

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Blue Bell Sunoco

899 Dekalb Pike, Blue Bell, PA 19422

PADEP Facility ID #46-20382 PAUSTIF Claim #2016-0163(I)

The PAUSTIF 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:

10

Number of bids received:

6

List of firms submitting bids:

Alpha Geoscience

August Mack

Environmental Alliance

MEA, Inc.

Mountain Research, LLC

Storb Environmental

This was a Defined Scope of Work so costs was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the six evaluated bids was \$41,703.17 to \$55,003.50. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the six bids was determined to meet the “Reasonable and Necessary” criteria established by the Regulations and was deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for PAUSTIF funding. The claimant had the option to select any of the consulting firms who properly submitted a bid to complete the scope of work defined in the RFB; however, PAUSTIF only provides funding up to the fixed-price cost of the highest bid deemed acceptable by the bid review committee. In this case the claimant elected to follow the committee’s recommendation.

The bidder selected by the claimant was MEA, Inc.: Bid Price – \$41,703.17.

Amount deemed acceptable for USTIF funding – \$41,703.17.

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

- Bids were regarded less favorably if they did not include enough details conveying bidder's own understanding of site conditions, conceptual site model, and approach to addressing the scope of work. Since bidders are not prequalified, bid content must be sufficient to equip the evaluation committee and Claimant to thoroughly assess the bid and the bidder.
- The RFB required that the bid response provide drawings showing the proposed location for the soil borings, monitoring wells, stream sampling locations, and soil vapor sampling points, and provide the rationale for the locations; however, some bids did not provide the required drawings and/or did not provide sufficient rationale for the monitoring locations.
- Some bids lacked enough clarity on, did not appropriately address, and/or proposed inappropriate work regarding the additional soil characterization. For example, (a) the proposed approach did not adequately address all three of the areas identified in the RFB; (b) did not provide the location for the background soil boring; (c) did not label the proposed soil borings on a drawing with specific IDs; (d) did not accurately depict on a drawing the known areas of concern as identified in the RFB; (e) did not indicate the depth of the soil borings; (f) did not discuss advancing borings/sampling to confirm existing soil impacts; (g) proposed using air knife/vacuum to clear each boring location to depth of five feet, when RFB required using methods that will not volatilize shallow soil contaminants (e.g. hand auger).
- Some bids did not propose or specify purging and sampling the monitoring wells using low flow methods as required in the RFB.
- Some bids lacked enough clarity or proposed inappropriate work regarding the vapor intrusion (VI) evaluation. For example, some bids may have provided only a vague description for the location of the sampling points and / or did not provide construction details for the sampling points, or sampling procedures / methods or may have inappropriately proposed installing soil vapor sampling points too deep or did not adequately address the spill/release area and / or existing site building and / or proposed methods inconsistent with latest PADEP VI guidance.
- Any bid that proposed completing stream sampling before or during the groundwater investigation did not fully follow the RFB SOW, which called for the stream sampling to be done after the groundwater investigation and if groundwater investigation data exceeded the PADEP SHS.