

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Watkins Market
427 Route 271, PA 15658

PADEP Facility ID #65-12005

PAUSTIF Claim #2008-0073(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: 10

Number of bids received: 6

List of firms submitting bids:

CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
DMS Environmental Services, LLC
Letterle & Associates, LLC
Monridge Environmental, LLC
Moody & Associates, Inc.
Mountain Research, LLC

This was a Defined Scope of Work bid and so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion; however, the numerical scoring process gave consideration to price, technical soundness, and bidder qualifications. The range in cost between the six (6) bids evaluated bids was \$21,055.00 to \$78,294.40. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the six bids was determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and was deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for PAUSTIF funding. The claimant reviewed and selected the acceptable bid.

The selected bidder is CORE Environmental Services, Inc.: Bid Price – \$24,961.99.

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.

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. For example, in this instance, bids that failed to mention the risk assessment, RAP, and/or RACR received lower technical soundness evaluation scores.

Some of the bids received were not as cost competitive as needed to be successful with this solicitation.

The RFB emphasized that each bidder should demonstrate its understanding of the scope of work and detail its task implementation, including any contingent or optional elements deemed necessary. Bid responses that simply referenced the RFB task descriptions or copied the RFB task descriptions largely verbatim failed to adequately demonstrate that the bidder had evaluated the RFB, and received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

Bid responses that received higher technical soundness evaluation points exhibited no or fewer discrepancies relative to the RFB SOW and contained more detailed descriptions of the work that was to be conducted.

Bids that appeared to neglect proposing at least one monitoring well location that would evaluate source area groundwater quality, and/or bids that appeared to offer a minimally suitable configuration for estimating groundwater gradient / flow direction, received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

Bidders who did not propose at least some soil sampling within the expected source area received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

Fewer technical soundness evaluation points were given to bids that neglected to: (a) discuss performing the background research requested in the SOW, including researching geology and water use ordinances and surveying local water use, (b) describe soil boring clearing methods, boring installation methods, soil parameters to be analyzed, boring abandonment procedures, or investigation-derived waste (IDW) management; (c) discuss well installation methods and well development procedures; (d) detail risk assessment methodology and its application to the development of site-specific standards; and/or (e) discuss the potential need for environmental covenants for the facility property and/or covenant waivers for the adjacent roadways.

Bids that presented an inordinate number of assumptions or extremely narrow or unreasonable assumptions, special conditions, and exemptions may make the bid difficult to evaluate, and risk creating doubts that the work scope was understood and/or that the bid price would be susceptible to frequent changes due to new conditions.

Bidders should note that specific questions are sometimes posed within the RFB Milestone descriptions. For example, the subject RFB asked for the following specific information.

“Bids shall provide a detailed description of how bidders will evaluate the on- and off-site Construction Worker vapor inhalation pathway including how it will estimate the Construction Worker vapor EPC. If a model is to be used to estimate the vapor concentrations, bidders shall identify the model and the input assumptions that will be used (e.g., trench width and depth dimensions, wind speed / direction, etc.)”

Care should be given to answering such questions clearly and directly. Bids that failed to answer this and other specific questions posed within the RFB received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

In presenting a soil or groundwater sampling plan, bidders should take care to make best use of the available sample points requested in the RFB, and provide a rationale for the location of each proposed sampling point (if any). If additional sampling points are recommended by the bidder, it is important to keep the costs for those additional points separate from the fixed cost entered on the Bid Cost Spreadsheet for the applicable milestone.

Again, thank you for participating in this competitive bid solicitation.

Jim Ackerman