

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation

Ebersole, Inc.

1900 Cumberland Street

Lebanon, Lebanon County, Pennsylvania

PADEP Facility ID #38-25931

PAUSTIF Claim #2004-0263(S)

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: **8**

Number of bids received: **6**

List of firms submitting bids:

- **Austin James Associates, Inc.**
- **DMS Environmental Services, LLC**
- **Environmental Compliance Services, Inc.**
- **Letterle & Associates, LLC**
- **MEA, Inc.**
- **Skelly and Loy, Inc.**

This was a Defined Scope of Work bid and so price was the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria. The range in cost between the 6 evaluated bids was \$25,457.50 to \$32,048.16. Based on the numerical scoring, 2 of the 6 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 reviewed and selected the acceptable bid.

The selected bidder was Letterle & Associates, LLC: Bid Price – \$25,457.50.

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

- The RFB presented a “defined” SOW that would ultimately lead to a PADEP Relief of Liability and specified that the Solicitor has chosen to pursue site closure under the Residential Used Aquifer Statewide Health Standard (SHS) for soil and groundwater. However, some bid responses considered the incorrect site closure goal.
- The technical details provided in some of the bid responses were insufficient to allow a thorough evaluation of how the bidder intended to complete the soil and groundwater attainment demonstrations. Also, some of the bids either referenced methods that were inconsistent with the SOW or regulatory guidance / industry standards (e.g., low-flow groundwater purging and sampling), did not reference applying the 75/10x rule or petitioning the PADEP for an abbreviated period of groundwater attainment sampling, or specified areas / depths for the systematic random soil sampling that the PADEP could view as inadequate.
- A clear understanding of site history / site conditions was not conveyed in some of the bid responses. For example, one bid incorrectly referenced completing the soil attainment demonstration within a formerly closed, pre-Fund release area. In another case, a bid did not specify the correct sampling analytical parameters for soil and groundwater.

Under Milestone A (Site Vapor Intrusion Screening), given the unknowns with current site soil conditions, some bid responses proposed to first conduct the soil attainment demonstration before completing a determination as to whether a vapor intrusion evaluation (e.g., soil gas or indoor air sampling) was needed whereas other bids did not consider this approach. Also, the discussion for completing this milestone provided in some bids was not sufficiently detailed to allow a thorough technical evaluation.

- Other general details that were missing from some of the bid responses included:
 - A discussion of QA/QC samples for the soil and groundwater attainment demonstrations and related costs.
 - A discussion of how investigation derived wastes would be managed and related costs.
 - Specific details related to how the surface restoration would be completed.

Thank you again for your participation in this competitive bid solicitation.

Best Regards,

Mary Lynn Yurko, P.G.
Excalibur Group LLC

Third Party Technical Reviewer for ICFI