

**BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM**  
**Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation**  
**Remediation To Closure**  
**United Refining Company of PA**  
**Kwik Fill M-26**  
**1500 Riverside Drive**  
**Oil City, Pennsylvania 16301**  
**PADEP Facility ID #61-23788; USTIF Claim #2012-0109(F)**

---

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 who submitted bids in response to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 10  
Number of bids received: 4

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): CORE Environmental Services, Inc.  
Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.  
Keystone Environmental Health & Safety  
Services, Inc.  
The ShaleZip Group, LLC

This was a bid to result scope of work (SOW) bid; therefore, the bidders technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in base bid cost associated with the four bids received was \$103,666.53 to \$236,035.00. Based on the numerical scoring, three of the four bids were determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and were deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for PAUSTIF funding. The claimant reviewed and –

**The selected bidder was Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc. with a base bid of \$110,304.18.**

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

- Bids that did not include enough “original” (i.e., not copied verbatim from the RFB) language conveying bidder’s thought such that the understanding of site conditions, conceptual site model, closure approach, and approach to addressing the scope of work could be evaluated were regarded less favorably. Since bidders are not prequalified, the content of the bid response must equip the evaluation committee and Claimant to make a thorough and complete review of the bid and bidder.
- Some bids deviated from the RFB SOW by providing SOW options for a SSS closure in addition to the RFB SOW.
- Certain bids were unclear on how the data from supplemental site characterization activities would be used in support of the site cleanup.
- Some bids provided inadequate information and/or lacked sufficient clarity in regards to the additional site characterization activities. For example, not describing (a) how many soil borings would be advanced and/ or not providing the boring locations on a site drawing; (b) the total depth for advancement of soil borings; (c) the depth at which soil samples would be collected and that the investigation would focus on the unsaturated / periodically saturated soil zones; (d) the soil investigation area as encompassing the entire thickness of the unsaturated and periodically saturated soil zones; and (e) the data gaps found (i.e., bidders that alluded to data gaps but did not specifically identify them were considered less favorably).
- Some bids proposed site characterization activities, without providing sufficient information showing that the work was necessary and appropriate relevant to the closure strategy.
- Some bids lacked clarity and/or provided inadequate information on the frequency of site visits during quarterly O&M events; remedial system performance sampling; preparation of monthly Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) for the NPDES permit; groundwater purge and sampling methodology; timeframe for temporarily idling of the remedial system prior to quarterly groundwater monitoring/sampling; and/ or reporting of groundwater analytical data to the off-site property owner.
- Some bids did not address the 85% remedial system uptime, or the performance criteria regarding early termination of the remedial system.
- Some bidders’ methods for evaluating VGAC usage and determining change-outs would likely result in more frequent than necessary VGAC change-outs and added costs, or did not provide rationale for VGAC change-outs.
- Some bids were only collecting field parameters from only 3 monitoring wells during purging & sampling without providing sufficient rationale for deviating from standard practice. Other bids were not clear if all of the on- and off-property wells would be gauged for water level during attainment activities.

- Some bids did not provide adequately compelling rationale for when additional quarters of O&M would be implemented beyond four quarters, and others proposed overly conservative assumptions for remedial system O&M timeframe.
- Some bids lacked sufficient clarity regarding demonstration of soil attainment (e.g., did not identify a depth interval for sample collection). In other bids, the proposed soil attainment sampling depth interval did not appear to correspond with the depth interval of known unsaturated and periodically saturated soil impacts and/or the proposed attainment sampling extended within the zone of permanent saturation.
- Some bids alluded to proposing changes to fixed price agreement but did not explicitly identify the changes as required by the RFB.