

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Former McKitten Service Station
527 Route 422 East, Butler, Butler County, PA 16001
PADEP Facility ID #10-90308; USTIF Claim #1998-211(F)

USTIF 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: 14
Number of bids received: 9

List of firms submitting bids:
(in alphabetic order)

- Alternative Environmental Solutions, Inc.
- CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
- DMS Environmental Services, LLC
- InSite Group, Inc.
- KU Resources, Inc.
- Letterle & Associates, LLC
- MIG Environmental, LLC
- Mountain Research, LLC
- United Environmental Group

This was a defined Scope of Work bid; therefore, price and technical responsiveness to all work scope elements were the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. Across the nine bids received, the range in cost was \$39,727 to \$84,300. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the nine bids was determined to meet the "Reasonable and Necessary" criteria established by the Regulations and this bid was presented to the claimant for his evaluation. The claimant selected this bidder.

The selected bidder was:

CORE Environmental Services: Bid Price - \$39,727.

Following are some general comments regarding the evaluation of the nine bids received for this solicitation. These comments are intended to provide general information that may assist you in preparing bids in response to future competitive bid solicitations for work at USTIF-funded sites.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- For this Request for Bid (RFB), two tasks were deemed critical in the technical evaluation of the bids: Task 5 (Updating Contaminant Fate-and-Transport Modeling) and Task 6 (Exposure Analysis/Baseline Risk Assessment). As these two tasks were central in implementing a successful combined SSS-SHS closure of this site, the bidder's responses to these tasks were scrutinized carefully during the bid evaluation and weighted more heavily in the technical evaluation. Items reviewed included discussion of the model(s) to be used, input and calibration testing, model verification, linkage of the model to the risk assessment, risk assessment criteria, potential exposure pathways, exposure pathways assessment, toxicity assessment, and risk characterization.
- Subcontracting out conduct of the fate-and-transport modeling and/or risk assessment tasks in the scope of work was not a negative provided details of the subcontractor's approach to and qualifications for completing these tasks were included in the bid response. The ability to review the subcontractor's corporate and personnel experience and qualifications, especially project experience similar to the specific scope of work, is necessary in order to evaluate whether the subcontractor can perform these technical tasks.
- When task descriptions presented in a bid response simply reference or repeat the RFB task descriptions verbatim, it is not clear whether the bidder's technical personnel actually evaluated the RFB and historical site documents, thoroughly assessed the technical requirements, and developed task content that the bidder regards as necessary and appropriate to accomplish the project objectives. The RFB emphasized that each bidder is to critically evaluate each individual task and describe, in detail, how it will accomplish each task.
- Deductions are assessed for each task response that does not fully address all technical elements specified in the RFB for that task. Additional deductions are assessed for task descriptions that respond incorrectly to the task specifications (e.g., substituting analysis for the post-March 2008 PADEP short list of unleaded gasoline parameters when analysis of the pre-March 2008 short list is specified). Bidders are welcome to propose modifications or additions to the RFB-specified work scope provided the "as is" work scope is addressed and the rationale behind the proposed modification/addition is explained.
- Descriptions of and resumes for the proposed project team members enable assessing the bidder's qualifications and experience to perform the scope of work.

Thank you for your participation.

Geoffrey G. Back
Senior Project Manager
EXCALIBUR GROUP, LLC