

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Remediation To Closure
V&M Keystone Service
1008 Parade Street
Erie, Erie County, Pennsylvania 16503
PADEP Facility ID #25-01144; USTIF Claim #2011-0112(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 bid responses to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 4
Number of bid responses received: 4

List of firms submitting bid responses (alphabetical order):

Compliance Environmental Services
CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
Environmental Remediation & Recovery, Inc.
Letterle & Associates, LLC

This was a bid-to-result Request For Bid (RFB); therefore, cost was less heavily weighted and the technical approach was more heavily weighted than for defined Scope of Work (SOW) RFBs.

The range in base bid cost associated with the bids received was \$70,690.00 to \$152,210.00. Based on the numerical scoring, two of the 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 acceptable bid.

The selected bidder was Letterle & Associates, LLC - \$90,831.28.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the 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, 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 proposed strategies that would necessitate delays which the RFB indicated the PADEP was opposed to seeing with this site.
- Some bids lacked adequate technical rationale/justification to support the proposed remedial approach.
- Some bids offered very narrow critical criteria for the site characterization / pilot study results or did not propose any pilot testing activities.
- Some bids may not have provided enough details to allow an adequate understanding of the bid approach to proposed additional soil delineation and / or proposed source soil excavation/removal activities.
- Some bids may not have adequately discussed or provided enough details to understand bidder’s approach to evaluating plume stability; discontinuing remedial activities and commencing with attainment of remedial goals; soil attainment sampling; and / or soil vapor point installation / sampling.
- Some bids were significantly higher in cost than others while pursuing the same objectives.