

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

TNT Enterprises, Inc.

21779 State Highway 8

Bloomfield Township, Crawford County

Centerville, PA 16404

PADEP Facility ID #20-90351

PAUSTIF Claim #1998-0188(S)

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: **5**

Number of bids received: **4**

List of firms submitting bids:

Compliance Environmental Services, Inc.

Core Environmental

Insite Group, Inc.

Letterle & Associates, LLC

This was a Bid to Result solicitation so technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the four evaluated bids was **\$70,057.68** to **\$125,663.13**. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the four bids were 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 was Core Environmental Services, Inc.: Bid Price – \$70,057.68.

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.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- 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: (a) clearly state the bidder's understanding of the conceptual site model and how that model relates to the bidder's proposed approach; or (b) provide the rationale for the locations of soil borings and groundwater monitoring wells 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 an understanding of the RFB scope of work, 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 did not adequately identify the location, collection, and analyses of three soil samples for fractional organic carbon, porosity, and bulk density required for fate and transport analysis received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.
- Bidders who did not propose at least some soil sampling within the suspected source area received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.
- Fewer technical soundness evaluation points were given to bids that neglected to: (a) detail their approach for 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; and/or (d) detail risk assessment methodology.

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