

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Former Weiser's Service

29128 PA Route 66, Lucinda, PA 16235

PADEP Facility ID #16-34573

PAUSTIF Claim #2015-0142(W)

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:	8
Number of bids received:	2
List of firms submitting bids:	CORE Environmental Services, 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 two evaluated bids was \$578,389.75 to \$694,350.62. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the two 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 either of the consulting firms that had a technical score that allowed the bid to advance to cost scoring to complete the scope of work defined in the RFB; however, PAUSTIF will only provide funding up to the fixed-price cost of the bid deemed reasonable and necessary for USTIF funding 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 – \$578,389.75.

The attached sheet lists 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

- Bids were regarded less favorably if they did not include enough details conveying bidder's own understanding of site conditions, conceptual site model, 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.
- Some bids lacked enough clarity on, and/ or did not appropriately address, the proposed work during pilot testing. For example, some bids: (a) did not provide enough details to understand approach at performing the reinfiltration testing; (b) clarity/ rationale for their approach at reinfiltrating treated groundwater at untested areas outside the limits of the soil excavation; (c) no testing of the proposed methods for iron filtration; (d) rationale for evaluating how/ why iron sequestration would be unnecessary; and/or (e) proposed critical criteria inconsistent with existing pilot testing results or that were not consistent with results likely to be achieved from proposed pilot testing methods.
- Bids that did not give consideration to using other available ASTM LNAPL transmissivity methods were regarded less favorably.
- Bids that exhibited little confidence in cleanup timeframe projections, and proposed remedial approach were regarded less favorably.
- Some bids were proposing to locate the remedial treatment enclosure in a location inconsistent with the RFB and Claimant's request.
- Some bids lacked enough clarity on, and/or did not appropriately address proposed work regarding the implementation of the proposed remedial approach. For example, some bids: (a) were missing locations of the proposed reinfiltration wells; (b) missing spare/ extra reinfiltration well if active reinfiltration well(s) would become unusable; (c) lacked details on how the remedial system would restart when water levels in the reinfiltration wells would decrease; (d) were proposing to inappropriately extend the screen for the remediation wells up into the former soil excavation; (e) details on startup procedures; and/or (f) proposed injection interval was inconsistent with the proposed injection well screened interval.
- The RFB required that the bid response provide an O&M checklist, which some bid responses failed to provide.
- Some bids were missing drawing(s) that were referenced in the bid response.