

**BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM**  
**Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation**  
**Former Charlie's Mini Mart**  
**204 Canaan Street**  
**Carbondale, Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania 18407**  
**PADEP Facility ID #35-50603; USTIF Claim #2003-0104(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 who submitted bids in response to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 13  
Number of bids received: 7

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): Alternative Environmental Solutions, Inc.  
AMO Environmental Decisions  
Chambers Environmental Group, Inc.  
Converse Consultants  
Monridge Environmental  
Pennsylvania Tectonics  
Tyree Environmental Corp.

This was a defined Scope of Work (SOW) bid; therefore, price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in base bid cost associated with the 7 bids received was \$72,260 to \$219,603. In addition to the fixed-price for the base SOW, the bid responses each included unit cost adder quotes covering variable soil excavation related work (e.g., soil T&D) beyond the base bid. The range in bids for contaminated soil T&D combined with clean fill importation ranged from \$61.00/ton to \$95.04/ton. Bids were normalized to a common expected number of units for each unit cost variable (e.g., tons of clean fill importation). Based on the numerical scoring, three of the 7 bids was determined to meet the "Reasonable and Necessary" criteria established by the Regulations and was deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for USTIF funding. The claimant reviewed and selected the accepted bid.

**The selected bidder was Pennsylvania Tectonics: Bid Price - \$72,260.00 plus \$65.40/ton for contaminated soil T&D combined with clean fill importation.**

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the 7 bids received for this solicitation. These comments are intended to provide general information that may assist in preparing bids in response to future solicitations.

## **GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS**

- Bid responses should include a rationale description and details where the words “shall” and “must” are used in the RFB. For example, if the RFB specifications are to: (a) respond to the SOW task in detail; and (b) demonstrate the prior site documentation has been reviewed, the bid response must address each specification clearly and fully. With respect to this solicitation, particularly critical RFB requirements were for the bidder to specify (1) approach for the PID screening / frequency for the excavated soils; (2) approach at side wall attainment soil sampling from completed excavation; (3) describe approach and provide anticipated locations and depths for the soil vapor monitoring points; and (4) describe approach at performing fate and transport analysis. Failing to respond to these and other specifications at all or fully affects the bid evaluation negatively.
- Bid responses should include enough “original” (i.e., not copied verbatim from the RFB) language and thought that the understanding and approach of the bidding firm can be evaluated. Since bidders are not prequalified, the technical content of the bid response must equip the evaluation committee and claimant to make a thorough and complete review of the bid and bidder. For example, in the case of this solicitation, bidders indicated that they will utilize geophysical methods to locate below grade utilities before initiating the soil excavation, and a bidder confirmed that a highway occupancy hauling permit would be required and that the permit could take up to 30 days to be issued.
- Discharging treated groundwater removed from the soil excavations to the local storm water system via a NPDES permit may be problematic and/or may unnecessarily delay the project schedule versus containerizing the water for off-site disposal.
- Given the size of the site and limited work area, stockpiling “impacted” soils for disposal may be problematic and/or cause unnecessary delays in project schedule versus “direct loading” of these impacted soils.