

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Remediation To Closure
Superior Petroleum Company – Fueland #203
101 Mile Lock Lane
Brackenridge, Pennsylvania 15014
PADEP Facility ID #02-13744; USTIF Claim #2009-0125(F)

PAUSTIF understands and appreciates the effort necessary to prepare a well-conceived response to a bid solicitation. As a courtesy, the following summary information is being provided to the bidders who submitted bids in response to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 6
Number of bids received: 3

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): DMS Environmental Services, LLC
EnviroTrac Environmental Services
Letterle & Associates, LLC

This was a bid to result scope of work (SOW) bid; therefore, the bidders technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in base bid cost associated with the three bids received was \$447,480.28 to \$505,430.00. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the three bids was determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and was deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for PAUSTIF funding. The claimant has the option to select any of the consulting firms who properly submitted a bid to complete the scope of work defined in the RFB; however, PAUSTIF will only provide funding up to the fixed-price cost of the highest bid deemed acceptable by the bid review committee. In this case, the claimant selected the bid deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee.

The bidder selected by the claimant was Letterle & Associates, LLC with a base bid of \$488,038.69.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the three bids received for this solicitation. These comments are intended to provide general information that may assist in preparing bids in response to future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- Bids that did not include enough “original” (i.e., not copied verbatim from the RFB) language conveying bidder’s thought such that the understanding of site conditions, conceptual site model, closure approach, and approach to addressing the scope of work could be evaluated were regarded less favorably. Since bidders are not prequalified, the content of the bid response must equip the evaluation committee and Claimant to make a thorough and complete review of the bid and bidder.
- Bids were less favorably received if their scope of work for supplemental site characterization activities was: a) unclear on how the data would be used to finalize the design of the remedial approach; b) vague on criteria for expanding additional soil delineation/characterization work; or c) investigated other site areas (i.e. kerosene UST or former waste oil UST areas) that are not the subject of the cleanup because the PADEP-approved site characterization work did not find these areas to be of concern.
- Some bids provided inadequate information and/or lacked sufficient clarity for the proposed pilot testing work. For example, some bids did not provide any critical criteria to evaluate the outcome of the pilot test, or provided a concerning overly narrow range for critical criteria; or, did not provide the pilot testing locations on a site drawing; or, did not address that the work would be included in a Pilot Test Report; or did not discuss how the TDS, metals, and other data would be used in evaluating/modifying the remedial system to address sediment and iron fouling.
- Some bids provided inadequate information and/or lacked sufficient clarity on the proposed remedial system. For example, some bids (a) did not adequately assess and address sediment and iron fouling; or (b) did not include an assessment of the off-gas treatment options; or (c) did not sufficiently explain the remedial design / components or were missing construction details for the remedial system; (d) did not include the justification and management of wastes from the system; or (e) did not provide an example O&M form; or (f) provided vague language regarding the criteria for VGAC change outs; or (g) describe how any unforeseen system shutdowns would be addressed.
- Some bids identified POC wells that were inconsistent with the PADEP-approved RAP and RFB, or bids lack clarity on whether a decrease in GW attainment events would be petitioned with PADEP if the POC wells have been below SHS for 4 consecutive quarters.
- Some bids lacked sufficient clarity regarding demonstration of soil attainment. For example, the approximate area for demonstrating soil attainment may not have been adequately identified or the area was missing from the bidders drawings; or, the soil attainment sampling depth interval proposed in some bids did not appear to include the depth interval of known unsaturated soil impacts.