

**BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM**  
**Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation**  
**Risk-Based Closure via Site Specific Standards**  
**Jake Schneider's Garage**  
**1609 Smith Township Road**  
**Atlasburg, Pennsylvania 15004**  
**PADEP Facility ID #63-30485; USTIF Claim #1999-0571(F)**

---

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 who submitted bids in response to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 9  
Number of bids received: 7

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): CORE Environmental Services, Inc.  
DMS Environmental Services, LLC  
Flynn Environmental, Inc.  
In-Site Group, Inc.  
Letterle & Associates, LLC  
Moody & Associates, Inc.  
Sovereign Consulting, Inc.

This was a bid to result scope of work (SOW) bid; therefore, the bidders technical approach was the most heavily weighted evaluation criterion. The range in base bid cost associated with the seven bids received was \$40,437.34 to \$78,006.00. Based on the numerical scoring, two of the seven bids was determined to meet the "Reasonable and Necessary" criteria established by the Regulations and were deemed acceptable by the evaluation committee for PAUSTIF funding. The claimant reviewed and selected the acceptable bid.

**The selected bidder was CORE Environmental Services, Inc. - \$40,437.34.**

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the seven 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**

- Bids that did not include enough “original” (i.e., not copied verbatim from the RFB) language conveying bidder’s thought such that the understanding of site conditions, interpretation of the conceptual site model, closure approach, and approach to addressing the scope of work could be evaluated were regarded less favorably. Since bidders are not prequalified, the content of the bid response must equip the evaluation committee and Claimant to make a thorough and complete review of the bid and bidder.
- Some bids did not adequately explain their approach at demonstrating plume stability. For example, lack sufficient details to understand approach for both the quantitative and qualitative approach; unclear on the data to be used in the evaluation (e.g. post-remedial data); and no discussion on how all of the data would be evaluated as a whole and how any differences between the quantitative and qualitative evaluation would be resolved.
- If supplemental site characterization activities were proposed, some bids lacked sufficient clarity on the location of soil borings and sampling intervals, and failed to explain how the results from these activities would impact the remedial approach.
- Some bids did not adequately explain approach to finalizing the risk assessment, including identifying deficiencies of the current risk assessment, how the deficiencies will be resolved and identifying / re-evaluating exposure point concentrations.
- Some bids lack clarity on the institutional controls envisioned and if the institutional controls would be applied to the claim site and the adjoining residential property also owned by Solicitor.
- Some bids were significantly higher in cost than others while pursuing the same objective.