

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Defined Scope of Work
Remedial System Installation/O&M, Remedial System Performance
Monitoring, & Quarterly Monitoring, Sampling, & Reporting
SGL Investment Group
Former L&L Service Center
51 South Main Street
Stewartstown, Pennsylvania 17363
PADEP Facility ID #67-62730; USTIF Claim #2001-0107(F)

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 who submitted bids in response to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 6
Number of bids received: 5

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): DMS Environmental Services, LLC
EnviroTrac Environmental Services
Keystone Environmental Health and Safety
Services Inc.
Mountain Research, LLC
P. Joseph Lehman, Inc.

This was a defined scope of work (SOW) bid; therefore, the bidders's quoted cost was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in base bid cost associated with the five received bids was \$313,592.96 to \$434,890.00. 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 subsequently selected –

The bid received from Mountain Research, LLC, with a quoted bid cost of \$316,660.82.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the five bids received for this solicitation. These comments are intended to provide general information that may assist in preparing bids in response to future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- Bid responses should include enough “original” (i.e., not copied verbatim from the RFB) language conveying bidder’s thought such that the understanding of site conditions, conceptual site model, closure approach, project goals, and approach to addressing the scope of work could be evaluated, whereas bid responses that did not include enough original language were regarded less favorably. Since bidders are not prequalified, the content of the bid response must equip the evaluation committee and Claimant to make a thorough and complete review of the bid and bidder.
- Bids should have indicated if there was a commitment to initiating construction of and obtaining permits for the remedial system within the timeframe specified in the RFB.
- Bids that proposed alternative F&T methods, in lieu of QD, should have also provided a supporting rationale for alternative model. Also, it would have been appropriate for bid responses to have included adequate and comprehensive descriptions as to how plume stability would be evaluated.
- Certain bids deviated from the approved RAP and RFB SOW in regards to the RAP final design and implementation/operation of remediation, and should have provided the appropriate rationale/justification. For example, proposed SVE blower specs for maximum flow rate were not consistent with the approved RAP and might have been insufficient. Another example was varying the depth/construction details for the remediation system wells in comparison to the well depths specified in the approved RAP.
- Bid responses should have included adequate information and/or sufficient clarity in regards to – disposition of excavated material from trenches; remedial startup procedures; revised location of the remedial system shed; whether the remedial shed would rest on a concrete pad or gravel; and what “triggers” would be applied for switching from CatOx to VGAC treatment of the vapor stream. Also, it was regarded less favorably on bids that did not define or only provided vague VGAC change out criteria.
- Bids should have included an example O&M checklist.
- Bid responses should have included adequate information and/or clarity regarding the risk assessment milestone. For example, a detailed discussion on recalculating risks, updating the risk assessment, and providing a cross-referenced list of changes were requested in the RFB.
- Certain bids contained assumptions contradicting RFB specifications. For example, assumptions such as: stating excavated material from trenches will be “clean fill” and could be disposed of at a C&D landfill; changing the milestone payment schedule; providing a cost cap for waste disposal, for securing permits, and/or on subcontractor work; and indicating that the pre-existing former remedial piping conduits would be usable.