

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation Hassler's Amoco

3200 Conrad Weiser Parkway, Womelsdorf Borough, Berks County, Womelsdorf, PA
PADEP Facility ID #06-11882; USTIF Claim #1998-0435(M)

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.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 7

Number of bids received: 4

List of firms submitting bids (in alphabetical order):

1. Alternative Environmental Solutions, Inc.
2. Environmental Alliance
3. MEA Environmental Services, Inc.
4. Synergy Environmental Inc.

This was a defined Scope of Work bid so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost quotes for the four bids received was \$39,189.86 to \$83,016.00. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the four bids was determined to meet the "Reasonable and Necessary" criteria established by the Regulations and was deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for USTIF funding. The claimant reviewed this bid and selected it for award of the assignment.

The selected bidder was Alternative Environmental Solutions, Inc.: Bid Price - \$39,189.86.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding evaluation of the bids received in response to this solicitation. These comments are intended to provide general evaluative information based on the bids received in response to this solicitation and to assist you in preparing bids for future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- When task descriptions presented in a bid response simply reference or copy the Request for Bid (RFB) task descriptions verbatim, it is not clear whether the bidder's technical personnel thoroughly reviewed the RFB and historical site documents, understood the technical requirements, and developed task content that the bidder regarded as necessary and appropriate to accomplish the project objectives.
- Some bid responses failed to or inadequately addressed one or more of the six key considerations specified in the RFB. For example, each bid needed to provide enough information so that the bid evaluation committee and Solicitor could determine whether the bidder designed a project approach and schedule that periodically takes stock of whether the remedial goal of demonstrating attainment of the residential used aquifer SHS-MSCs for soil and groundwater can be reasonably achieved at this site. Some bid responses failed to incorporate language that provided assurance to the evaluation committee and Solicitor that the bidder would adequately identify / discuss all current and future exposure pathways, including the vapor intrusion pathway associated with the release.
- Some bidders failed to indicate that their fixed price bid cost included addressing any PADEP comments to the RACR (Task 4) or that Task 5 would not commence until approval of the RACR has been provided by the PADEP.
- Some bids omitted language that QA/QC samples would be collected and analyzed for all media of concern (Tasks 1, 2, and 3).
- Some bidders failed to provide all the unit costs in the Schedule of Unit Rates Table included in Attachment 3, Bid Cost Spreadsheet included in the RFB.