

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Remediation To Closure
Solomon's Mini Mart
615 Hancock Avenue
Vandergrift, Pennsylvania 15690
PADEP Facility ID #65-81314; USTIF Claim #2010-0128(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: 3

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
Letterle & Associates, LLC
Sovereign Consulting, Inc.

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 base bid cost associated with the three bids received was \$256,985.62 to \$412,687.46. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the three bids was 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 acceptable bid.

The selected bidder was Letterle & Associates, LLC - \$375,015.23.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the three 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, closure approach, 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 appear to include adequately investigating the source area (former UST field) or to provide rationale why investigation was not necessary. The former UST field was identified as a potential data gap in the RFB. Also, some bids lacked sufficient clarity on specifics of proposed soil borings (e.g., depth), or did not adequately explain how the results from these activities would impact the remedial approach.
- Some bids provided inadequate information on the proposed remedial system. For example, some bids did not: (a) sufficiently convey where the proposed additional recovery wells would be situated; or (b) sufficiently describe the remedial system / components or provide construction details for the remedial system or (c) identify size specifications for many system components; or (d) identify what O&M checklist would be followed during system operations; or (e) provide sufficient discussion regarding permit compliance reporting and managing unforeseen system shutdowns.
- Some bids did not adequately explain their approach/rationale for implementing the off-property periodic DPE events, or did not provide rationale or provided inappropriate rationale for terminating the off-property periodic DPE events.
- Some bids lack clarity on whether the pre-remedial quarterly groundwater sampling events would be performed until remedial system was installed and operational.
- Some bids lack sufficient clarity regarding demonstration of soil attainment. For example, the approximate area for demonstrating soil attainment may not have been adequately identified; the soil attainment sampling depth interval proposed in some bids did not appear to adequately address the depth interval of known periodically saturated soil impacts; and discussion lacking the evaluating of soil data.
- Some bids did not accept the performance criteria of RFB.
- Some bids were significantly higher in cost than others while pursuing the same objective.