

**BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM**  
**Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation**  
**Sheetz Store #31**  
**380 Philadelphia Street**  
**Indiana, Indiana County, Pennsylvania 15701**  
**PADEP Facility ID #32-34720; USTIF Claim #2010-0015(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: 13  
Number of bids received: 11

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order):

- Alternative Environmental Solutions, Inc. (AES)
- Applied Geology & Environmental Sciences, Inc. (AGES)
- American Geosciences, Inc. (AGI)
- CORE Environmental Services, Inc. (CORE)
- DMS Environmental Services, LLC (DMSE)
- Environmental Alliance (EA)
- Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc. (GES)
- Letterle & Associates, LLC (Letterle)
- Mountain Research, LLC (MRLLC)
- P. Joseph Lehman, Inc.
- United Environmental Group (UEG)

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 \$16,889.45 to \$37,491.80. Based on the numerical scoring, three (GES, CORE, and Letterle) 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 GES with the bid price of \$16,889.45.**

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 respond to the SOW task in detail, the bid response must address each specification clearly and fully. With respect to this solicitation, particularly critical RFB requirements were for the bidder to – (1) identify the proposed location for the source area monitoring well (on a drawing) and demonstrate an understanding of the reasoning for the new monitoring well; (2) adequately describe the bid approach for the groundwater attainment task, in particular, to identify the wells to be sampled along with purge and sampling methods, analytes, and purge water disposal methods, and specify the intent to petition PADEP to reduce quarterly groundwater attainment events if data permits; (3) adequately describe the bid approach to the fate and transport modeling task, including describing the approach for slug testing (e.g., 3 wells to be used) and bid approach for the associated fate and transport modeling; and (4) describe the bid approach for preparing RACR including how soil risks would be assessed, and how / what IC’s and/or EC’s might be identified for the site.
- 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 the rationale / reasoning for the proposed new monitoring well in the source area; included the monitoring of the stream gauges in developing groundwater flow maps; and indicated what data would be used improve fate and transport model accuracy.