

BID INFORMATION MEMORANDUM
Fixed Price Competitive Bid Solicitation
Harrison Senior Living
300 Strode Avenue
Coatesville, Chester County, Pennsylvania 19320
PADEP Facility ID #15-41092; USTIF Claim #2008-0016(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 who submitted bids in response to the solicitation listed above.

Number of firms attending pre-bid meeting: 6
Number of bids received: 2

List of firms submitting bids (alphabetical order): MEA Environmental Services, Inc.
Synergy Environmental 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 two bids received was \$88,495.00 to \$154,326.10. Based on the numerical scoring, one of the two 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 Synergy Environmental Inc. - \$88,495.00.

The attached sheet lists some general comments regarding the evaluation of the two 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, 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.
- Bid responses should include detailed descriptions of the bid activities. Additionally, the SOW presented in the bid response must address the RFB specifications clearly and fully.
- When bidder(s) use the occurrence of “free product” as the criteria for continuing remediation, the bidder(s) are expected to provide adequate detail on what specifically constitutes the occurrence of “free product” and the bidder’s interpretation of “maximum extent practicable”. At Act 2 regulated sites, bids that infer that “any” amount of free product remaining in the subsurface requires active remediation may receive lower technical score(s).
- Bidders should have – (1) fully described and provided sufficient details to understand each bidders approach at their free product recovery approach design, implementation, and attainment; (2) conveyed understanding of project goal and defined “maximum extent practicable” for free product removal; and (3) adequately specified conditions for terminating free product recovery and initiating free product rebound monitoring.