

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Bernard III Land Co., Inc. – “Indiana Site”

4470 West Pike Road, Armstrong Township, Indiana County, PA

PADEP Facility ID #32-32708 PAUSTIF Claim #2010-0017(S)

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:	10
Number of bids received:	3
List of firms submitting bids:	CORE Environmental Services, Inc. DMS Environmental Services, LLC Letterle & Associates, LLC

This was a Bid to Result and so technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the 3 evaluated bids was **\$104,490.23** to **\$156,709.73**. Based on the numerical scoring, 2 of the 3 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 reviewed and selected the acceptable bid.

The selected bidder was DMS Environmental Services, LLC: Bid Price – \$104,490.23.

The attached sheet lists 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 that were received for this solicitation and to assist you in preparing bids for future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- As applicable to Milestones A, D3 and D4 of the RFB with groundwater purging / sampling requirements, when low-flow groundwater purging / sampling is proposed, bidders need to ensure that the methods specified are consistent with accepted industry standards and regulatory guidance to assist with eliminating the potential for generating erroneous analytical data.
- Under Milestone C (Supplemental Site Characterization Activities and Reporting), some bids proposed: i) activities that did not appear to be reasonable, necessary or appropriate and for which no useable / definitive information could likely be gained; ii) additional soil borings for limited purposes although additional useful information could have been gained; and iii) additional work that was not necessarily related to site characterization or remedial feasibility

testing. Bidders are urged to consider their proposed supplemental site characterization / remedial feasibility testing activities carefully based on existing data and what additional data may be needed to assist with achieving an efficient and economical site closure.

- In general, with respect to Milestone D (Implementation of Remedial Solution), bidders should carefully review and understand the existing site data when considering a remedial action to ensure that it is reasonable, necessary and appropriate so that available claim funding is preserved to the extent possible. Some bid responses proposed remedial actions that appeared unnecessary for achieving the site closure objectives and that would result in extraneous effort and costs.
- When a soil excavation remedy is proposed, care should be exercised when evaluating and identifying existing wells that may be damaged or destroyed and which well installations will need to be repaired or replaced.
- A successful closure for groundwater under the Site Specific Standard will rely heavily on developing a technically sound exposure pathway evaluation and quantitative risk assessment under Milestone F, along with the related contaminant fate & transport modeling and plume stability analysis. However, in some cases, the proposed approach for completing this critical milestone did not address several RFB requirements and/or was too brief to allow technical evaluation.