

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed-Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Herr Foods, Inc.
20 Herr Drive
Nottingham, Chester County, PA 19362

PADEP Facility ID #15-24418 PAUSTIF Claim #1997-0175(F)

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: 7
Number of bids received: 3
List of firms submitting bids: Compliance Management International
Environmental Alliance, Inc.
RETTEW

This was a Bid to Result with technical approach being the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the three evaluated bids was \$440,909.75 to \$560,990.00. Based on the numerical scoring, 1 of the 3 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 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 Environmental Alliance, Inc.: Bid Price – \$440,909.75.

Note that the costs referenced above reflect adjusted base bid costs and account for the assumed volume of contaminated soil and water transport and disposal and imported clean fill as defined in the Request for Bid and on the Bid Cost Spreadsheet. These costs were used for bid scoring purposes.

Below are 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 received for this solicitation and to assist you in preparing bids for future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- It is mandatory that a bid response provide a scope of work and fixed-price cost for each milestone specified in a Request for Bid (RFB) package. At least one of the bid responses received for the Herr Foods bid solicitation did not address all of the RFB milestones. Bids that fail to address all RFB-requested milestones will be viewed as unresponsive which will significantly affect the overall bid score.
- Bidders must ensure that the Bid Cost Spreadsheet is complete and accurate. Otherwise, the bid response will be viewed as unresponsive and could be rejected. At least one bid response received for the Herr Foods bid solicitation contained an incomplete Bid Cost Spreadsheet.
- As specified in the RFB, bid responses require clear descriptions, specific details, and original language of how the proposed work scope will be completed for each milestone. Milestone descriptions that are too general, rely on “recycled” RFB language, or simply reference that the work will be performed according to the RFB or RAP do not provide sufficient information to complete an adequate technical evaluation and such bid responses typically score poorly in the technical review.
- It’s important that the proposed scope of work in a bid response consider the nature of the facility operations and accommodate any facility-required scheduling limitations to avoid business disruption, especially at a larger manufacturing facility like the Herr Foods plant.
- For the soil excavation remedial alternative, some bids did not address important technical requirements of this RFB milestone including, in part, application of Oxygen Delivery Product to the open excavation prior to backfilling; exploring the possibility for direct-loading of impacted soil; use of sloping, shoring or trench boxes when excavating close to the garage building; or specifying the proposed photoionization detector (PID) screening threshold for determining clean versus excessively impacted soil. In general, failure to address all technical requirements of a RFB milestone will negatively affect the technical bid score.
- Some bid responses did not appear to fully grasp the nuances of the risk-based site closure as described in the RFB and in the historical documents. For example, the risk-based SSS numeric standards not only need to be attained for key compliance monitoring well MW-11, but also for the other key compliance wells OW-2 and MW-10 which was unclear in some bids.