

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Quik Serv
400 Union Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15022
PADEP Facility ID #02-80224
PAUSTIF Claim #2010-0132(S)

November 19, 2014

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 at pre-bid meeting:	5
Number of bids received:	2
Firms submitting bids:	Letterle & Associates, LLC Sovereign Consulting Inc.

The Quik Serv request for bid (RFB) specified a Bid to Result scope of work, and technical content (understanding site conditions, technical approach/details, and regulatory approach) was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion; however, the numerical scoring process also gave consideration to price, and bidder qualifications / experience. The price difference between the two evaluated bids was \$21,501.01. Based on the numerical scoring, one submitted bid was determined to both meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and to be deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for PAUSTIF funding. The claimant reviewed and selected the acceptable bid.

The selected bidder is Sovereign Consulting Inc., with a bid price of \$338,642.05.

The balance of this memorandum provides 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

Proposals must be developed enough to demonstrate that the bidder adequately understands the RFB, the technical and regulatory issues, and objectives of the project. Proposals that fail to address major scope items risk being considered non-responsive or will suffer a lower technical soundness score upon bid evaluation. This was a *Bid to Result* solicitation. As such, the evaluation committee relied on individual bidders to provide a high level of project-specific detail on how to achieve RFB goals. Each bidder's approach as well as their specific details and assumptions for achieving milestone objectives were considered thoroughly by the evaluation committee and a lesser emphasis was placed on bid price during the evaluation process. In addition, the number and scope of any modifications to the standard agreement language is used as one of the criteria used to evaluate the bid. Bids that do not clearly and unambiguously state whether the bidder accepts the associated Remediation Agreement language "as is", or that does not provide a cross-referenced list of requested changes to this agreement, are considered non-responsive.

The RFB emphasized that each bidder should demonstrate its understanding of the scope of work and detail its proposed task implementation. Bid responses that simply reference or largely copy RFB task descriptions fail to adequately demonstrate that the bidder had a complete understanding of the RFB, and therefore, receive fewer evaluation points.

Among other considerations (e.g., price), the evaluation committee considered the following in evaluating bids submitted in response to the Quik Serv RFB:

1. Has the bidder demonstrated an understanding of existing site conditions?
2. Has the bidder addressed each RFB milestone in detail?
3. Has the bidder demonstrated an understanding of Site-specific regulatory and permitting issues?
4. Has the bidder demonstrated an understanding of individual milestone objectives as well as the overall project goal?
5. Has the bidder assessed if additional site characterization is needed and why.
6. Has the bidder assessed if pilot testing is needed, identified associated and desired pilot results, and presented any associated contractual "off-ramp" criteria?
7. Has the bidder presented how any resulting pilot test data will be used to finalize the remedial system design?

8. Has the bidder provided enough detail for the evaluation committee to understand their approach regarding their design, implementation, startup, operation and maintenance of their proposed remedial system?
9. Has the bidder demonstrated the viability of and flexibility in their approach to achievement of site closure goals?
10. Has the bidder provided thoughtful and detailed descriptions of key remedial system components?
11. Are the bidder's technical assumptions reasonable? [Bids that present an inordinate number of assumptions, or that present narrow or unreasonable assumptions, can be difficult to evaluate, and risk creating doubts whether the scope of work was fully understood and/or whether the bid price might be susceptible to frequent changes due to new conditions.]

Thank you once more for participating in this competitive bid solicitation.

Lawrence Martin,
Technical Contact