

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Country Fair #44
1843 South Center Street Ext.
Grove City, Mercer County, Pennsylvania 16127
PADEP Facility ID #43-91315; USTIF Claim #1998-0451(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: 16
Number of bids received: 10

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order):

Compliance Environmental Services
Converse Consultants
CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
DMS Environmental Services, LLC
Environmental Remediation & Recovery, Inc.
EnviroTrac Environmental Services
Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.
Letterle & Associates, LLC
Matrix Environmental Technologies, Inc.
United Environmental Group

This was a defined Scope of Work (SOW) bid; therefore, price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in fixed-price base SOW bids was \$62,416 to \$149,032. In addition to the fixed-price bids for the base SOW, the bid responses each included unit cost adder quotes covering variable soil excavation related work (e.g., soil T&D) beyond the base bid. The range in bids for contaminated soil T&D combined with clean fill importation ranged from \$56.60/ton to \$100.80/ton. Bids were normalized to a common expected number of units for each unit cost variable (e.g., tons of clean fill importation). Based on the numerical scoring, two of the 10 bids were 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 and selected the acceptable bid.

The selected bidder was Compliance Environmental Services. Bid Price - \$62,810.00 plus \$64.00/ton for contaminated soil T&D combined with clean fill importation.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the 10 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

- Bid responses should include a rationale description and details where the words “shall” and “must” are used in the RFB. For example, if the RFB specifications are to respond to the SOW tasks in detail, the bid response must address the specification clearly and fully. With respect to this solicitation, bidders should have – (1) fully described the source soil excavation, soil attainment approach, and reporting of these activities including the abandoning of appropriate wells and capping buried remedial system piping, defining the area and depth of the excavation, PID screening frequency and segregating soils, management of impacted and potentially “clean” soils, management of groundwater, and how appropriate PADEP guidance are incorporated to collection of soil samples and demonstrating attainment of soils; (2) described the approach for replacing monitoring wells MW-2 and MW-12; (3) discussed performing the 1st of the four quarterly post-excavation groundwater monitoring events at all wells prior to abandoning wells and initiating soil excavation; and (4) 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 independent thoughts 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.
- Bids should have clearly identified the cost, schedule and other advantages of the selected excavation water management approach. For example, if discharging treated groundwater removed from the soil excavation to the local storm water system via a NPDES permit is proposed, the benefits of this approach should be explained over alternatives (e.g., containerizing the water for off-site disposal).
- Bids should have clearly described the cost, schedule and other benefits of the proposed soil management method over alternatives (e.g., if on-site stockpiling “impacted” soils for disposal is proposed, how this would work given site constraints and how this would be beneficial over other options such as “direct loading” of these impacted soils).