

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Remediation To Closure
Root Oil Co. Inc.
Former DD Garage
156 Main Street
Knoxville, Pennsylvania 16928
PADEP Facility ID #59-11706; USTIF Claim #2012-0125(I)

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: 6
Number of bids received: 4

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): DMS Environmental Services, LLC
Juniata Geosciences, LLC
Letterle & Associates
Mountain Research, LLC

This was a bid to result scope of work (SOW) bid; therefore, the bidders technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in bid cost associated with the four bids received was \$161,282.48 to \$320,642.75¹. Based on the numerical scoring, two of the four 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 –

The selected bidder was Juniata Geosciences, LLC with a bid of \$191,277.61.

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

¹ The range in bid costs include normalization using the unit cost adders UC1, UC2, & UC3 from each bid; UC1 & UC3 were each multiplied by 710 tons, and UC2 from each bid was multiplied by 7500 gallons.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- Bid responses should 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, closure approach, project goals, 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.
- Bids should demonstrate clear understanding of where soil and groundwater attainment need to occur and be demonstrated.
- Certain bids made assumptions contradicting RFB information.
- Bid responses should clearly indicate how the data from supplemental site characterization activities would be used in support of the site cleanup.
- Some bids proposed unnecessary supplemental site characterization activities (e.g. additional off-property site investigation wells), with some of this work not included in the bidders fixed price cost.
- Bid responses should have included adequate information and/or sufficient clarity in regards to the soil excavation remedial approach. For example, providing/addressing: (a) location of the two replacement wells on a site drawing; (b) depth interval for the post-excavation biased soil samples and rationale on how the soil samples would be selected; (c) sampling of the excavated presumed clean soils for reuse; and describing (d) locating buried utilities & the management/repair/replacement of any buried utilities inadvertently encountered & damaged; and (e) timing for transitioning to initiating attainment activities. Also, some bids did not appear to understand why biased soil attainment sampling was to be initially applied to the excavation sidewall and instead proposed implementing SRSS procedures for initial sidewall confirmation sampling. Also, it was unclear in some bids if the bidder’s excavation would extend to include known soil contamination defined by the limits depicted in the approved RAP.
- Certain bids did not appear to include the costs for the removal/disposal of the canopy and footers, as required of the RFB.
- Bid responses should have included adequate information and/or clarity regarding follow-up soil attainment demonstration sampling. For example some bids, (a) proposed work that did not appear to perform SRSS in necessary demonstration areas; (b) inappropriately proposed sampling only in areas where biased sidewall soil sampling fails; (c) did not identify a depth interval for SRSS sample collection; (d) did not provide technical justification for the proposed SRSS based on known unsaturated and periodically saturated soil impacts. Also, some bids did not provide a drawing showing the locations where SRSS would be performed.