

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Competitive Fixed Price Bid Solicitation
Blair Co. Oil & Supply
BCO Mart
RR#2, Route 164
Cove Mountain Road
Martinsburg, Blair County, Pennsylvania 16662
PADEP Facility ID #07-30912; USTIF Claim #1999-0478(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 who submitted bids in response to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 8
Number of bids received: 5

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.
Juniata Geosciences, LLC
Letterle & Associates, LLC
Mountain Research, LLC
P. Joseph Lehman, Inc.

This was a defined Scope of Work (SOW) bid; therefore, price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in base fixed-price bids was \$40,358.00 to \$48,722.53 and the range of unit costs for contaminated soil T&D plus clean fill importation ranged from \$57.00/ton to \$104.80/ton. The bids were normalized using a common number of estimated units (e.g., tons of soil T&D & clean fill importation) to arrive at a total cost bid range of \$53,383.38 to \$61,033.06. Based on the numerical scoring, three of the five bids were determined to meet the "Reasonable and Necessary" criteria established by the Regulations and deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for USTIF funding. The claimant reviewed and selected the acceptable bid.

The claimant selected Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.: Bid Price (including normalized mass of contaminated soil T&D combined with clean fill importation) - \$57,261.28.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the five 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

- Some bids were not as cost competitive as needed to be successful with this solicitation.
- Bid responses should include detailed descriptions of the bid activities where the words “shall” and “must” are used in the RFB. Additionally, the SOW presented in the bid response must address the RFB specifications clearly and fully. With respect to this solicitation, bidders should have – (1) provided the PID screening value used to segregate excavated soils and described approach for the PID screening / frequency; (2) described approach at management and disposal of any groundwater removed from the excavation; (3) identified the proposed location for the replacement monitoring well on a drawing along with a description on construction details; (4) detailed approach at addressing soil attainment; and (5) specifically discussed petitioning PADEP to reduce quarterly groundwater attainment events when permitted by the data.
- The bid response should have included enough “original” (i.e., not copied verbatim from the RFB) language conveying bidder’s thought such that the understanding and approach of the bidder could be evaluated. Since bidders are not prequalified, the technical content of the bid response must equip the evaluation committee and Claimant to make a thorough and complete review of the bid and bidder.