

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Chiquita Holdings

208 Filbert Street, Curwensville, PA 16833

PADEP Facility ID #17-31221

PAUSTIF Claim #2012-156(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:	3
Number of bids received:	2
List of firms submitting bids:	DMS Environmental Services, LLC Mountain Research, LLC

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 \$234,315.66 to \$542,770.09. Based on the numerical scoring 1 of the 2 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 reviewed and selected the acceptable bid.

The bidder selected by the claimant was DMS Environmental Services, LLC.

Bid Price – \$234,315.66.

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.
- Outlined approaches that hinged on regulatory permit approvals without providing adequate information assuring that permit approval was feasible and likely.
- Did not provide adequate details (e.g., anticipated depth of soil borings, affirming RFB excavation depth, etc.) or rationale (e.g., depth of piezometers greater than current monitoring well network, proposed locations of piezometers, depth of air sparge wells, etc.) for the proposed work;
- Included work encroaching on or within PennDOT rights-of-way but did not address obtaining a HOP from PennDOT;
- Proposed injecting ODP below the maximum depth of site monitoring wells without adequate explanation;
- Proposed more costly in-situ remedial approaches without sufficient discussion presenting rationale for in-situ approach and that did not provide specific conditions for discontinuing remedial system operations for initiating groundwater attainment demonstration;
- Did not explain how the facility sign would be protected during excavation;
- Did not explicitly acknowledge claimant's specific schedule requirements / penalties and other requirements (e.g., parking spaces, ingress and egress, etc.);
- Described soil attainment sampling methods that contradicted the RFB and soil contamination lateral and vertical extent information without adequate explanation; and / or
- Proposed backfill / compaction methods that differed from the RFB specifications without adequate explanation.