

**BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM**  
**Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation**  
**Remediation To Closure**  
**Pine Run Market**  
**101 Pine Run Road**  
**Freedom, Beaver County, Pennsylvania 15042**  
**PADEP Facility ID #04-14610; USTIF Claim #2010-0010(F)**

---

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 bid responses to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 6  
Number of bid responses received: 5

List of firms submitting bid responses (alphabetical order):

Applied Geology & Environmental Science, Inc.  
Austin James Associates  
Converse Consultants  
CORE Environmental Services, Inc.  
Letterle & Associates, LLC

This was a bid-to-result RFB; therefore, cost was less heavily weighted and the technical approach was more heavily weighted than for defined SOW RFBs.

The range in base bid cost associated with the bids received was \$289,947.23 to \$361,959.23. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the bids was determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and were deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for USTIF funding. The claimant reviewed and selected the acceptable bid.

**The selected bidder was Letterle & Associates, LLC - \$289,947.23.**

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the 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, 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 may have lacked information or details on proposed activities for the remedial system design, implementation, startup, & O&M (e.g. as-built drawings, iron treatment, permitting, waste management, O&M checklist).
- Some bids may have offered very narrow, inappropriate critical criteria for the site characterization / pilot study results (e.g. no variability in sustained vacuum, higher groundwater recovery rates than published in the PADEP approved RAP).
- Some bids may have specified inappropriate or infeasible drilling methods and / or well screen depths for the proposed additional wells.
- Some bids may have provided little to no insight into the bidder’s interpretation of and approach to the ‘maximum extent practicable’ free product recovery goal, and rationale for discontinuing remedial activities.
- Some bids may not have adequately discussed or provided enough details on the bidder’s approach to the soil attainment sampling and / or soil vapor point installation / sampling.
- Some bids were significantly higher in cost than others while pursuing the same objectives.