

# **BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM**

## **Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation**

### **Worthington Sunoco**

**15126 US Route 422, Worthington, PA 16262**

**PADEP Facility ID #03-80025**

**PAUSTIF Claim #2017-0043(F)**

---

The 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.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting:	<b>7</b>
Number of bids received:	<b>5</b>
List of firms submitting bids:	<b>Compliance Environmental Services CORE Environmental Services, Inc. DMS Environmental Services, LLC Mountain Research, LLC P. Joseph Lehman, Inc.</b>

This was a Defined Scope of Work so cost was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the five evaluated bids was \$57,627.60 to \$89,973.78.

**The bidder selected by the claimant was CORE Environmental Services, Inc.**

**Bid Price – \$57,627.60.**

**Amount deemed acceptable for USTIF funding – \$57,627.60.**

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the five 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 preparing bids for future solicitations.

## GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- Bids were regarded less favorably if they did not include enough details conveying bidder's own understanding of site conditions, conceptual site model, and approach to addressing the scope of work. Since bidders are not prequalified, bid content must be sufficient to equip the evaluation committee and Claimant to thoroughly assess the bid and the bidder.
- Some bids lacked clarity on, and/or did not appropriately address, and/or proposed inappropriate work for the additional groundwater characterization work. For example, bid(s) were viewed less favorably if the proposed well locations did not appear to attempt to provide delineation of the contaminant plumes in all directions; did not provide the construction details for the proposed monitoring wells; and/or proposed the 3 vertical delineation / POC wells closer to source area to avoid installing the wells within the PennDOT ROW.
- Bids that did not label the proposed additional monitoring wells with distinct ID's were viewed less favorably.
- The RFB required that the bid response identify the wells, along with rationale, to be used during aquifer testing work, which some bid responses failed to provide. Some bids were also viewed less favorably if slug testing was proposed on existing wells that are likely to provide insufficient water for testing and/or were outside the contamination zone.
- Some bids did not provide proposed sampling procedures / analyses for the tank field OW.
- Bids that lacked adequate discussion of proposed work and rationale for the optional F&T modeling of the nearby stream were viewed less favorably.
- Some bids lacked clarity on or did not appropriately address the vapor intrusion evaluation work. For example, bid(s) were viewed less favorably if the proposed work did not appear to satisfy current Act 2 guidance and/or were proposing work without rationale for the sampling locations.
- Bids that did not include details of the proposed risk assessor / risk assessment team experience and/or identify where the firm had completed similar SSS closure projects under Chapter 245 were regarded less favorably.
- Some bids did not appropriately address or lacked clarity on, and/or proposed inappropriate work regarding the human health exposure evaluation and risk assessment. For example, some bids lacked clarity on how: potential risk to construction/utility worker in roadway right-of-way would be addressed; the risk assessment would take into account current land-use restriction already applied to Site; and/or whether a potable well prohibition EC waiver would be sought from PADEP for the roadway.
- Bids which proposed collecting monitoring well groundwater samples using bailers were viewed less favorably since this is inconsistent with the RFB.