

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed-Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Honey Bear Mini Mart

200 McKean Street

Kittanning, PA 16201

PADEP Facility ID #03-07315 PAUSTIF Claim #2002-0197(I)

The 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.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting:	10
Number of bids received:	5
List of firms submitting bids:	Compliance Management International CORE Environmental Services, Inc. Insite Group, Inc. Letterle & Associates, Inc. Mountain Research, LLC

This was a Bid to Result and so technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the 5 evaluated bids was \$389,776.39 to \$568,277.82. Based on the numerical scoring, 1 of the 5 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 elected to follow the committee’s recommendation.

The bidder selected by the Claimant was Mountain Research, LLC: Bid Price—\$389,776.39.

Below are some general comments regarding the evaluation of the bids that were received for this solicitation. These comments are intended to provide information regarding the bids that were received for this solicitation and to assist you in preparing bids for future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- As clearly specified in the RFB, bid responses require clear descriptions, specific details, and original language of how the proposed work scope will be completed for each milestone. Milestone descriptions simply referencing that the work will be performed according to the RFB or RAP do not provide sufficient information to complete an adequate technical evaluation and such bid responses typically score poorly in the technical review.
- Although most bid responses proposed a reasonable scope of supplemental site characterization activities, certain aspects of the technical approach proposed in some bid responses for implementing these activities were technically inappropriate or questionable apparently due to an insufficient understanding of known site conditions.
- Under the milestone for pilot testing of the bidder's proposed remedial technology, some bids left significant available funding under this milestone that could have been used to expand the scope of proposed pilot testing activities for obtaining additional information to allow a more thorough assessment of the viability of the proposed remedial technology.
- A thorough understanding of site environmental conditions and historical investigations / remedial pilot testing activities is also critical for allowing the bidder to provide a reasonable estimate of the number of quarters expected to achieve the selected site cleanup objectives. For the Honey Bear Mini Mart bid solicitation, most of the bid responses provided a reasonable projection for achieving the SHS through operation of the proposed remedial approach, although the estimated timeframe for site cleanup in some responses appeared to be unreasonably brief / overly optimistic based on site conditions.
- To avoid point deductions during the technical review process, bid responses should ensure that all RFB-required elements are adequately addressed. For example, the RFB for the Honey Bear Mini Mart site required maintaining a minimum 85% remediation system uptime per quarter and requested that bids explicitly state an understanding of the possible consequences of premature remedial system deactivation. Some bid responses failed to address, or inadequately addressed these RFB requirements.