station locations at each installation prior to contract award so that the contractor can plan initial logistics and equipment staging without delay?
Reference: PWS §1.1.2.1; PWS §3.0; PWS §1.4

USAF Response: The responsibility for providing all necessary resources rests with the contractor as the installations will not provide potable water. The Government does not maintain verification data for flow rates. A list of on-base water sources will not be provided as the contractor is responsible for providing potable water.

18. **Installation Access, Escort Requirements and AT/FP Restrictions**
Are there any installations on the contract performance list where contractor personnel would be required to operate under escort, or where anti-terrorism/force protection restrictions would prevent unescorted contractor access to the flight line? If so, please identify the affected installations and describe the access coordination process.
Reference: PWS §1.7; PWS §1.3.2.1; DFARS 252.204-7004

USAF Response: Contractor personnel will need to be escorted on each base facility at all times by the base POC. Every time a wash event occurs, the contractor will notify the base POC (whose information will be provided by the Program Manager), who will then escort the contractor personnel to the appropriate location.

19. **Wash Scheduling Coordination with Installation Maintenance Personnel**
Will the contractor have the opportunity to coordinate wash scheduling directly with installation maintenance personnel to group aircraft washes for operational efficiency? If so, please describe the scheduling coordination process, specifically whether the contractor proposes a schedule for Government approval, or whether the Government issues a fixed schedule that the contractor must accommodate.
Reference: PWS §1.3.1; PWS §1.3.2; PWS §1.8.2

USAF Response: The contractor will only schedule wash events through the designated Engine Wash Program Manager. The PM serves as the single point of contact for coordinating with base-level schedulers. The Government will provide the wash requirements, and the contractor will coordinate with the PM to fulfill them. Direct communication with base maintenance units for scheduling is not permitted.

20. **Wash Procedure Approval Sequence and Two-Week Regional Standup Requirement**
PWS §1.1.2.2 requires the contractor to submit wash procedures for Government review and concurrence before commencing operations, and those procedures must reference the applicable military Technical Order for each engine type. PWS §1.1.2.1 requires the contractor to be ready to commence steady state wash within 30 calendar days of award. Section L additionally requires the contractor to demonstrate the ability to support all five regions within two weeks of contract award, with at least two simultaneous locations per region. Since wash operations cannot commence until procedures are approved by the Government, and the applicable Technical Orders have not been provided to offerors, please clarify: (a) will the Government provide the applicable Technical Order wash procedures for each engine type prior to contract award so that compliant contractor procedures can be submitted immediately upon award; (b) what is the Government's expected review and concurrence timeline for submitted procedures, and does the 30-day steady state clock begin at contract award or upon Government concurrence; and (c) if procedures are approved on a rolling basis by engine type or region, how does the Government intend to implement a partial approval to satisfy the two-week, two-location-per-region requirement in Section L before all procedures are fully approved?
Reference: PWS §1.1.2.1; PWS §1.1.2.2; CDRL A001; Section L, Volume I, Subfactor 1

USAF Response: (a) The TOs are not necessary to perform this requirement as all needed information is provided in the PWS. This solicitation amendment includes an updated PWS which removes the following statement from 1.1.2.2, *"These engine wash procedures shall incorporate/reference military engine wash cycle Technical Order (TO) procedures."*
(b) The Contractor will submit wash procedures within 7 calendar days of award and the Government will review and provide approval within 30 calendar days of award. CDRL A001 has been amended to specify this.
(c) The Section L Addendum has been amended to reflect supporting six (6) locations per region within 30 days and 100% of all regions within 60 days.

21. **Airworthiness Authority for Contractor Wash Procedures**
Please identify: (a) which airworthiness authority will review and approve contractor wash procedures submitted under CDRL A001; and (b) the expected Government review and approval timeline so that the 30-day steady state deadline in PWS §1.1.2.1 can be met.
Reference: PWS §1.1.2.1; PWS §1.1.2.2; CDRL A001

USAF Response: (a) CDRL A001 will be reviewed by Engineering and approved by a Contracting Officer via a PCOL.
(b) The Government will review and provide approval within 30 calendar days of award of the wash procedures (CDRL A001).

22. **Process Validation at Contract Award, Live Aircraft or Documentation Only?**
CDRL A001 requires delivery of engine wash procedures within 30 calendar days of award. Does this requirement include performing live validation washes on Government aircraft, or is it limited to procedural documentation and Government review? If live validation is required within 30 days, please identify the installation(s) where validation will occur.
Reference: PWS §1.1.2.1; CDRL A001; PWS §1.3.2.1

USAF Response: No, a separate, live validation or demonstration wash is not required as part of the CDRL A001 approval process. The CDRL requirement is for the submittal and approval of procedural documentation only. There will be a Government POC at each regional location for each wash to provide support and ensure compliance with the approved procedures.

23. Test Cell Wash Events at Tinker AFB, Engine Type and Depot Access

Attachment 2 identifies 30 test cell wash events at Tinker AFB (CLIN X002AF: 20 Base Year, 20 OY1, 10 OY2, zero OY3-OY4) but does not specify the engine type. Please provide: (a) the engine type(s) for the Tinker AFB test cell wash events; (b) whether OC-ALC depot-level access credentialing is required beyond standard base access; and (c) whether the Government intends X002AF test cell events to be priced at a separate CLIN rate given the potentially different equipment and access requirements.

Reference: Attachment 2, Tinker AFB test cell row; PWS §1.4; PWS §1.7.3

USAF Response: (a) The F108-CF-100/201 engine is the only engine that will be used for test cell washes.
(b) Specialized depot-level credentialing is not required for this task. The process will be the same as for flight line access; the contractor will coordinate with the designated base Point of Contact (POC) to be escorted to and from the test cell work site.
(c) CLIN X002AF is the dedicated CLIN test cell washes. Offerors must provide a separate unit price for this CLIN that reflects any unique costs associated with test cell operations, equipment, or access, distinct from the on-wing regional washes.

24. FAR Part 13 SAP Authority, Applicable Ceiling ($9M or $15M)

The Section M addendum states the Government will use FAR Part 13 Simplified Acquisition Procedures. FAR 13.500 establishes two ceiling thresholds for commercial services: $9M under FAR 13.500(a), or $15M under FAR 13.500(c) per 41 U.S.C. §1903, which requires a determination by the head of the agency. These thresholds are measured against total contract value including all option years. Please confirm: (a) which ceiling authority applies to this acquisition; and (b) if FAR 13.500(c) applies, confirm that the required head-of-agency determination has been made and is documented in the acquisition file.

Reference: FAR 13.500(a) and (c); 41 U.S.C. §1903; Section M Addendum

USAF Response: FAR Part 13 Simplified Acquisition Procedures was determined appropriate for this acquisition based on FAR 13.500(a).

The following statement refers to questions 25-28. *"We would greatly appreciate guidance from the Civil Engineer/Environmental Office on the approval process required to conduct these operations on base. Specifically, we would like to better understand the following:"*

25. The anticipated timeline and steps required to obtain approval to perform on-wing engine wash services at Travis AFB.

    USAF Response: The approval process for Travis AFB is identical to the process for all other installations specified in this contract. There are no additional or unique steps. The contractor must follow the standard procedure submittal and approval process outlined in the PWS and coordinate the service start date with the Program Manager per the overall contract mobilization schedule.

26. **The process for review and approval of our total effluent capture equipment and containment system for flight line use.**

    USAF Response: The Government will evaluate the contractor's proposed effluent capture system during the technical proposal evaluation. The technical team will assess the proposed system's compliance against all PWS requirements, with PWS §1.3.5.2 being the minimum standard. A detailed description of the system must be included in the offeror's proposal.

27. Whether it would be possible to utilize the installation's existing wastewater disposal process or another approved method for disposing of the captured engine wash effluent.

    USAF Response: Per 1.1.1.2 and 1.6.1.2 of the PWS, the contractor is required to capture and dispose of all effluent. The contractor is independently responsible for all disposal arrangements. Effluent shall not be disposed of on any base installation.

28. **Any documentation, environmental review, or testing data that may be required to support this request.**

    USAF Response: All documentation and requirements for environmental review or testing data are fully detailed within the solicitation. No supplemental information will be provided. Offerors should refer to the PWS and its associated attachments for all pertinent details.

29. **SF1449**

    When attempting to extract the SF1449 and Supplies or Services and Prices and Costs from the Solicitation Document. That document is locked and cannot be

separated from the Solicitation document. Yet we are required to submit SF1449 and unit prices for all CLINs. How would the government want to address this conflict?

USAF Response: Due to a system limitation, our solicitation documents are locked for direct editing. To complete the SF-1449, please first download the document from SAM.gov. Then, use your computer's 'Print to PDF' function to create a new, fillable version of the file. This new PDF can then be edited to add text and the required signatures. The USG will input the awardee's fill-ins into the CON-IT contract writing system.

30. Is glycol an acceptable additive for use during cold weather washes? Reference: "1.6.1.1 The Contractor shall not use any chemicals or additives, except for isopropyl alcohol for purposes of cold temperature operations."

USAF Response: No, the use of glycol is not authorized. As stated in PWS 1.6.1.1, the only chemical additive permitted for cold temperature operations is isopropyl alcohol. The use of any other additive, including glycol, is prohibited.

31. Due to high-wing aircraft configurations, a stand or ladder is required to access the engine. Will equipment be provided for Contractor to access the engine?

USAF Response: In accordance with the PWS, the contractor is required to provide a complete, self-sufficient solution. This includes furnishing all tools, materials, and equipment necessary for contract performance. Therefore, the contractor is responsible for providing its own access equipment, such as stands or ladders, for high-wing aircraft. The Government will not provide this equipment.

32. Volume I, Subfactor 1 – Schedule and Wash Effectiveness (PWS 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.2.1, 1.3.1.1, 1.4) – requirement to support all five regions within two weeks of award.

Our process uses specialized engine mount hardware that requires prior Air Force engineering/safety coordination and technical publication updates for safe operations. The two-week timeline is insufficient for this coordination and publication updates.

Can the Government clarify whether any flexibility exists in the two-week post-award timeline, or provide guidance on addressing the required coordination?

USAF Response: As stated above in Question 4, the Government concurs with a phased rollout. The mobilization requirement will be amended to the following schedule:

- Within 30 days of award: The contractor shall support six (6) locations per region.
- Within 60 days of award: The contractor shall support 100% of all regions on contract

This solicitation amendment includes an updated PWS formally changing this requirement.

33. The Pricing Matrix includes a line item for a 6-month extension option, however that same option does not appear to be reflected in the SF1449. I want to make sure we price and complete both documents consistently and in accordance with the Government's intent. Could you please clarify whether the 6-month extension option should be included in the SF1449, or whether it is captured exclusively through the Pricing Matrix? I want to ensure our submission is complete and responsive.

USAF Response: The 6-month extension clause will not be included as a CLIN on the SF1449 as it is a non-priced option clause which allows for an extension of services for up to six months. The 6-month extension clause is captured exclusively through the Pricing Matrix and is solely for determining the Total Evaluated Price (TEP). For this effort, the contract award price on the SF1449 and the evaluated price on the Pricing Matrix will not match for this reason. For determining the TEP, the 6-month extension should be based on ½ of the final CLIN year (4001-4005). The quantities in pricing matrix for the 6-month extension are ½ of year 4 to account for this. The Pricing Matrix has been updated to add a Total Evaluated Price grand total at the bottom to more clearly show the TEP value. Additionally, Section M in the L&M Addendum attachment has been updated to more clearly describe the TEP criteria for evaluation.

34. Do you want the pricing in the price matrix to include detergent?
USAF Response: As the contract will be Firm-Fixed Price (FFP), the proposal pricing should include the entirety of the costs needed to complete the requirement.

35. The Q&A responses state that glycol additives are prohibited. Will a proposal incorporating a glycol additive for cold weather washes be immediately disqualified

without further review, or will the government evaluate it on its merits?

USAF Response: At this time, the Technical Orders only state alcohol as an approved additive for use. Please be aware that there is nothing that precludes your company from submitting a proposal if you would like the technical team to evaluate your alternative method. However, we cannot award a contract to a proposal found to be technically unacceptable.

36. Paragraph 1.1.2.1 requires steady state washes within 30 days of award - yet Paragraph 1.2.1 only requires being able to support 3 locations simultaneously within 30 days of award. If only 3 simultaneous locations are required - how is that considered 'steady state'?

USAF Response: 1.1.2.1 of the PWS has been updated to account for this discrepancy.

37. Reference PWS Paragraph 1.1.1.5. Is the Government now allowing spray probes/nozzles to be placed in front of the engine nacelle? If so - how is that considered no FOD?

USAF Response: The restrictive language in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) was intentionally removed to allow offerors to propose their own unique technical solutions. In accordance with the Section L&M Addendum: Subfactor 3 – Equipment Procedures, it is the vendor's responsibility to describe how their solution is "Foreign Object Damage (FOD) free, to include design and procedures showing how the equipment is mounted using damage free mounting hardware". The Government's technical team will evaluate each proposed solution strictly in accordance with the evaluation criteria.