

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Request for Bid (RFB)
Supplemental Site Characterization Report Including
Fate and Transport and Risk Assessment
Pinto's Atlantic Inc.
1317 South 3rd Street, Philadelphia, PA 19147
PADEP Facility ID #51-30404; USTIF Claim #1999-0439(M)

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 the pre-bid meeting:	16
Number of bids received:	10
List of firms submitting bids:	Alternative Environmental Solutions, Inc. Converse Consultants Environmental Alliance, Inc. EnviroTrac Ltd. Gilmore & Associates, Inc. MEA, Inc. MIG Environmental & Drilling Monridge Environmental, LLC Mountain Research, LLC Mulry and Cresswell Environmental, Inc.

This was a defined scope of work bid so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the 10 bids was \$53,052.00 to \$84,113.20. Based on the numerical scoring, 2 of the 10 bids were determined to meet the "Reasonable and Necessary" criteria established by the Regulations and were deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for USTIF funding. The claimant reviewed these bids and made his selection:

The selected bidder was Mountain Research, LLC: Bid Price - \$61,537.50

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the bids that were received for the 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

- Bid responses that contain very little text describing how the bidder plans to complete the SOW or simply reiterates or attaches the RFB text make it difficult to evaluate the bidders understanding of the nature of the problem and knowledge of how to perform the work.
- Some bid responses contained more assumptions and/or much more restrictive assumptions than others. Excessive assumptions can make a bid difficult to evaluate and can lessen the chances of success.
- One or more bid responses indicated that the bidder did not fully consider the emailed Q&A.
- One or more bidders specified use of geoprobe direct push technology, which is not recommended for monitoring wells. Some of the more powerful geoprobe models can use hollow stem augers, which can be a viable option. While most (maybe all) TPR bid reviewers may be aware of the various geoprobe model capabilities, bidders should specify both the model and HSA if planning to use HSA capability (most bidders did this very well).
- One bid response specified 4 rather than 8 vapor samples. The bid documented 4 nested points with 2 intervals in each.
- One bid response provided no text discussing the slug testing task. Another bid referenced an ASTM method with very limited text in the bid response. Bidders should consider that discussions specific to the bid site can be more effective at conveying a bidders understanding than general references which often contain multiple options and large amounts of information not pertinent to the bid task.
- Bidders should not assume that all TPR reviewers are familiar with or have easy access to all potential method references.