

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed-Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Point Store
5867 Highway 522 North
McClure, Mifflin County, PA 17841

PADEP Facility ID #44-12044 PAUSTIF Claim #2014-0116(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: 7
Number of bids received: 3
List of firms submitting bids: DMS Environmental Services, LLC
Letterle & Associates
Mountain Research, LLC

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 \$242,087.38 to \$405,140.16. 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 Mountain Research, LLC: Bid Price – \$242,430.77.

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 essential that bid responses provide a site background discussion, and that the discussion be developed using original language to demonstrate an adequate grasp of the background information (e.g., site environmental conditions, historical investigative results, previous pilot testing / remedial efforts, regulatory issues, etc.). As appropriate, bidders are also encouraged to offer data interpretations / observations and an independent conceptual site model. Bid responses that do not provide a site background section, or that simply restate the RFB text, do not provide the technical reviewer with insight as to whether the bidder recognizes key site conditions necessary for successfully completing the site cleanup.
- Some bidders that selected one of the reduced soil excavation remedial alternatives proposed possible expansion of the excavation footprint assumed in the RFB, if necessary, but did not describe the condition(s) under which the excavation footprint would be expanded. As such, it was not clear whether potential expansion of the assumed excavation area might possibly defeat the intent of removing only the volume of excessively impacted soil necessary to stabilize / contract the dissolved-phase plume to support the SSS site closure.
- For the soil attainment demonstration, rather than combining appropriate soil excavation areas for efficiency to limit the number of attainment soil samples / analyses, some bidders proposed to conduct systematic random soil sampling within each individual excavation area. This resulted in a significant number of soil attainment samples that increased costs and the chances of encountering conditions that could complicate the site closure.
- Bidders responding to an RFB that specifies a soil excavation remedy requiring placement of a chemical amendment into the open excavation prior to backfilling (e.g., oxygen delivery product or carbon-based product), should explain the design basis for the volume of product proposed. Bidders are encouraged to base the proposed volume of product on a vendor design and include the vendor design calculations in the bid response.
- For sites such as Point Store that are pursuing a risk-based closure under the Site Specific Standard, it is necessary that consultants proposing to develop the quantitative human health risk assessment “in-house” include sufficient information in their bid response to demonstrate that the project team member(s) identified for preparing the risk assessment possess adequate qualifications and experience.
- The insurance certificate included with the bid response needs to be current and satisfy all of the coverage requirements specified in Section 7 of the Remediation Agreement.