

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Former Canonsburg Supply & Equipment
1718 Route 980
Cecil Township, Canonsburg
Washington County, Pennsylvania 15317
PADEP Facility ID #63-80660; USTIF Claim #2000-0022(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 who submitted bids in response to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 11
Number of bids received: 4

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.
KU Resources, Inc.
Letterle & Associates, LLC
Mountain Research, LLC

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 four (4) bids received was \$208,984.77 to \$432,970.00. 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 Letterle & Associates, LLC. Bid Price - \$208,984.77.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the four 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

- Some bids were not as cost competitive as needed to be successful with this solicitation.
- Bid responses should include detailed descriptions of the bid activities where the words “shall” and “must” are used in the RFB. Additionally, the SOW presented in the bid response must address the RFB specifications clearly and fully. With respect to this solicitation, bidders should have – (1) fully described and provided sufficient details to understand each bidders approach at their remedial system design, implementation, startup, & O&M; (2) provide details for any pre-system design pilot testing; (3) identified the proposed locations for the new monitoring and recovery wells on a drawing along with construction details description and presented the associated rationale; (4) provided rationale for when to idle remedial system and begin attainment monitoring; and (5) specifically discussed petitioning PADEP to reduce quarterly groundwater attainment events when permitted by the data.
- The bid response should have included enough “original” (i.e., not copied verbatim from the RFB) language conveying bidder’s thought such that the understanding and approach of the bidder could 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.