

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed-Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
CoGo's Store #007

RR 1, Box 104, Templeton, Armstrong County, Pennsylvania 16259
PADEP Facility ID #03-80031; PAUSTIF Claim #2005-0210 (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.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting:	15
Number of bids received:	11
Number of administratively complete bids:	11
List of firms submitting bids:	

- Alternative Environmental Solutions, Inc.
- American Geosciences, Inc.
- Converse Consultants
- CORE Environmental Services, Inc.
- DMS Environmental Services, LLC
- Environmental Alliance, Inc.
- Letterle & Associates, LLC
- MIG Environmental, LLC
- Moriarty Environmental Solutions, Inc.
- Mountain Research, LLC
- United Environmental Group, Inc.

This was a defined Scope of Work bid and so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the eleven evaluated bids was \$75,710 to \$186,762. Based on the numerical scoring, three of the eleven bids were determined to meet the "Reasonable and Necessary" criteria established by the Regulations and were deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for USTIF funding. The Claimant reviewed and selected one of the bids deemed acceptable.

The selected bidder was Mountain Research, LLC
Bid Price - \$85,704.

The attached sheet lists 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 preparing bids for future solicitations.

GENERAL COMMENTS REGARDING EVALUATED BIDS

- A limited number of bid responses provided very little or no detail on the technical approach to completing the prescribed Request for Bid (RFB) tasks. As such, it was not clear whether these bidders understood the RFB scope of work and technical evaluation of these bid responses was not possible.
- Six key considerations for the bid evaluation were identified in the RFB as being crucial to the successful completion of this project. However, none of the bid responses completely addressed these key considerations and most bids addressed less than half.
- One or more technical inadequacies were identified for the monitoring well installation task in several of the bid responses related primarily to the proposed length and method for installing surface casing, the specific groundwater horizons targeted for monitoring, and the methods for monitoring the shallow well borings for the presence / absence of groundwater.
- Several bids proposed pumping and observation wells for the aquifer characterization task that were questionable for producing adequate hydraulic data either for the site characterization or as input to the remedial feasibility / alternatives analysis.
- A limited number of bid responses failed to recognize the RFB request for developing a numerical groundwater / contaminant fate and transport model which the PADEP has indicated will likely be necessary for this site.
- Several bid responses did not appear to grasp the technical and regulatory requirements for replacing the facility groundwater supply well.
- At least one bid failed to recognize the PADEP requirement that all waste waters generated at this facility during the site characterization and replacement water supply well installation work be containerized and properly transported / treated / disposed off-property.

Thank you for your participation.

Bob

Robert D. Breakwell, P.G.
Project Manager
EXCALIBUR GROUP, LLC