

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Cantanese Bros.

655 Little Deer Creek Valley Road, Russellton, PA 15076

PADEP Facility ID #02-25149 PAUSTIF Claim #2015-0109(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:	3
Number of bids received:	3
List of firms submitting bids:	Core Environmental Letterle & Associates 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 three evaluated bids was \$555,459.05 to \$663,249.69. Based on the numerical scoring, two of the three bids were determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and were 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 only provides funding up to the fixed-price cost of the highest bid deemed acceptable by the bid review committee.

**The bidder selected by the claimant was Core Environmental:
Bid Price – \$586,060.00**

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the three 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.
- The RFB required that the bid response provide an O&M checklist, which some bid responses failed to provide.
- Some bids lacked clarity on or did not appropriately address the pilot testing work. For example, bid(s) were viewed less favorably if they: proposed critical criteria inconsistent with existing pilot testing results or that were vague, qualitative or too strict (i.e., pilot study off-ramp provision likely to be triggered); or if iron and silt treatability testing was not proposed or not adequately described; or if LNAPL recovery and testing approach was not adequately conveyed or if unconventional methods were proposed without adequate explanation.
- Bids that did not mention including LNAPL thickness and distribution maps in RAPRs as part of demonstrating recovery to the maximum extent practicable were viewed less favorably.
- Bids were viewed less favorably due to potential short-circuiting issues from proposed recovery wells being installed with shallow screen intervals within the limits of soil excavation backfill material; and did not mention post-installation / start-up testing at well heads to verify design parameters had been met.
- Some bids failed to explain how the bidder's proposed system would efficiently address LNAPLs and MTBE when none of the remediation wells were proximate to locations with these environmental issues.
- Bids that either failed to identify the bidder's remediation system operations termination criteria (as required by the RFB) and/or lacked clarity on or did not appropriately address recovery of LNAPL to the maximum extent practicable (MEP) were viewed less favorably.
- Bids that omitted a work scope description(s) were viewed less favorably.
- Bids that proposed installing additional bedrock monitoring well(s) that did not appear to ensure groundwater samples would be representative of only the bedrock groundwater were viewed less favorably (i.e. no double casing to seal off overburden groundwater).
- Some bids proposed supplemental site characterization data without describing why the information is needed and how the data would be used (e.g., without adequate explanation, proposing geotechnical testing of soil for well design when the remediation is focused in bedrock).
- Bids that did not discuss using PADEP's recently updated guidance on demonstrating LNAPL MEP recovery (e.g., using the transmissivity and physical property data collected in earlier milestones) were viewed less favorably.