

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Sheetz Stores, Inc. #159 Site
315 Water Street, Conneaut Lake, Pennsylvania
PADEP Facility ID #20-31866 PAUSTIF Claim #2008-131(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: 7

Number of bids received: 3

List of firms submitting bids:

CORE Environmental Services, Inc.

Environmental Alliance, Inc.

Groundwater & Environmental Services, Inc.

This was a defined Scope of Work bid and so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria, followed by technical soundness. This RFB and subsequent contract included a fixed reimbursement portion and a performance payment portion based on achieving specified groundwater cleanup goals in the contract. The range in total cost for meeting the cleanup goals went from \$397,074 to \$557,199. Based on the numerical scoring, only one of the three 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. Following their review of all the bids, the claimant reviewed and selected the following bidder.

The selected bidder was CORE Environmental Services, Inc.: Bid Price - \$397,074.

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

- Bidder task descriptions were evaluated from each bid to determine the bidder's understanding of the task scope of work, their plans for work implementation, their plans for any contingencies, compliance with RFB requirements, and any task assumptions made. The highest technical scoring bidders addressed all of these factors in their bids(s). When task descriptions presented in a bid response simply reference or mimic the Request for Bid (RFB) task descriptions verbatim, it is not clear whether the bidder's technical personnel actually evaluated 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. Each bidder is requested to evaluate each individual task and describe, in detail, how they would accomplish the task themselves.
- Bidders are encouraged to discuss the Site background / history of the site to demonstrate they have a reasonably good understanding of existing on and potential off site conditions. A discussion of the site conceptual model and known site technical issues / considerations is also useful. This also aids the reviewer when evaluating each task knowing that the bidder may anticipate any problems that could arise from previous releases and or conditions.
- This RFB contained an optional task which could be used to modify / enhance the RAP proposed remediation system and its operation. Some bidders discussed several alternatives / add-ons to the selected remedial technology, but did not select or choose a single technology to propose to enhance the design.
- Bidders should avoid using ill-defined or unreasonable assumptions that cast doubt on the reliability of the bid. Bidders should reconsider inserting bids assumptions of specific conditions that are reasonably likely to arise that would trigger the contract "new condition" clause. Bidders should also reconsider inserting critical bid assumptions that are not adequately defined.

Again, thank you for participating in this competitive bid solicitation.

Frank Markert