

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed-Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

**Valley Village
10243 State Route 85
Kittanning, PA 16201-8165**

PADEP Facility ID #03-06500 PAUSTIF Claim #2014-0036(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: 7
Number of bids received: 3
List of firms submitting bids: Letterle & Associates, Inc.
Mountain Research, LLC
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 \$362,339.70 to \$444,499.50. 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 selected one of the bids recommended by the committee.

The bidder selected by the Claimant was Letterle & Associates, Inc.: Bid Price – \$365,256.99.

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

- As specified in the RFB, bid responses require clear descriptions, specific details, and original language of how the proposed work scope will be completed for each

milestone. Milestone descriptions simply referencing that the work will be performed according to the RFB or RAP do not provide sufficient information to complete an adequate technical evaluation and such bid responses typically score poorly in the technical review.

- Thoughtful design of a remedial pilot testing program based on the available site data, and careful consideration of critical pilot testing criteria that will define whether a proposed remedial approach may or may not be viable is a vital element of a bid response to reduce the chances for potentially invoking the “Pilot Test Off-Ramp” conditions which, in part, could result in pre-mature termination of the Remediation Agreement.
- A thorough understanding of current site environmental conditions and results from historical investigations, remedial pilot testing, and remedial actions is critical for bidders to provide a technically sound conceptual remedial approach for inclusion in their bid response. Although each of the bid responses received for the Valley Village site proposed a conceptual remedial approach that was generally consistent with the bidders selected remedial alternative, technical deficiencies were identified which, in most cases, were related to an inadequate understanding of site conditions.
- Bid responses should provide all information necessary to conduct a thorough technical review of the proposed remedial approach. For example, figures depicting typical recovery and injection well details, the trenching & piping layout and trench cross sections, a remediation system schematic, etc.