

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Classic Super Petrol, Inc.
190 West Street Road, Feasterville, Pennsylvania 19053
PADEP Facility ID #09-30207 PAUSTIF Claim #2019-0191(F)

The Pennsylvania Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Fund (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: 7
Number of bids received: 6
List of firms submitting bids: Atlas Technical Consultants, LLC
Earth Systems, Inc.
EnviroSure, Inc.
MEA, Inc.
Mountain Research, LLC
Scientific Based Solutions, LLC

This was a Defined Scope of Work bid and so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. One bidder chose to withdraw their bid following submittal. The range in cost between the five evaluated bids was \$62,462 to \$97,454. Based on the numerical scoring, two of the six bids were determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for PAUSTIF funding. The claimant had the option to select any of the consulting firms that had a technical score that allowed the bid to advance to cost scoring to complete the scope of work defined in the Request for Bid (RFB); however, PAUSTIF will only provide funding up to the fixed-price cost of the highest bid deemed acceptable by the bid review committee. In this case, the claimant elected to follow the committee’s recommendation and selected one of the two bids deemed to be acceptable for funding.

The bidder selected by the claimant was Mountain Research, LLC: Bid Price - \$77,128.67

The attached sheet lists 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 preparing bids for future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- Bids should be prepared following Request For Bid (RFB) instructions so they are administratively complete. Some bids were missing information/documents such as standard operating procedures, subcontractor quotations, lists of bid labor rates, subcontractor markup details, and signed bid cost forms.
- Submittal deadlines in the RFB shall be strictly adhered to. Late submittals or responses will result in bid disqualification.
- Some bids included assumptions in the technical sections of the bid that would modify the Remediation Agreement. All assumptions and requested modifications to the Remediation Agreement must only be listed under the Remediation Agreement section of the Required Responses Submission Form.
- Some bids contained costs within the technical sections of the bid. Bidders shall provide bid costs only in the Bid Cost Submission Form. No cost information should be provided in the technical submittal.
- Bidders shall utilize submission attachments specific to the subject RFB; attachments from prior RFBs (e.g., subcontractor quotations or other documents) should not be included with a bid submission.
- Some bids lacked enough detail to clearly demonstrate how each milestone would be completed. The bid should discuss all milestones and optional milestones, what specific activities are important to meet objectives in each task, and how the tasks will be completed (e.g., provide sufficient detail on the bidder's understanding and approach for developing an updated conceptual site model, and completion of an exposure pathway evaluation and remedial alternatives analysis).
- Some bids did not provide sufficient information on the schedule and sequencing of milestones to demonstrate how the work would be performed.
- Some bid responses failed to provide enough "original" language and thought, so that the qualifications and approach of the bidder could be evaluated (e.g., nothing more than the RFB work scope was provided). This includes discussion on unique site conditions and potential issues or challenges that may be encountered during performance of the work. Because bidders are not pre-qualified, sufficient details regarding bidders' understanding of site conditions and approach for conducting work must be provided so the evaluation committee can thoroughly evaluate the technical aspects of the bid and bidder.
- Bidders should include all information or procedures requested as part of milestone tasks (e.g., health and safety procedures, groundwater purging and sampling methods, QA/QC procedures, laboratory analysis methods, sample management procedures, details on waste management) in the bid submittal. In some cases, this information was not provided which negatively impacted the bid's technical score.

- In accordance with the RFB Site-specific Guidelines, additional health and safety precautions may be warranted for specific milestones and shall be included as part of the bidder's base bid. Bidders are responsible for conducting the work safely and in accordance with industry standards.
- Some bids were missing copies of quotations from subcontractors included as part of their proposed work scope. Quotations from all major subcontractors (including, but not limited to, drilling companies, surveyors, and analytical laboratories) should be included as attachments in the bid package. In addition, details on subcontractor involvement should be provided for milestones.
- Bidders should provide thorough and detailed answers to the questions posed in the Qualifications and Experience (Q&E) section of the Required Responses Submission Form to highlight the bidder's qualifications and experience. In some cases, bidders provided inadequate details/discussion of project experience included within the Q&E section which negatively impacted their score.