

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Belany's Mini Mart
200 Division Ave, Ben Avon, PA 15202
PADEP Facility ID #02-36089, PAUSTIF Claim #2008-0171(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: 7

Number of bids received from those firms attending the pre-bid meeting: 6

List of firms submitting bids:

CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
Envirotrac LTD
Key Environmental, Inc.
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 range in price for bids was \$32,825.68 to \$78,200.52. Based on the numerical scoring, two bids were determined to meet the "reasonable, necessary, and appropriate" criteria established by the Fund regulations, were deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for USTIF funding, and were relayed to the Claimant for review. **The Claimant selected and has subsequently negotiated an agreement with CORE Environmental Services, Inc.**

The attached list offers some general comments regarding the 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

Some of the bids received were not as cost competitive as needed to be successful with this solicitation.

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 the accompanying historical site documents, and received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

Similarly, bids that did not provide any site history or project background discussion or 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) received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

Bid responses that received higher technical soundness evaluation points exhibited no or fewer discrepancies relative to the RFB SOW and contained more detailed descriptions of the work that was to be conducted.

Bids that appeared to neglect proposing at least one monitoring well location that would evaluate source area groundwater quality, and/or bids that appeared to offer a minimally suitable configuration for estimating groundwater gradient / flow direction, received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

Bidders who did not propose at least some soil sampling within the expected source area received fewer technical soundness evaluation points.

Fewer technical soundness evaluation points were given to bids that neglected to: (a) discuss performing the background research requested in the SOW, including researching geology and water use ordinances, surveying local water use, and developing a preliminary conceptual site model; (b) describe soil boring clearing methods, boring installation methods, soil parameters to be analyzed, boring abandonment procedures, or investigation-derived waste (IDW) management; (c) discuss well installation methods and well development procedures; (d) describe the possible need for a risk assessment and its application to development of site-specific standards; and/or (e) discuss the potential need for environmental covenants and/or covenant waivers for the adjacent roadways.

Bids that presented an inordinate number of assumptions or extremely narrow or unreasonable assumptions, special conditions, and exemptions made the bid response difficult to evaluate.

Bidders must be certain that the costs discussed in the text of the proposal match the costs presented in the Standardized Bid Form spreadsheet. One bid could not be evaluated due to cost discrepancies because the amount of the bid could not be determined.

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

Jim Ackerman