

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Additional Site Characterization Activities & Reporting
Former Wayne Pumps
1194 Wayne Avenue
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15701
PADEP Facility ID #32-81999; PAUSTIF Claim #1998-0529(F)

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 who submitted bids in response to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 10
Number of bids received: 7

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
DMS Environmental, Inc.
Flynn Environmental, Inc.
Letterle & Associates, LLC
Mountain Research, LLC
P. Joseph Lehman, Inc.
Sovereign Consulting, Inc.

This was a defined scope of work (SOW) bid; therefore, cost was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in base bid cost associated with the seven bids received was \$52,376.74 to \$84,981.00. Based on the numerical scoring, three of the seven 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 reviewed and selected the following acceptable bid.

The selected bidder was Mountain Research, LLC - \$58,748.91.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the seven bids received for this solicitation. These comments are intended to provide general information that may assist in preparing bids in response to future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- Bids that did not include enough “original” (i.e., not copied verbatim from the RFB) language conveying bidder’s thought such that the understanding of site conditions, conceptual site model, and approach to addressing the scope of work could be evaluated were regarded less favorably. Since bidders are not prequalified, the content of the bid response must equip the evaluation committee and Claimant to make a thorough and complete review of the bid and bidder.
- Some bids did not adequately describe the approach to characterize / delineate soil impacts and lacked clarity in conveying bidder’s understanding of all the site characterization goals. Also, some bids did not include soil boring locations in key areas highlighted in the RFB and / or were too distant from the presumed source area. Certain bids also failed to propose including TMBs in the sample analyte list.
- The drawings in some bids showing the proposed soil borings and/or monitoring wells locations did not coincide with the bid text.
- Some bids did not adequately explain the proposed approach to the well drilling and/ or well installation details. Also, it was unclear in some bids if surface casing was being installed for the bedrock monitoring wells.
- Some bids proposed to combine soil boring and monitoring well locations, which did not appear to be an appropriate / effective method in all cases to characterize the impacts of this site.
- The background research & surveying milestone discussions in some bids were too general and lacked details explaining how the work would be completed. Such discussions did not prove to be sufficient for completing the work necessary to successfully support a SSS closure.
- Some bids proposed installing staff gauges within Marsh Run; however, the bid lacked key discussion on the methods to collect and evaluate the data.
- Some bids did not adequately explain the bidder’s approach to fate and transport modeling and risk assessment. It was unclear in these bids if the proposed work included key elements required by the RFB and as called for in PADEP guidance.
- Some bid responses gave the impression that some bidders did not understand the objectives of the site characterization and alternative closure pathways via SCR/RACR or SCR/RAP with inadequate discussion of evaluating the exposure pathways, and the use of institutional and/or engineering controls.
- Some bids were significantly higher in cost than others while pursuing the same objective.