

# **BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM**

## **Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation**

### **Cooks Country Store**

**21042 Cooks Road, Robertsdale, PA 16674**

**PADEP Facility ID #31-07856**

**PAUSTIF Claim #2014-0163(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>8</b>
Number of bids received:	<b>5</b>
List of firms submitting bids:	<b>CORE Environmental Services, Inc. DMS Environmental Services, LLC Letterle &amp; Associates Mountain Research, LLC P. Joseph Lehman, Inc.</b>

This was a Bid to Result and so technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the five evaluated bids was \$360,798.28 to \$538,784.05<sup>1</sup>. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the five 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 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 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 – \$360,798.28.**

**Amount deemed acceptable for USTIF funding – \$360,798.28.**

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Costs include the bidder’s total fixed price plus unit cost adders UC1 & UC3 from each bid multiplied by 765 tons, and UC2 from each bid multiplied by 7500 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. depth of soil borings, construction details for wells, location for soil borings on a site drawing).
- Some bids provided inadequate information and/or lacked sufficient clarity for the proposed pilot testing work. For example, some bids provided inadequate explanation / rationale for critical criteria (i.e. groundwater removal rates far exceeding previous pilot testing data); or, explanation for testing focused on the permanently saturated zone and groundwater recovery; or did not explain how pilot testing of a vertical well would be used in the design of horizontal extraction wells; or, did not address that the work would be included in a Pilot Test Report; or was vague on the evaluation/modifications of the remedial system to address sediment and iron fouling; or not adequately providing basis for pilot test focused on a VEGE design.
- Some bids provided inadequate information and/or lacked sufficient clarity on the proposed remedial approach. For example, some bids (a) lacked explanation for lower assumed excavated volume of soils as basis for the scope of work; or (b) did not provide adequate information on the frequency for screening excavated soils, or the screening threshold was not being applied to excavated soils but soil boring data; or (c) did not provide the depth interval targeted for biased post-excavation soil sampling, or explanation for proposing collecting post-excavation soil samples below the zone of permanent saturation; or (d) did not adequately address methods to prevent short circuiting between extraction wells and backfilled excavation; or (e) proposed installing/operating an extraction well within the "clean" footprint of the excavation backfill without adequate explanation; or (f) provided conflicting information on the proposed depth of the recovery wells; or (g) did not adequately assess and address sediment and iron fouling; or (h) did not address if the remedial system would be pre-assembled and tested prior to site deployment; or (i) system design does not include the treatment of extracted vapors; or (j) remediation wells proposed to target permanent saturated zone without adequate explanation of rationale; or (k) did not provide a PI&D of the remedial system.
- Some bids lacked clarity on whether a decrease in GW attainment events would be petitioned with PADEP if the POC wells have been below SHS for 4 consecutive quarters.
- Some bids lacked sufficient clarity regarding demonstration of soil attainment. For example, the approximate area for demonstrating soil attainment does not address the entire area of known impacts left in-place to be remediated via the in-situ remedial system; or information in bid suggests unnecessarily sampling within the footprint of the

backfilled soil excavation; or confusion in regards to the number of soil samples to be collected; or provided the proposed location for the soil samples but did not explain how the locations were derived; or, the soil attainment sampling depth interval proposed in some bids inappropriately extends into the saturated zone.

- Some bids lacked sufficient clarity regarding vapor intrusion sampling. For example, vague description for sampling procedures and methods, no discussion of the pre-sampling survey, collecting only one indoor air sample per structure when the RFB specified two samples per structure, and no ambient air sampling proposed to be collected or the ambient air sampling costs not included in the fixed price.