

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed-Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

**Seneca Mini Mart
3390 State Route 257
Seneca, Venango County, PA 16346**

PADEP Facility ID #61-18854 PAUSTIF Claim #2015-0120(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: 4
Number of bids received: 2
List of firms submitting bids: Compliance Management International
Insite Group, Inc.

This was a Bid to Result with technical approach being the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the two evaluated bids was \$340,871.44 to \$469,583.66. 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 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 Insite Group, Inc.: Bid Price – \$340,871.44.

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 imperative that bidders thoroughly review the site background information provided in the RFB and in the RFB attachments, and that a bid response contain sufficient language to

demonstrate an adequate grasp of this information (e.g., historical investigative results, previous pilot testing / remedial efforts, regulatory issues, etc.). As appropriate, bidders are encouraged to offer independent observations, data interpretations and an independent conceptual site model. Bid responses presenting a site background section that simply restates 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 which could reduce the technical bid score.

- Apparently due to an insufficient understanding of site conditions including the PADEP-approved soil excavation remedial approach as prescribed in the RFB, some questionable supplemental site characterization activities were proposed, for example: i) performing pre-excavation contaminant F&T modeling which is premature and should be conducted after soil excavation only if residual groundwater impacts >SHS remain); ii) collection of remedial feasibility parameters with no defined purpose or parameter identification, and which seem unnecessary for site remediation via soil excavation; and iii) advancing soil borings to a depth of 15 ft-bg for vertical delineation of adsorbed-phase contamination which is significantly below the top of permanent groundwater saturation and is not appropriate.
- During pre-bid site meetings, bidders are encouraged to spend more time observing site conditions and focusing on the information presented orally. Bidders are afforded up to 0.5 hour to walk the site and surroundings, but are often observed completing their reconnaissance within 10 or 15 minutes. Regarding the Seneca Mini Mart site, key items not recognized / understood from the pre-bid site meeting that were evident in at least one bid response was the presence of a utility pole within the soil excavation footprint (how would this be managed?) and the proper location where the attending Claimant specified he wanted the remains of the demolished dispenser canopy placed on-property.
- For site remedies involving soil excavation, and as requested in the RFB, a PID screening threshold must be provided for determining and segregating “clean” versus excessively impacted soil. It’s important that ICF / PAUSTIF are aware of the proposed soil screening threshold value in advance to provide a level of confidence that only excessively contaminated soil will be transported and disposed off-property. In general, failure to address all technical requirements of a RFB milestone will negatively affect the technical bid score.
- Bidders must ensure that the Bid Cost Spreadsheet is complete and accurate and that the instructions for completing the spreadsheet are understood. Otherwise, the bid response will be viewed as unresponsive and could be rejected. At least one bid response received for the Seneca Mini Mart bid solicitation contained an inaccurate Bid Cost Spreadsheet. Should a bidder be unclear on how to complete the Bid Cost Spreadsheet, related questions can be asked either at the pre-bid site meeting or during the post-meeting question and answer period.