

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Cost Not-to-Exceed Time and Materials Competitive Bid Solicitation

Jackson's Citgo

1112 Slate Hill Road, Lower Allen Township, Cumberland County, Pennsylvania

PADEP Facility ID # 21-61843 – PAUSTIF Claim # 2001-0031(S)

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 pre-bid meeting	21
Number of bids received	13
Number of administratively complete bids	13

List of firms submitting bids	Alternative Environmental Services, Inc. Apex Companies, LLC B&B Diversified Enterprises Chambers Environmental Duffield Associates Groundwater Services International Langan Engineering Liberty Environmental MEA Moriarity Environmental Solutions Mountain Research Patriot Environmental Skelly and Loy, Inc.
-------------------------------	--

This was a Cost Not-to-Exceed Time and Materials Competitive Bid to complete a Site Characterization Plus for the subject site. The Request For Bid required that the successful bidder will complete the necessary investigations and submit a Site Characterization Plus Report (SCPR) which shall include sufficiently detailed remedial technology evaluations to permit PaDEP's review and approval those technologies which are determined to be viable. As such, the bidders understanding of the Site Characterization Plus process, technical approach and costing were factors which were heavily weighted evaluation criteria.

The range in cost between the 13 bids was \$ 76,767.50 to \$ 235,410.90.

The selected bidder was B&B Diversified: Bid Price: \$ 76,767.50.

Following are 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 future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- This bid was for a Site Characterization Plus, and required that the successful bidder demonstrate an understanding of the Site Characterization Process and provide a scope of work that was sufficient to meet the project goals. One or more bidder failed to demonstrate an understanding of the Site Characterization Plus process. One or more bidder provided work scope(s) considered to be insufficient to adequately assess appropriate remedial alternatives capable of achieving the remedial goals for the site. One or more bidder proposed insufficient, inappropriate or no pilot testing(s) of remedial alternatives that would be reasonably considered to be appropriate for remediation of the site.
- One or more bidder proposed remediation to the Statewide Health Standard rather than a Site Specific Standard. The Request For Bid clearly specified that this site is to be remediated to the Site Specific Standard.
- Bidders should provide a detailed description of the sampling methodologies and data acquisition methods that they will use.
- The use of low flow sampling techniques for the collection of groundwater samples from monitoring wells is generally considered to result in more representative samples than are able to be obtained through purging of a set number of well volumes and bailing of samples. One or more bidder proposed low flow purging of the wells, but the collection of samples using bailers, which is considered to be an inappropriate sampling methodology.
- One or more bidder proposed to complete Fate and Transport modeling using Quick Domenico only. The Quick Domenico model is not considered to be appropriate for karstic bedrock aquifers such as that present beneath this site.
- One or more bidder proposed the closure of existing wells by tremie grouting. Simply tremie grouting a screened well without first removing or drilling out the well screen will not result in an reasonable sealing of the well, as groundwater and contaminants would still be able to circulate along the sand pack on the exterior of the screen.
- One or more bidder provided quotation(s) for the closure of 2-inch diameter; however, as identified in the Request For Bid, the wells are 4-inch diameter.
- One or more bidder proposed soil borings or wells, but failed to identify the locations of those borings and wells.
- One or more bidder proposed the completion of bedrock wells as open rock holes despite information from prior site investigations indicating that well bores were unstable within the bedrock and required screening to remain open.

- One or more bidder proposed the installation of monitoring wells to depths that were considered to be excessive based on conditions identified from prior site investigations.
- One or more bidder proposed the installation of monitoring wells to depths that were considered to be too shallow based on conditions identified from prior site investigations.
- One or more bidder proposed the use of geophysical techniques which were considered to be unnecessary or ineffective due to interferences that would occur from overhead wires and vehicles located on the property.
- One or more bidder failed to provide for aquifer testing of both the overburden wells and the bedrock wells.
- One or more bidder neglected to include sampling of the unused former supply well on the neighboring property.
- One or more bidder failed to provide proof of insurance with their bid submittals. Simply stating that a bidder will meet or exceed the insurance requirements if awarded the contract is not sufficient.
- Bidders must clearly state whether or not they accept the standard contract.