

# **BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM**

## **Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation**

### **Kwik Fill M-90**

**1322 S. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Clearfield, PA 16830**

**PADEP Facility ID #17-14821      PAUSTIF Claim #2015-0004(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:	<b>9</b>
Number of bids received:	<b>4</b>
List of firms submitting bids:	<b>Compliance Environmental Services Converse Consultants Letterle &amp; Associates Mountain Research, LLC</b>

This was a Bid to Result and so technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the four evaluated bids was \$107,358,65 to \$205,344.58<sup>1</sup>. Based on the numerical scoring, two of the four bids were 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 had 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 only provides 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 Letterle & Associates: Bid Price – \$180,051.40<sup>1</sup>. Amount deemed acceptable for USTIF funding – \$205,344.58<sup>1</sup>.**

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the 4 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Costs include the bidder’s total fixed price plus unit cost adders UC1 & UC3 from each bid multiplied by 30 tons, and UC2 from each bid multiplied by 500 gallons.

## GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- Bids were regarded less favorably if they did not include enough details conveying bidder's own understanding of site conditions, conceptual site model, closure approach, and approach to addressing the scope of work. Since bidders are not prequalified, bid content must be sufficient to equip the evaluation committee and Claimant to thoroughly assess the bid and the bidder.
- The proposed work scope for supplemental site characterization activities in some bids was: a) unclear on how the data would be used to finalize the design of the remedial approach; or b) did not include enough details to understand rationale for work (i.e. reasons for pilot testing, depth of soil borings, location for soil borings on a site drawing, not including unleaded gas parameters in soil sample analysis). Also, some bids unnecessarily proposed extending soil borings several feet into the saturated zone, and in others it was unclear if soil sampling would appropriately only target the unsaturated & smear zone.
- Some bids provided inadequate information and/or lacked sufficient clarity on the proposed remedial approach. For example, some bids (a) did not provide the rationale and details for the remedial system modifications; or (b) lacked the details for replacing MW-1; or (c) did not identify the extraction wells to be used; or (d) remedial component included a focus on groundwater extraction when groundwater is no longer an issue; or (e) did not provide adequate information on the frequency for screening excavated soils at off-property location; or (e) did not provide the depth interval targeted for post-excavation soil sampling at off-property excavation; or (f) the approach to post-excavation attainment sampling at off-property location was unclear.
- Some bids did not include costs for all RFB work scope elements. For example, a bid excluded some costs for quarterly monitoring all the specified monitoring wells during remedial system operation by inappropriately assuming that PADEP would approve a reduced number of wells identified by the bidder.
- Some bids did not provide the criteria that would be used to trigger discontinuing remediation; or some bids inappropriately stated that groundwater data at the POC wells would be used as criteria when the remediation focus is to address residual soil contamination.
- Some bids were not analyzing the groundwater samples for both unleaded gas and diesel fuel parameters; or lacked clarity on whether a decrease in groundwater attainment events would be petitioned with PADEP if the POC wells have been below SHS for 4 consecutive quarters; or it was unclear in some bids if off-property wells MW-7 and MW-10 would not be sampled during quarterly events.
- Some bids lacked clarity or proposed inappropriate work for the on-property demonstration of soil attainment. For example, some bidders did not depict the area where soil attainment would be demonstrated; or provided the number of samples to be collected but did not explain how this was derived; or proposed soil attainment sampling in areas where soil is not impacted; or did not clearly define the depth interval for demonstrating attainment; or did not include both unleaded gas and diesel fuel parameters in sample analyses.

- Some bids lacked sufficient clarity or providing a confusing approach to the optional soil attainment work at the off-property excavation.
- Some bids lacked sufficient clarity regarding vapor intrusion sampling. For example, providing only a vague description for the location of the sampling points, construction details for the sampling points, and sampling procedures / methods.