

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Cost Not-To-Exceed Time and Materials Competitive Bid Solicitation

SUNOCO MARIETTA AVENUE, LANCASTER, PA

2141 Marietta Avenue, Lancaster, Lancaster County, Pennsylvania

PADEP Facility ID # 36-20447 – PAUSTIF Claim # 2010-0004(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.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting 15

Number of bids received 11

Number of administratively complete bids 11

List of firms submitting bids

- Alternative Environmental Solutions
- Chambers Environmental Group, Inc.
- Converse Consultants
- Environmental Alliance
- Leggette, Brasheres & Graham
- MEA
- Mountain Research, LLC
- Mulry & Cresswell
- P Joseph Lehman
- Storb Environmental
- Tyree Environmental

This was a Cost-Not-To-Exceed Time and Materials Competitive Bid for the Completion of a Site Characterization Plus. As this was a Bid to Result solicitation, the technical and regulatory approach of the bidder towards solving the problem was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria; however, not the sole criteria for the selection of the successful bidder.

The range in cost between the 11 bids was \$ 46,447.48 to \$ 84,041.41. Based on the numerical scoring, 2 of the 11 bids were determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and were deemed acceptable to the

evaluation committee for USTIF funding. The claimant has reviewed the bids and has informed the Fund that he has selected an acceptable bidder.

The bidder selected by the claimant was Alternative Environmental Solutions with a Base Contract Bid Price of \$ 49,826.00.

Following are some general comments regarding the evaluation of the bids that were received for this solicitation. These comments are intended to provide information regarding the bids that were received for this solicitation and to assist you in future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- Bidders were required to provide a demonstration of an understanding of the site conditions, the problems to be addressed and detailed descriptions of how they will complete the required work scope. Some of the bid packages submitted provided little or no discussion of the site history and prior site investigations; and, as such, provided only little or no demonstration of an understanding of the site conditions.
- Bidders should have provided detailed descriptions of the sampling methodologies and data acquisition methods that they would use; some did not.
- The RFB provided detailed discussions of the well construction and sampling methods to be used. Some bidder's proposed well constructions and samplings did not follow the specified methodologies; and, some bidders did not demonstrate an understanding of the methodologies required to be used.
- Some monitoring well locations proposed by some bidders were considered to be sited such that they would not result in full characterization of the site and/or did not include necessary off-site well locations.
- Not all bidders provided a discussion of or plans for any pilot testing, nor discussion of how site appropriate remedial alternatives would be identified and evaluated. Consequently, those proposals were considered to be insufficient to meet the goals and requirements of the Site Characterization Plus required by the RFB.
- The RFB clearly stated that bidders must provide proof of insurance with their bid submittals. Some bidders simply stated that they have sufficient insurance, or will meet or exceed the insurance requirements if awarded. That is not consistent with the requirements of the RFB.