

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Sheetz #10 Site

**1330 Moore Street, Huntingdon, Huntingdon County, PA
PADEP FACILITY ID #31-29418 USTIF CLAIM #2002-0295(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 who responded to the bid solicitation referenced above.

Number of firms attending the pre-bid meeting: 12

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

List of firms submitting bids: CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
 EMS Environmental, Inc.
 Environmental Alliance, Inc.
 Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.
 Juniata Geosciences, LLC
 Liberty Environmental, Inc.
 P. Joseph Lehman, Inc.

As this was a defined Scope of Work bid solicitation, price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria followed by technical soundness. Bid costs were normalized to an assumed common set of point-of-compliance (POC) wells to be sampled during the quarterly attainment sampling events (Task 2 in the RFB). The range for the normalized bid costs was \$15,499.63 to \$115,689.40.

Based on the numerical scoring, one submitted bid was determined to meet the “reasonable, necessary, and appropriate” criteria established by the Fund regulations and was deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for USTIF funding. The Claimant concurred in this assessment and has negotiated an agreement with. **Juniata Geosciences, LLC.**

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

- 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.
- 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.
- Bidders that: (a) did not discuss their rationale for attainment well selection; (b) selected attainment wells that failed to represent the multiple aquifer zones (an important criterion to the PADEP) or groundwater quality beyond the POC; (c) did not select wells that would facilitate the demonstration of plume stability and/or the modeling for the demonstration of future attainment; (d) did not discuss the site closure documentation, methods, or how work will be done; and/or (e) did not discuss groundwater trends or readiness of this site for closure received fewer technical soundness evaluation points. Bid responses that received higher technical soundness evaluation points exhibited no or fewer discrepancies and contained more detailed descriptions of the work that was to be conducted.
- Some bids described task content and/or procedures that did not match the stated requirements (e.g., failure to provide pre-event notice to the Solicitor and/or the facility; no photo-documentation of Task 4 activities; no discussion of capping or grouting the former underground remediation system piping runs; etc.). Other bids offered no discussion of groundwater sampling methodology, were missing a discussion of how purge water will be handled, or did not discuss the content of the quarterly RAPR submissions.
- 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.

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

Frank Markert