

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

OTTO'S SERVICE STATION

2001 MacDade Boulevard, Holmes, Ridley Township, Delaware County, Pennsylvania

PADEP Facility ID # 23-25941 – **PAUSTIF Claim # 2010-0104(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.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting	15
Number of bids received	8
Number of administratively complete bids	8
List of firms submitting bids	Alternative Environmental Solutions, Inc. Environmental Alliance Leggette, Brashears & Graham, Inc. Liberty Environmental, Inc. Mountain Research, LLC Mulry and Cresswell Environmental, Inc. Storb Environmental Inc. Tyree Environmental Corporation

This was a Fixed Price Competitive Bid for a Defined Scope of Work, so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria; however, not the sole criteria for the selection of the successful bidder. The range in cost between the 8 bids was \$ 21,146.00 to \$ 44,188.50. Based on the numerical scoring, 3 of the 8 bids were determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and were deemed acceptable to the evaluation committee for USTIF funding. The claimant has reviewed the bids and has selected the acceptable bid.

The bidder selected by the claimant was Alternative Environmental Solutions with a Bid Price of \$ 31,522.93.

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

- Bidders must provide a demonstration of an understanding of the site conditions, the problems to be addressed and detailed descriptions of how they will complete the required work scope. Some of the bidder's submittals provided little or no discussion of the site history and prior site investigations; and, as such, provided only little or no demonstration of an understanding of the site conditions.
- Some submitted bids did not clearly address any concerns regarding access, rights-of-ways and/or utilities that could impact the investigations; and, some did not include costs and provisions for access permit applications and permit fees.
- Some submitted bids did not include provisions and costs to complete the required surveying and the use of a Pennsylvania Licensed Professional Surveyor to do that work.
- Bidders were instructed to provide detailed description of the sampling methodologies and data acquisition methods that they will use; some did not.
- The RFB provided detailed discussions of the well construction and sampling methods to be used and requirements for same. Some bidder's proposals did not follow the RFB requirements; and/or did not provide for collection and analysis of the required number of samples specified by the RFB. Some bidders did not demonstrate an understanding of the methodologies required by the RFB to be used.
- Bidders were instructed to provide proof of insurance with their bid submittals. As reiterated during the mandatory site visit, simply stating that a bidder will meet or exceed the insurance requirements if awarded the contract is not sufficient.
- Some of the submitted Standard Bid Format Spreadsheets included costs for some tasks and line items necessary to the completion of the work scope, but some of those costs were not added in the final totals shown on the spreadsheets resulting in the reviewer having to add those costs to determine the true amount being bid.
- Some of the submitted Standard Bid Format Spreadsheets did not include sufficient detail for some of the line items. For example in some cases, lump costs were provided for analytic work, but per sample costs were not included.
- The RFB was for a Fixed Price Competitive Bid. At least one bidder provided a quotation as an "Estimated Fixed Price." Another bidder stated that their bid was a Fixed Price quotation, but in the detail of the bid continually listed Estimated Quantities of man hours and materials. Both conditions lead to confusion as to the bidders intent relative to a Fixed Price Contract.
- Bidders were instructed to bid the Scope of Work as presented in the RFB. As reiterated during the mandatory site visit, if a bidder wanted to propose additional work tasks or modifications of the scope of work presented by the RFB they were encouraged to do so, but that those alternatives were to be bid separately. Not all bidders followed those instructions.