

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

United Kwik Fill M-389

8795 Wattsburg Road, Erie, PA 16509

PADEP Facility ID #25-10433

PAUSTIF Claim #1995-0370(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 all the bidders.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 6

Number of bids received: 6

List of firms submitting bids:

Compliance Environmental Services

CORE Environmental Services, Inc.

Flynn Environmental, Inc.

Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.

Letterle & Associates, LLC

Moody and Associates, Inc.

This was a Defined Scope of Work bid and so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion; however, the numerical scoring process gave consideration to price, technical soundness, and bidder qualifications. The range in cost between the six (6) bids evaluated was \$51,761.83 to \$87,762.00. Based on the numerical scoring, two of the six bids were determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and were deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for PAUSTIF funding. The claimant reviewed and selected the bid from these two “reasonable and necessary” bids.

The selected bidder is Compliance Environmental Services: Bid Price – \$53,930.00.

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.

- The SOW was amended during the RFB question and answer period to include a professional survey to field locate the northeast facility property boundary bordering Old Wattsburg Road and to also locate a natural gas pipeline right-of-way (ROW) positioned near that boundary. This work was considered important for accurately locating POC wells outside the road and pipeline ROWs. Proposals that failed to address this added survey work received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.
- The RFB indicated that “*each bid should specify those measures to be taken to ensure the initial five (5) feet at each boring location is clear of utilities.*” Proposals that failed to address this point received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.
- The RFB emphasized that each bidder should demonstrate its understanding of the scope of work and detail its task implementation, including any contingent or optional elements deemed necessary. 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, as a result, received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.
- One of the RFB requirements for a bid response was to provide “*a clear description, specific details, and original language of how the proposed work scope will be completed for each milestone.*” Proposals that failed to provide specific details and/or their own descriptions (i.e., original language) for all milestones received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.
- The RFB requested “*a detailed schedule of activities for completing the proposed SOW, including reasonable assumptions regarding the timing and duration of Solicitor reviews (if any) needed to complete the SOW. Each bid must provide a schedule that begins with execution of the Remediation Agreement with the Solicitor and ends with completion of the final Milestone proposed in this RFB. Schedules must also indicate the approximate start and end of each of the milestones specified in the SOW, and indicate the timing of all proposed key milestone activities.*” Proposals that failed to provide a schedule for all milestones received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.
- The RFB advised bidders that complete plume stability analysis requires a comprehensive qualitative and quantitative assessment and should be based on the preponderance of data for overall plume stability, and provided a detailed outline of how this analysis might be approached. Proposals that failed to address both the qualitative and quantitative elements of the plume stability assessment received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

- Bids that failed to correctly identify the circumstance that would trigger implementation of Milestone G (Fate-and-Transport Modeling) received fewer technical soundness evaluation points. In this case, Milestone G would be triggered if the interior source area wells still exhibit detectable COC concentrations above the respective PADEP SHS-MSCs at the conclusion of Milestone B.
- Bids that did not indicate that PADEP would be contacted for approval of the (a) final proposed POC well locations, and/or (b) proposed fate-and-transport modeling method (should Milestone G be implemented) received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

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

Jim Ackerman