

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed-Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

**URC Kwik Fill M-061
227 East Main Street
Bradford, PA 16701**

PADEP Facility ID #42-14809

PAUSTIF Claim #2013-0035(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: 7
Number of bids received: 3
List of firms submitting bids: Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.
Letterle & Associates, Inc.
P. Joseph Lehman, Inc.

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 \$224,790.55 to \$248,032.10. 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 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 Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.:
Bid Price – \$224,790.55.**

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

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- Although most bid responses proposed a reasonable scope of activities for evaluating performance of the operating VEGE and oxygen injection remediation systems, certain aspects of the technical approaches for implementing these activities were deficient or

questionable, apparently due to an insufficient understanding of known site conditions and remedial systems design.

- As pointed out in the RFB site background section, most bids failed to recognize the apparent need for additional off-property observation wells to monitor performance of the existing oxygen injection remediation system, and only proposed such observation wells if additional oxygen injection points are potentially added beyond the existing network.
- A thorough understanding of current site environmental conditions and historical investigation / remedial pilot testing data is critical for allowing bidders to provide a reasonable estimate of the number of quarters expected to achieve the selected site cleanup objective. For the Kwik Fill M-061 bid solicitation, the timeframe for achieving an SHS site cleanup estimated in some bid responses appeared to be unreasonably brief / overly optimistic based on available site information.
- Regarding routine operation and maintenance of the VEGE and oxygen injection remediation systems, some bids did not propose to measure important performance evaluation parameters such as air flow, groundwater extraction rate, vacuum influence and dissolved oxygen levels in groundwater.
- To avoid point deductions during the technical bid review process, bid responses should ensure that all RFB-required elements are adequately addressed. For example, the RFB scope of work for the Kwik Fill M-061 site required preparation of a “stand-alone” *Engineering Performance Evaluation Report* for the two operating remediation systems to be submitted for Solicitor / PAUSTIF review, and acknowledging a minimum 85% runtime for each of the two remediation systems. Some bid responses failed to address these and other RFB requirements.