

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Kwik Fill S-58
1001 East Spring Street
Titusville, Crawford County, Pennsylvania 16438
PADEP Facility ID #20-00741; USTIF Claim #1997-0240(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: 15
Number of bids received: 11

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): Compliance Environmental Services
Converse Consultants
CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
Environmental Alliance
Environmental Remediation&Recovery, Inc.
EnviroTrac Environmental Services
Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc
Kleinfelder
Letterle & Associates, LLC
Mountain Research, LLC
United Environmental Group, Inc.

This was a defined Scope of Work (SOW) bid; therefore, price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in base bid cost associated with the 11 bids received was \$31,412.00 to \$68,755.75. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the 11 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 and selected the acceptable bid.

The selected bidder was Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc. Bid Price - \$31,412.00.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the 11 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: (a) respond to the SOW task in detail; and (b) demonstrate the prior site documentation has been reviewed, the bid response must address each specification clearly and fully. With respect to this solicitation, particularly critical RFB requirements were for the bidder to specify – (1) identify and provide drawing showing the proposed locations for the POC wells, understanding objectives for the new POC wells, and describe approach at installing the wells; (2) approach at performing soil attainment and analysis of data; and (3) describe approach and provide anticipated locations and depths for the soil vapor monitoring points. Failing to respond to these and other specifications at all or fully affects the bid evaluation negatively.
- Bid responses should include enough “original” (i.e., not copied verbatim from the RFB) language and thought that the understanding and approach of the bidding firm can 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. For example, in the case of this solicitation, bidders provided reasoning for the proposed POC well locations; described approach at accessing the POC well locations; and utilizing appropriate methods to locate below grade utilities before initiating attainment sampling.
- During advancement of the borings intended for collection of systematic random samples, the collection of additional soil samples based on PID readings is considered unnecessary and inappropriate.