

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Northwest Bank

730 Main Street, Clarion, PA 16214

PADEP Facility ID #16-13642 PAUSTIF Claim #2009-0013(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:	8
Number of bids received:	6
List of firms submitting bids:	Atlas Technical Consultants LLC Compliance Environmental Services CORE Environmental Services, Inc. DMS Environmental Services, LLC Letterle & Associates, Inc. Mountain Research, LLC

Five bids were administratively qualified to advance to technical scoring. This was a Defined Scope of Work and so cost was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the five evaluated bids was \$130,112.00 to \$186,190.93. Based on the numerical scoring, all five of the 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 one of the five consulting firms that had technical scores that allowed the bids to advance to cost scoring.

The bidder selected by the claimant was CORE Environmental Services, Inc. Bid Price – \$130,112.00.

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

- 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.
- Some bids lacked enough clarity on, and/or did not appropriately address proposed work installing the additional bedrock wells. For example, some bids: (a) proposed locations for the additional monitoring wells inconsistent with the scope of work in the RFB; and (b) rationale for proposed monitoring well locations was confusing.
- Some bids lacked enough clarity on, and/ or did not appropriately address, the proposed work for performing the risk assessment. For example, some bids did not provide enough details, including site specific information to understand approach.
- Some bids did not provide their rationale for the proposed number of quarters in Milestone A.
- Bids that did not describe how the preponderance of the data would be used to assess the nature of the overall plume stability, and/ or were not giving consideration on using all data since remediation ceased when evaluating plume stability were regarded less favorably.
- Bids that provided a schedule that was inconsistent with the proposed schedule in the RFB were regarded less favorably.
- Bidders should carefully review the bid requirements detailed in the Request for Bid to ensure submitted bids are administratively complete.