

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
United Refining Kwik Fill S-171 Site
400 Allegheny River Blvd., Oakmont, PA 15139
PADEP FACILITY ID #02-29317 USTIF CLAIM #2010-0118(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 responded to the bid solicitation referenced above.

Number of firms attending the pre-bid meeting: 13

Number of bids received from those firms attending the pre-bid meeting: 7

List of firms submitting bids:

- Converse Consultants, Inc.
- CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
- Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.
- Juniata Geosciences, LLC
- Letterle & Associates, LLC
- P. Joseph Lehman, Inc.
- United Environmental Group, Inc.

As this was a defined Scope of Work bid solicitation, price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria followed by technical soundness. The initial range in baseline costs quoted among the seven bids received was \$69,725 to \$109,806. To these baseline costs, the same minimum quantities were applied to each bidder's quoted unit rates to produce a normalized total cost. This process resulted in normalized bidder costs falling in the range of \$105,791 to \$150,686. Based on the numerical scoring, three of the seven bids submitted were determined to meet the "Reasonable, Necessary, and Appropriate" criteria established by the Fund regulations and were deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for USTIF funding. These three bids ranged in cost from \$105,791 to \$112,637. Following its review of these three bids, the Claimant selected the following bidder.

Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc. Bid Price - \$105,855.

The attached list offers some general comments regarding the technical soundness evaluation of the bids received in response to this solicitation. These comments are intended to provide information that may assist in preparing responses to future USTIF-sponsored competitive bid solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- The Limited Soil Excavation & Soil Attainment Demonstration task (Task 2) was deemed the most critical work scope task technically and proved to be the task that accounted for the bulk of the proposed costs. Therefore, this task was assigned 50% of the possible total technical soundness evaluation points while the remaining eight tasks were weighted equally.
- The RFB emphasized the importance of each bidder demonstrating its understanding of the scope of work and detail its task implementation, including any contingent or optional elements deemed necessary. Therefore, bid responses that simply referenced the RFB task descriptions or copied the RFB task descriptions largely verbatim failed to adequately demonstrate that the bidder had evaluated the RFB and the accompanying historical site documents. The subsequent task descriptions were lacking content that are regarded as necessary and appropriate to accomplish the project objectives. Similarly, bids that did not discuss (or only briefly discussed) the bidder's perspective on the site background/history and that do not offer its interpretation of the conceptual site model (based on the currently available site data) fail to demonstrate an investment in thinking about site conditions.
- Several bids described task content and/or procedures that did not match the stated requirements. Among the more significant discrepancies were these:
 - Neglecting to include Task 1A as identified in the bidder question responses distributed to all bidders
 - Failing to specify the correct number of high-vacuum extraction wells to be sampled before and after each event and/or specifying the incorrect number of wells to be sampled under a given task (either too many or too few)
 - Specifying a project schedule that failed to meet the requirement to complete Tasks 1 through 3 within four months
 - Specifying PID screening values for segregating impacted vs. "clean" soils beyond the acceptable range stated in the RFB
 - Failing to address/mention specific technical elements or procedures identified in the RFB such as the biased post-excavation soil attainment sampling, well development, well sampling, and well abandonment
- Bid responses that received higher technical soundness scores exhibited no or fewer discrepancies that were not otherwise justified and contained more detailed descriptions of the work that was to be conducted.

- Several bids failed to convey the correct timing for the work specified, particularly relative to the conduct of other tasks in the work scope or relative to the Solicitor's preference that soil excavation not be attempted until the availability of asphalt is assured for immediate restoration of the excavated area.
- Choosing not to include project personnel resumes and/or project organization charts presents difficulties for assessing bidder qualifications and experience to perform the scope of work.

Again, thank you for participating in this competitive bid solicitation.

Frank Markert