

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Former Avon Grove Citgo
525 Gap Newport Pike, Avondale, PA 19311
PADEP Facility ID #15-42312 PAUSTIF Claim #2010-0109(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:	5
Number of bids received:	2
List of firms submitting bids:	Aquaterra Technologies, Inc. MEA, Inc.

This was a Bid to Result so technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the two evaluated bids was \$338,009.10 to \$639,154.00. Due to an error on the bid cost spreadsheet, MEA, Inc. elected to withdraw their bid.

The bidder selected by the claimant was Aquaterra Technologies, Inc.:
Bid Price – \$639,154.00.
Amount deemed acceptable for USTIF funding – \$639,154.00.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the two 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.
- The RFB required that the bid response provide an O&M checklist, which some bid responses failed to provide.
- Without sufficient explanation some bids proposed further LNAPL plume delineation or collecting data where LNAPL is already reasonably known.
- Some bids lacked clarity on or did not appropriately address the pilot testing work. For example, bid(s) were viewed less favorably if they: proposed critical criteria inconsistent with existing pilot testing results or that were vague or qualitative; or proposed performing testing outside the target LNAPL zone; proposed air sparge test wells spacing or construction that would not likely fairly evaluate the feasibility of the remedial technology; or proposed bioslurping methods that seemed to emphasize rather than de-emphasize groundwater recovery.
- Some bids did not exude confidence in or offer sufficient commitment to the bid remedial technology
- Some bids did not instill confidence that the Pilot Test Off-Ramp provisions were understood and embraced.
- Bids that did not fully embrace specialty subcontractor or provided one or more "unsolicited" subcontractor quotes obtained from a third party were viewed unfavorably;
- Bids that did not provide all the cost information required in the bid cost spreadsheet form were viewed unfavorably;
- Bids that exhibited little confidence in cleanup timeframe projections were regarded less favorably;
- Bids that did not include a Professional Engineer (PE) on the project team for system design, engineering performance review and other engineering tasks were viewed less favorably;
- Bids that did not include project team resumes and provide descriptions of similar LNAPL / SSS closure projects under Chapter 245 were regarded less favorably;
- Some bids lacked enough clarity on, did not appropriately address, and/or proposed inappropriate work regarding the implementation of the proposed remedial approach, O&M, and potable water well abandonment. For example, some bids lacked: (a) details on the remedial system equipment; (b) construction details for recovery wells; and / or (c) details on frequency of operational measurements.
- Some bids inappropriately proposed sequentially operating the remedial system in zones rather than focusing on the LNAPL area target for the SSS closure;
- Some bids proposed consulting with PADEP on continuing to monitor/evaluate the on- and

off-property potable water wells after municipal water connection when this is not part of the RFB SOW already shared with PADEP.

- Some bids lacked clarity on or did not appropriately address 1) rationale or criteria for determining when remediation should cease; and 2) for discontinuing post-remediation LNAPL monitoring/recovery.
- Bids that did not discuss using PADEP's recently updated guidance on demonstrating LNAPL maximum extent practicable (MEP) recovery (e.g., using the transmissivity and physical property data collected in earlier milestones) were viewed less favorably