

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Radhe Oil

222 Buffalo Street, Freeport, PA 16229

PADEP Facility ID #03-29674 PAUSTIF Claim #2017-0012(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:	3
List of firms submitting bids:	CORE Environmental Services, Inc. Letterle & Associates, Inc. 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 \$200,519.82 to \$292,039.00. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the three 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 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. In this case the claimant elected to follow the committee’s recommendation.

The bidder selected by the claimant was CORE Environmental Services, Inc.:

Bid Price – \$221,943.10.

Amount deemed acceptable for USTIF funding – \$221,943.10.

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 drawings showing the proposed location for the three proposed sub-slab soil vapor sampling points on a drawing; however, some bids did not provide the required drawing(s) and did not indicate if leak testing of the soil vapor sampling points would be performed. In addition, some bids proposed soil vapor sampling points in inadequately explained locations or construction configurations.
- Some bids inappropriately proposed without sufficient explanation additional soil sampling focused in the area where soil attainment was demonstrated for the previous closed 2000 unleaded gas release, where additional soil data would have been more productive in filling data gaps elsewhere.
- Some bids proposed further groundwater characterization to investigate bedrock groundwater without sufficient rationale, particularly given PADEP had already approved the site characterization.
- Some bids lacked clarity on or did not appropriately address the pilot testing work. For example, proposing critical criteria inconsistent with existing pilot testing results.
- Some bids lacked enough clarity on, did not appropriately address, and/or proposed inappropriate work regarding the SVE implementation, O&M, and quarterly monitoring/reporting. For example, SVE system design missing the portion of the remedial system piping that needed to be installed above-grade and/or did not provide procedures to avoid condensate blockages on the above-grade SVE extraction system piping.
- Some bids lack clarity on or did not appropriately address the remedial injections at MW-2. For example, (a) did not provide details on CBI vendor design; (b) did not provide and/or provided an inappropriately low mass of carbon to be injected; (c) did not provide the injection pressures or how breaching of product at surface would be addressed; (d) did not provide and/or provided a vague schedule for when the injections would occur; (e) provided weak or inappropriate rationale for performing 2nd injection event; (f) did not address how CBI material would be cleared from MW-2 if the well was impacted by the material; (g) limited design for the injection treatment area unnecessarily small; and (h) did not provide the sampling of any indicator parameters (e.g. sulfate) before and after injections.
- The RFB required that the bid response provide a drawing showing the area where soil sampling would occur to demonstrate attainment for soils; however, some bids did not provide the required drawing(s).