

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed-Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Lakeshore Service Station
5434 West Lake Road, Erie, PA 16505
PADEP Facility ID #25-90482; PAUSTIF Claim #2001-0308(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: | 9 |
| Number of bids received: | 4 |
| List of firms submitting bids: | CORE Environmental Services, Inc. Environmental Remediation & Recovery, Inc. Juniata Geosciences, LLC Letterle & Associates, LLC |

This was a defined Scope of Work bid and so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the four evaluated bids was \$49,263.00 to \$101,614.82. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the four 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 acceptable bid.

The selected bidder was Environmental Remediation & Recovery, Inc.:
Bid Price - \$49,263.00.

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

- When task descriptions presented in a bid response simply reference or copy the Request for Bid (RFB) task descriptions verbatim, it is not clear whether the bidder’s technical personnel actually reviewed the RFB and historical site documents, understood the technical requirements, and developed task content that the bidder regarded as necessary and appropriate to accomplish the project objectives. Furthermore, the RFB clearly stated that simply referencing the RFB specifications / requirements or repeating the RFB text verbatim would not be considered a sufficient description of the bidder’s proposed scope of work in full and in detail.
- Regarding the on-property soil attainment demonstration task, some bids did not propose to review new or historical depth to groundwater data to refine the assumed depth of 20 feet below grade for each soil boring as estimated in the RFB for bidding purposes. Also, some bids did not include professional surveying of the soil attainment borings as requested in the RFB.
- For the soil vapor intrusion assessment task, some bid responses were found to be technically deficient because either: a) an excessive depth for the soil vapor monitoring point installations was specified; b) the proposed location for one or more soil vapor monitoring

points was not reasonable or appropriate; and c) the proposed soil vapor monitoring point construction was insufficient.

- The RFB called for in-place abandonment of all monitoring and recovery wells. However, a limited number of bids specified pulling the casing with no indication that the PADEP would be contacted to first determine whether this additional effort is actually necessary.
- Some bids stated that the well on the adjoining Huttle property would be abandoned. However, this was a contingency task that only needed to be performed if warranted by groundwater analytical results and if permission was granted by the property owner.