COMPETITIVE BID SOLICITATION FOR THE COMPLETION OF AN AMENDED SITE CHARACTERIZATION REPORT AND A REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION

BP Stateline Exit 3 Travel Center
6143 Route 6N
West Springfield, PA 16443
PADEP FACILITY ID #25-06102
PAUSTIF CLAIM #2009-0002(M)

March 20, 2012

The Pennsylvania Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Fund (PAUSTIF) on behalf of the claimant for the above referenced claim is soliciting bidders for a fixed price contract project. Specifically, this Request for Bid (RFB) is seeking qualified firms to prepare and submit a fixed price proposal to complete an Amended Site Characterization Report (ASCR) and a remedial alternatives evaluation for the BP Stateline Exit 3 Travel Center, West Springfield, Pennsylvania (Site). A petroleum release to both soil and groundwater has been confirmed at the Site and an ASCR is still needed to meet the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) site characterization requirements. The Solicitor has an open claim (Claim #2009-0002(M)) with the PAUSTIF and the work outlined in this RFB will be completed under this aforementioned claim. Reimbursement of Solicitor-approved reasonable, necessary and appropriate costs (within claim limits) for the work described in this RFB will be provided by PAUSTIF.

This RFB includes five (5) major components with subtasks presented in an outline format for cost analysis and implementation. The fixed costs proposed by the consultant bidder shall be based on the scope of work provided in the RFB. Expenses in excess of the quoted price for the contract shall be the consultant's responsibility. The scope and budget for any identified out of scope activities must be pre-approved to be eligible for payment. Any costs associated with deviations from the scope that did not receive prior approval from the solicitor and PAUSTIF, or its representatives, will not be reimbursed.

Specifically, this RFB seeks competitive bids from qualified consultants to complete additional characterization activities, prepare an appropriate ASCR, evaluate potential remedial strategies, and facilitate progress towards site closure in a timely, efficient, and cost effective manner.

To be considered for selection, **one hard copy of the signed bid package and one electronic copy (one PDF file on a compact disk (CD) included with the hard copy) must be provided directly to the Fund's third party administrator, ICF International (ICF), to the attention of Deb Cassel, Contracts Administrator.** She will be responsible for opening the bids and providing copies to the Technical Contact and the Solicitor. Bid responses will only be accepted from those firms who attended the mandatory pre-bid site meeting. **The ground address for overnight/next-day deliveries is ICF International, 4000 Vine Street, Middletown, PA 17057, Attention: Deb Cassel. The outside of the shipping package containing the bid response must be clearly marked and labeled with "Bid – Claim #2009-0002(M)**. Please note

that the use of U.S. Mail, FedEx, UPS, or other delivery method does not guarantee delivery to this address by the due date and time listed below for submission. Firms mailing bid responses should allow adequate delivery time to ensure timely receipt of their bid package.

The bid response must be received by 3:00 PM, on Thursday, April 26, 2012. Bids will be opened immediately after the 3:00 PM deadline on the due date. Any bid packages received after this due date and time will be time-stamped and returned. If, due to inclement weather, natural disaster, or any other cause, the Fund's third party administrator, ICF's office is closed on the bid response due date, the deadline for submission will automatically be extended to the next business day on which the office is open. The Fund's third party administrator, ICF, may notify all firms who attended the mandatory site meeting of an extended due date. The hour for submission of bid responses shall remain the same. Submitted bid responses are subject to Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law.

On behalf of ICF and PAUSTIF, the Technical Contact will assist the Solicitor in evaluating the bids but the Solicitor will ultimately choose with whom to negotiate the mutually agreeable contract. The bid evaluation will consider, among other factors, total bid cost, unit costs, schedule, qualifications, and contract terms and conditions (no priority or relative weighting is implied by the order of these factors). The Solicitor anticipates informing the selected consultant with an approval to proceed within twelve (12) weeks of the bid response deadline. Please note that when the contract is in place with the consultant selected by the Solicitor, all other firms submitting bid packages will be notified that the contract was awarded.

SOLICITOR AND TECHNICAL CONTACT INFORMATION

ICF Representative

Ms. Bonnie Mackewicz
ICF International
4000 Vine Street
Middletown, PA 17057
Email: bmackewicz@icfi.com

Technical Contact

Mr. Mark Bedle
B&B Diversified Enterprises, Inc.
PO Box 16
Barto, PA 19504
Telephone: (610) 845-0640
Fax: (610) 845-0650
Email: mbedle@bbde.com

NOTE: All questions regarding this RFB solicitation and the subject site conditions must be directed to the Technical Contact and submitted in writing with the understanding that all questions and answers will be provided to all bidders. If questions are to be submitted via email, please note the following in the subject line of the email: BP Stateline Questions Claim No. 2009-0002(M). Bidders must neither contact nor discuss this RFB Solicitation with the Solicitor, PAUSTIF, or ICF International unless approved by the Technical Contact. Bidders may discuss this RFB solicitation with subcontractors and vendors to the extent required for preparing the bid response.

SITE LOCATION, OPERATION, AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site Address

BP Stateline Exit 3 Travel Center
6143 Route 6N
West Springfield, PA 16443
Springfield Township, Erie County

Site Location and Operation Information

The Site is located at the intersection of Route 6N and Sanford Road, just off the Route 90 exit ramp, in West Springfield, Pennsylvania. The Site is operated as a retail gasoline/diesel filling station and travel center. Located at the Site is a one (1) story building of slab on grade construction, gasoline and diesel dispensers, three (3) 8,000 gallon gasoline underground storage tanks (USTs), one (1) 15 gallon diesel UST and a sewage treatment plant. Three (3) 10,000 gallon diesel USTs were removed from the Site in 2008. Approximately one-half of the property is covered in asphalt and the other half is a grass/wetland area. The surrounding properties are a mix of agricultural farm land and undeveloped wooded properties. The Site is supplied water from an on-site potable well. A Site Location Map and a Site Plan are provided as Figures 1 and 2, respectively.

Site Background Information

- On December 15, 2008, a diesel fuel release was discovered at the Site by American Environmental Associates Inc. (AEA) during UST removal activities and reported to PADEP. A UST System Closure Report Form (UST Form) was prepared and submitted in January 23, 2009 for the Site. The UST Form indicated that three (3) 10,000 gallon diesel USTs were removed and noted that contamination was obvious and extensive. Multiple holes and "delamination / cracking of the very thin sprayed on lining" were noted on two (2) of the three (3) USTs removed.

- On April 30, 2009, four (4) soil test borings (TB-6 through TB-9) were installed at the Site. Samples are labeled as being collected from the borings at depths ranging from four (4) feet below surface grade (ftbsg) to eight (8) ftbsg. However, the Soil Boring Logs indicate that the total depth of each boring was only six (6) ftbsg. The soil samples were analyzed by a laboratory for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene (TMB) and 1,3,5-TMB. Benzene, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB were detected above their respective Residential Used Aquifer PADEP Statewide Health Standard (PADEP SHS) in borings TB-8 (4'-8') and TB-9 (4'-6'). Soil boring laboratory analytical data is summarized on Table 1 in Attachment 1.

- On April 29, 2009 and April 30, 2009, a total of five (5) monitoring wells (MW-1 through MW-5) were installed at the Site. The total depth of each well was 15 ftbsg. A "shallow zone of water within a layer of gray silty sand" was encountered but an exact

depth of the water bearing zone was not indicated. Soil samples were collected from the well locations during drilling and the groundwater in the wells was sampled on May 11, 2009. The soil and groundwater samples were analyzed by a laboratory for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB. The laboratory analytical results for soils indicated that benzene was detected above the PADEP SHS in MW-2 (3'-5'), MW-3 (3'-5'), and MW-4 (8'-10'), 1,2,4-TMB in MW-2 (3'-5') and 1,3,5-TMB in MW-2 (3'-5') and MW-3 (3'-5'). The laboratory analytical results for groundwater indicated that benzene was detected above the PADEP SHS in MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, and MW-5 and naphthalene, 1,3,5-TMB, and 1,2,4-TMB in MW-2. Soil and groundwater laboratory analytical data is summarized in Tables 1 and 2, respectively in Attachment 1.

- The Site's water supply well (STORE WELL) was sampled on April 30, 2009. However, no information is given in the SCR as to where the sample was collected. Table C-2 of the SCR shows that STORE WELL was sampled and analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB. Laboratory analytical results indicated that none of these compounds of concern (COC) were detected above their respective PADEP SHS for drinking water. Analytical data from the sampling of the STORE WELL is summarized in Table 3 in Attachment 1.

- In May of 2009, the owner of the Site installed a new UST in the area of the December 2008 UST removal activities. During the installation of the replacement UST, approximately 1,540.45 tons of contaminated soil was removed from the UST excavation. The contaminated soil was sampled and laboratory analyzed for proper disposal and removed from the Site by Waste Management for disposal at their Erie, Pennsylvania facility. 34,641 gallons of impacted groundwater was pumped from the excavation and through two (2) 55 gallon liquid carbon drums and discharged onto the ground surface. A temporary NPDES permit was secured prior to treating groundwater for discharge.

- On July 28, 2009, a field investigation conducted by AEA revealed the presence of one (1) well with a 24-inch diameter concrete casing. The total depth of the well was approximately 26 ftbsg. The groundwater level in the well was recorded at a depth of 3.8 feet. AEA's field investigation also identified a seven (7) foot diameter cistern with water recorded at a depth of 3.8 feet. Three (3) wells with six (6) inch diameter steel casings were also located by AEA near the cistern. AEA states that the "steel casings reportedly are installed on top of a holding tank." AEA goes on to state that:

  > "The Site water supply well most likely obtains water from an aquifer below the dense silt layer found beneath the near surface silty sand. We (AEA) believe the aquifer is represented in DW-1. At 26 feet, heaving wet gray sand was encountered (and) the depth of this material is very close to the Site's water supply well depth. The aquifer does not appear to be directly connected with the upper zone of water as demonstrated by analytical results of samples obtained from the deep well."

- On September 24, 2009, five (5) additional monitoring wells (MW-6 through MW-10) were installed at the Site. The total depth of each well was fifteen (15) ftbsg. Soil samples were collected from the well locations during drilling and the groundwater in the wells was sampled on September 25, 2009. September groundwater data for MW-10 was not available. The soil and groundwater samples were laboratory analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB. The laboratory analytical results for soils indicated that benzene was detected above the PADEP SHS in MW-6 (5-7'). The laboratory analytical results for groundwater indicated that benzene was detected above the PADEP SHS in MW-6 and MW-9, 1,3,5-TMB in MW-6 and 1,2,4-TMB in MW-6 and MW-7. Locations of the monitoring wells can be found on the Site Plan included as Figure 1. Soil and groundwater laboratory analytical data is summarized in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. A Soil Quality Map is provided as Figure 3 and a Groundwater Quality Map is provided as Figure 4 in Attachment 1.

- On November 6, 2009, five (5) additional monitoring wells (MW-11 through MW-14 and DW-1) were installed at the Site. The total depth of each well was fifteen (15) ftbsg. Soil samples were collected from the well locations during drilling and the groundwater in the wells (MW-1 through MW-14) was sampled on November 9, 2009. November groundwater data for DW-1 was not available. The soil and groundwater samples were laboratory analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB. Soil analytical results indicated that none of the wells had any COC detected above their respective PADEP SHS. The laboratory analytical results for groundwater indicated that benzene was detected above the PADEP SHS in wells MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, MW-5, MW-6, MW-10, MW-11 and MW-14, 1,3,5-TMB in MW-11 and 1,2,4-TMB in MW-2, MW-3, MW-7 and MW-11. Soil and groundwater laboratory analytical data is summarized in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. A Soil Quality Map is provided as Figure 3 and a Groundwater Quality Map is provided as Figure 4 in Attachment 1.

- In November 2009, three (3) vapor points (VP-1, VP-2 and VP-3) were installed at the Site. The vapor points were located between the source area and the Site building. The Site building is constructed concrete slab on grade. The vapor points were installed utilizing vacuum excavation to a total depth of five (5) ftbsg. The vapor points were constructed of one-inch PVC with four (4) feet of solid riser and one (1) foot of screened pipe. Vapor samples were collected from the three (3) points and sent for laboratory analysis on November 12, 2009 and January 11, 2010. The vapor samples were laboratory analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB. The analytical results for November 12, 2009 indicated that none of the wells had any of the COC detected above the selected Residential MSC's. The analytical results for January 11, 2010 indicated that benzene and ethylbenzene were detected above their selected MCS's in VP-2 and VP-3 and 1,3,5-TMB and 1,2,4-TMB in VP-3. The vapor analytical results were summarized in a table included in the SCR titled

Vapor Testing Results. A copy of the aforementioned table is attached for your reference. Locations of the vapor points are included on Figure 1 in Attachment 1.

- On January 7, 2010, groundwater in monitoring wells MW-1 through MW-14 and DW-1 were sampled and laboratory analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB. The laboratory analytical results for groundwater indicated that benzene was detected above the PADEP SHS in wells MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, MW-5, MW-6, MW-9, MW-10, MW-11 and MW-14, 1,3,5-TMB in MW-11 and 1,2,4-TMB in MW-2, MW-3, MW-7 and MW-11. Groundwater analytical data is summarized in Table 2 in Attachment 1.

- On January 11, 2010 a rising head slug test was performed on monitoring well MW-6. The slug test data was reduced using the Bouwer-Rice method and determined to be three (3) inches per day.

- On January 29, 2010, a SCR was submitted to the PADEP by AEA.

- On March 2, 2010, groundwater in monitoring wells MW-1 through MW-14, DW-1 and the STORE WELL were sampled and laboratory analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB. The laboratory analytical results for groundwater indicated that benzene was detected above the PADEP SHS in wells MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, MW-5, MW-6, MW-9, MW-10, MW-11 and MW-14 and 1,2,4-TMB in MW-2, MW-3, MW-7 and MW-11. Groundwater analytical data is summarized in Table 2 in Attachment 1.

- In a letter dated March 18, 2010, PADEP acknowledges their receipt of the January 2010 SCR from AEA. PADEP disapproved the SCR for the following reasons:

  1. "The remediation standards were not clearly stated."

  2. "Soil vapor testing was not completed and properly tabulated."

  3. "Insufficient information concerning interim remedial action was provided."

  4. "The source areas and groundwater plumes were not fully evaluated."

- On March 25, 2010, three (3) additional monitoring wells (MW-15 through MW-17) and three (3) test wells (MW-A, MW-B and MW-C) were installed at the Site. The test wells were installed for Remedial Action Plan testing and were not sampled for groundwater during site characterization activities. The total depth of each well was approximately fifteen (15) ftbsg. Soil samples were collected from the monitoring well and test well locations during drilling and the groundwater in the monitoring wells was sampled on March 29, 2010. The soil and groundwater samples were laboratory analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB. The laboratory analytical results for soils indicated that benzene was detected

above the PADEP SHS in MW-B (5-7') and MW-C (5-7') and 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB in MW-B (5-7'). Soil and groundwater laboratory analytical data is summarized in Tables 1 and 2, respectively in Attachment 1.

- On April 30, 2010, monitoring well MW-18 was installed on the property of Mr. Paul Weldon. Mr. Weldon's property lies adjacent to the Site, towards the east. The total depth of MW-18 was ten (10) ftbsg. Soil samples were collected during well drilling activities and groundwater was first sampled on May 3, 2010 and again on May 12, 2010. Monitoring wells MW-15, MW-16 and MW-17 were also sampled on May 3, 2010. The soil and groundwater samples were laboratory analyzed for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, cumene, naphthalene, MTBE, 1,2,4-TMB and 1,3,5-TMB. Laboratory analytical results indicated that none of the wells had any of the COC detected above their respective PADEP SHS in soil or groundwater on either dates. Soil and groundwater laboratory analytical data is summarized in Tables 1 and 2, respectively in Attachment 1.

- In May 2010, a second SCR was submitted for the Site. The revised SCR discussed the investigation completed thus far and indicated that the soil and groundwater standards selected for the Site are the Residential Used Aquifer Statewide Health Standard. The Statewide Health Standard Residential Value was chose to be the standard for the Site vapor analysis.

- In May 2010, a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) for the Site was prepared by AEA and submitted to PADEP on May 28, 2010. AEA determined that HVE in conjunction with GWP&T to be the most viable remedial solution for the Site. AEA conducted HVE pilot test studies utilizing monitoring wells MW-3, MW-7 and MW-A on March 31, April 1, 2010 and April 6, 2010 respectively. Monitoring well MW-3 was chosen because of its central position within the source area. MW-7 and MW-A were chosen because of their location on the perimeter of the source area. An Atlantic Fluids A-20, 3 HP Liquid Ring Pump (LRP) was used to conduct the HVE pilot tests. During the HVE pilot tests, liquid phase hydrocarbons (LPH) were not encountered. Groundwater extracted during the pilot tests was pumped through carbon vessels prior to discharge. A photoionization detector (PID) was used to field screen effluent vapors throughout the tests. PID readings fluctuated throughout the tests from 18.3 to 29.9 parts per million (ppm). The vacuum radius of influence (ROI) determined by the HVE pilot tests ranged from 70 feet (MW-3) to 140 feet (MW-7 & MW-A).

- In a letter dated July 30, 2010, PADEP acknowledges their receipt of the SCR and the RAP from AEA. PADEP disapproved the SCR and the RAP for the following reasons:

  1. "Documentation as to the disposition of the impacted soil excavated during interim remedial activities should be included in the report."

  2. "MW-14 shows anomalously high benzene concentrations for each sampling event and appears to indicate a secondary source of contamination. Additional

investigation in the vicinity of this well should be performed and the results included in the SCR."

3. "Benzene concentrations at sampling point MW-10 show exceedances to SHS MSCs for each sampling event. MW-10 is located on the eastern property line and indicates there is likely off-site contamination. A revision of the Contaminant Distribution Map for Benzene should be performed showing accurate benzene impact to MW-10."

4. The water supply well for this facility is regulated under Pennsylvania Safe Drinking Water Act (PWS ID No.: 6250833). Under 25 Pa. Code 245.309c(4), the responsible party shall provide a copy of the sample results to the water supply owner and the department within 5 days of receipt of the sample results from the laboratory. This should be noted in the report."

- On August 16, 2010, monitoring well MW-19 was installed at the Site. The aforementioned well was installed to a total depth of 15' 3". During the well installation activities, a soil sample was collected from the borehole and submitted to a laboratory for analysis. A total of two (2) rounds of groundwater samples were collected from monitoring well MW-19 following the August 16, 2010 installation activities. Soil and groundwater laboratory analytical data is summarized in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. A Groundwater Quality Map is provided as Figure 4. A monitoring well construction log for MW-19 is attached for your reference in Attachment 1.

- On October 7, 2011, a workplan was prepared and submitted to PADEP for review and comment. The PADEP requested a specific schedule for the project during the first week of November. On November 7, 2011, B&B provided a proposed schedule for completion of the project. No immediate response was received

- On March 2, 2012, an additional request for review of the workplan with an updated schedule was sent to the PADEP. A response was received from the PADEP n March 6, 2012.

Bidders are directed to the pertinent available documentation (including reports, figures, correspondence and analytical data) that has been provided in Attachment 1 for additional site background details.

PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of work has been prepared using the guidelines of Pennsylvania Code Title 25, Chapter 245 (The Storage Tank and Spill Prevention Program) and Chapter 250 (The Land Recycling Program). There are several key elements that must be completed in order for the approach outlined in this RFB to be successful. The critical elements include the following:

- Prepare the appropriate project guidance documents;

- Complete a full Sensitive Receptor Survey;

- Complete a site survey, map the important features of the Site and evaluate groundwater flow (Please note that a digital version of the map is not available and as such will not be provided to the winning consultant);

- Conduct a soil boring investigation;

- Install overburden monitoring wells;

- Complete aquifer testing on the monitoring well network;

- Conduct groundwater monitoring and sampling events;

- Sample the onsite supply well;

- Complete fate and transport modeling to assess soil, groundwater, and vapor intrusion media pathways to determine if and the extent to which dissolved phase hydrocarbons have or may be expected to migrate beyond the property boundary now or in the future;

- Prepare and submit an ASCR;

- Complete a risk assessment evaluation using the applicable guidance documents in an effort to appropriately evaluate exposure pathways;

- Remedial Alternatives Analysis should be completed for the Site to compare cleanup alternatives and evaluate which remedial action is most appropriate for the Site; and

- Prepare a Risk Assessment and Feasible Remedial Alternatives Analysis Report for the Site.

In addition to the above base Scope of Work, the following ***Optional Cost Adders*** need to be addressed in your bid response. These costs adders will not be part of your initially approved contract. However, if it becomes necessary to complete any of these activities, they will be completed under the Remediation Agreement signed as part of this project. More details regarding the work scope for each of these ***Optional Cost Adders*** is provided at the end of the RFB Scope of Work.

- ***Optional Cost Adder #1 –*** Provide a Unit Cost to complete an additional groundwater monitoring and sampling event.

- ***Optional Cost Adder #2 –*** Provide a Unit Cost to prepare a Progress Report for submittal to the Solicitor, ICF International as designated representative of the USTIF, and potentially PADEP.

- ***Optional Cost Adder #3*** **–** Provide a Unit Cost to extend the Pump test for four (4) additional hours at the Site. The pump test would be extended if stabilization does not occur by the end of the eight (8) hour pump test.

- ***Optional Cost Adder #4*** **–** Provide a Unit Cost to install one (1) overburden groundwater monitoring well. The scope of work for this cost adder should follow Task 2.2 construction guidelines, but would be completed during a separate event.

- ***Optional Cost Adder #5*** **–** Provide a Unit Cost to update the Site's survey to include the additional monitoring well locations. The scope of work for this cost adder should follow Task 2.3.

The bid package should follow the task format outlined below. A cost summary sheet to be attached to your proposal is included as Attachment 2. Proposals should also include a detailed description of the anticipated costs for each task including labor rates, time requirements, and equipment costs as broken out in the detailed cost sheet included as Attachment 3. The scope of work that we are requesting is provided below:

Task 1.0 Project Planning / Management:

Task 1.1 Preparation of Project Guidance Documents – Proposed documents to be prepared include a site specific health and safety plan, a field sampling and analysis plan, and a quality assurance/quality control plan. Where applicable, the pertinent project guidance documents should be prepared in accordance with Chapter 245.

Task 1.2 Project Management – The successful bidder shall complete necessary, reasonable, and appropriate project management activities for the duration of the contract period consistent with release investigation projects. Such activities would be expected to include client communications / updates, meetings, permitting, record keeping, subcontracting, personnel and subcontractor management, quality assurance / quality control, scheduling and other activities.

Task 1.3 Sensitive Receptor Survey – A Sensitive Receptor Survey (SRS) should be conducted for this Site. Sensitive receptors evaluated for this Site should include area water usage, surface water bodies, and subsurface underground utilities and basements. Submitted bids should specify what activities will be included in the SRS activities (i.e. review of tax maps and property assessment records; area canvass; PNDI search, etc.). A 1,000-foot radius water usage survey should be completed as part of the SRS in an effort to document the area water use. As part of the water usage survey, the selected consultant should complete the following:

1. Conduct a private and public well search by obtaining an area specific report;
2. Obtain and review tax maps for the area;
3. Contact the local municipality and water authority to confirm water usage in the area of the Site and any local restrictions on water usage;

4. Review of previously completed sensitive receptor surveys;
5. Review of county property assessment records;
6. Canvass of the area; and
7. Field verification of water supply to surrounding properties.

Results of the SRS are to be taken into consideration during the execution of the project and are to be summarized and included in the ASCR to be submitted to PADEP. Please note that recent discussions with the PADEP indicate that current property owner may have recently installed an additional supply well at the property. The well may or may not have been installed with permits. The status of the previous well is also unknown.

Task 2.0 Additional Site Characterization and Interim Remedial Activities:

Task 2.1 Soil Boring Investigation – In an effort to investigate an area of concern at the Site noted in the most recent PADEP correspondence, a soil boring investigation is being proposed at the Site. As part of the investigation, the selected consultant will advance a total of six (6) soil borings at the Site. The approximate locations of the six (6) soil borings (B-1 through B-6) are provided on the attached figure for your review. Specifics on the proposed investigation are provided below:

- All soil boring locations will be advanced in the locations proposed in the RFB, unless the presence of utilities, obstructions, or safety concerns requires a change in the location. The proposed locations of the soil borings are provided on Figure 1.

- The soil boring locations are at a Site with an operational UST system. As such, if a consultant feels it is appropriate and necessary to complete hole clearing activities before advancing the borings, the cost should be included in their proposal and costs. If a consultant includes the cost to complete air-knifing, they should state it in their proposal and discuss why it is appropriate and necessary. As discussed in the RFB, cost is not the only factor when evaluating proposals and other factors are taken into consideration during the review process, including appropriate safety measures.

- Soil borings will be advanced to groundwater, bedrock, or refusal, whichever is encountered first. Please note that information from prior investigations indicate that groundwater should be encountered at depths of five (5) feet or shallower in the area of the proposed soil borings. However, in the event that there is no evidence of petroleum hydrocarbon impact (includes olfactory, visual, and field instrument detections) for more than 15 feet, then the boring maybe terminated.

- Soil samples shall be collected continuously in four (4) foot intervals and will be logged by an on-site geologist (or under direct supervision of a geologist) for soil classification and structure, odor, soil moisture, soil texture, color, and screened

with a PID. Soils should be described using the Unified Soil Classification System.

- A total of 12 soil samples (two (2) soil samples per boring) shall be collected and submitted to an accredited laboratory for analysis. Soils exhibiting the highest PID reading in each borehole will be collected for submittal to a laboratory for analysis. An additional soil sample will be collected at the bedrock interface or just above groundwater in an effort to delineate the soil sample with the highest PID reading. If a boring exhibits no PID readings, a soil sample will be collected from approximately four (4) feet below surface grade of the boring.

- Soil samples shall be collected using Encore Samplers (or equivalent) and field-preserved in laboratory-provided glassware with the appropriate preservatives (e.g., methanol or sodium bisulfate) provided by the laboratory in general accordance with USEPA Method 5035 and the PADEP guidance;

- In addition, one (1) duplicate sample and one (1) equipment blank sample will be collected and submitted per day of sampling;

- Samples should be properly handled under chain of custody documentation protocol and kept cold from sample collection until the samples are relinquished to the accredited laboratory;

- Soil samples should be analyzed for the PADEP short list of diesel parameters using laboratory methods 5035/8260B in accordance with Pennsylvania's Storage Tank Regulation procedures and cleanup standard criteria as specified in Pennsylvania's Act 2 (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes (BTEX); cumene; naphthalene; methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE); 1,2,4-trimethylbenze; 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene).

- One (1) soil sample should also be analyzed for fraction of organic carbon and porosity to facilitate modeling efforts (Please make sure you choose the appropriate porosity parameter based on the predictive model selected as part of Task 4.1);

- The laboratory to be utilized should be identified in the bid package. Upon receipt of the results, the consultant should forward a copy of the analytical data to the Solicitor and PAUSTIF (or its designated representative); and

- Compile the field findings and laboratory data into a summary table and comprehensive soil boring logs.

- Please note that the proposed boring locations may need to be moved due to health and safety concerns, obstructions, and/or the presence of subsurface utilities at the Site. Prior to the advancement of the soil borings, the selected

consultant will be required to complete a private markout at the Site to identify the location of obstructions and underground utilities. If due to valid concerns the general locations of the proposed borings need to be altered significantly from the approximate locations provided on the attached figure, then the selected consultant will be required to contact the PADEP, discuss the need for the changes, and provide the PADEP with a revised soil boring location map.

Task 2.2 Overburden Monitoring Well Installation – In order to fully characterize the dissolved phase plume in the overburden aquifer, a total of four (4) overburden monitoring wells (MW-20, MW-21, MW-22, and MW-23) are to be installed at the Site. The proposed locations of the overburden monitoring wells are provided on Figure 1. As part of the installation of the overburden wells, the selected consultant should consider the following:

- All monitoring wells will be advanced in the locations proposed in the RFB, unless the presence of utilities, obstructions, or safety concerns requires a change in the location. The proposed locations of the monitoring wells are provided on Figure 1;

- For the four (4) overburden monitoring well(s), the borehole will be drilled to an anticipated maximum depth of approximately 15 feet bsg, and a monitoring well will be constructed using no more than 2 feet of schedule 40 PVC flush threaded casing and with schedule 40 PVC flush threaded 0.010 slot size screening to be installed in the remaining length of the well column. The total depth and screening interval provided are approximated based on limited available information. The selected consultant will install the shallow wells to a depth of no more than five (5) feet into competent bedrock. The total depth and screening interval provided are approximated. The selected consultant will install the shallow wells to a depth of no more than five (5) feet into competent bedrock. The wells will be cased for the first five (5) feet with screening extending from the bottom of the casing to the well completion depth. In addition, the estimated construction specifications provided above may need to be altered during drilling as dictated by actual site conditions (i.e. actual depth to bedrock, actual depth to groundwater, etc.);

- The annular space will be filled using Morie #2 sand from the bottom of the screen to not more than 4-inches above the screen. A 1.5 foot bentonite seal will be placed above the sand pack and the remainder of the annular space will be filled with a portland/bentonite grout to approximately 0.5 feet bsg;

- A flush-mounted manhole shall be cemented into place to complete the well at grade level. A locking, pressure fit, watertight cap will be used to prevent the infiltration of surface runoff and rainwater and to restrict access by unauthorized individuals;

- The wells should be drilled and constructed in accordance with generally accepted practices as outlined in the PADEP Groundwater Monitoring Guidance Manual, dated January 1, 1999 (Document # 383-3000-001). Based on anticipated drilling conditions, a Pennsylvania-licensed driller should install the wells using hollow stem auger drilling methods;

- Drilling should be conducted under the supervision of a Pennsylvania-licensed Professional Geologist, although a field supervisor may be used in the field on a day-to-day basis. The field supervisor should visually inspect subsurface materials encountered during drilling, screen cuttings with a PID, and complete field well construction logs. When encountered, soils should be described using the Unified Soil Classification System. Bedrock should be described using USGS descriptive protocol, with the identification of the depth of and size of potential fractures and/or other subsurface anomalies;

- The newly installed monitoring wells should be developed to promote adequate hydraulic connection between the aquifer and the well. Depending on the depth and amount of sediment in the well, development should be completed via mechanical surging using either a bailer or an electric submersible pump, or by airlift techniques. The IDW waste and purge water should be disposed of per the PADEP Northwest Regional Office (NWRO) guidance; check with the NWRO for current requirements. Bidders will be responsible for arranging any offsite waste disposal (if required) and including costs in their bid response to cover the disposal of all potential waste related to the tasks included in the SOW. Please estimate the volume of waste using your professional opinion, experience, and the data provided. Invoices submitted to cover additional costs on waste generated as part of activities included under the fixed price contract for this Site will not be paid. The groundwater may be temporarily stored on site, but should be removed from the Site in a timely manner;

- Soil/rock cuttings and liquids generated during the drilling activities should be disposed of offsite in a manner consistent with the protocols set forth by the PADEP. Disposal of soil/rock cuttings should be arranged through a certified waste disposal subcontractor. In an effort to eliminate or minimize the need for change orders on a fixed price contract, please include costs to dispose of all anticipated volumes of waste in your bid response. ICF and PAUSTIF will not entertain any assumptions on the contract with regards to a volume of waste (i.e. project costs assume that no more than one (1) ton of soil cuttings will require disposal after the installation of the additional monitoring wells). Bidders will be responsible for including costs in their bid response to cover the disposal of all potential waste related to the tasks included in the SOW. Please estimate the volume of waste using your professional opinion, experience, and the data provided. Invoices submitted to cover additional costs on waste generated as part of activities included under the fixed price contract for this Site will not be paid; and

- Compile the field findings into comprehensive monitoring well construction diagrams and logs.

- The proposed location of one (1) of the monitoring wells is located off-site. In order to install the monitoring well in the proposed location, offsite access to the Paul Weldon property, located towards the east of the Site, must be secured prior to drilling activities. The cost should cover the necessary time and materials needed to contact the off-site property owner, draft an access agreement, and obtain approval with one (1) draft revision to the access agreement. The cost does not include any legal fees, payments or permitting costs. Providing this Unit Cost does not commit the consultant to obtain the access agreement. If necessary, the cost should also cover the necessary time and material needed to provide the PADEP with the information they will require to facilitate access to the property. If access is denied, the selected consultant will move forward with installing MW-20, MW-21, and MW-22 until access can be obtained.

Task 2.3 Site Survey – Following the installation of the proposed monitoring wells, a professional survey of the Site by a Pennsylvania-licensed surveyor including all current site features (e.g., buildings, property boundaries, monitoring wells, etc.) shall be completed. All monitoring wells, supply wells, borings, the Site building, property boundaries and other important Site features are to be surveyed with the purpose of placing their horizontal coordinates on a scaled site map. In addition, the vertical coordinates of the new monitoring well top of casings and surface grade are to be surveyed. The benchmark elevation shall be obtained by referencing the approximate ground surface elevation of the property or from an available benchmark from a USGS topographic map or benchmark elevation marker located at the Site. In conjunction with collecting depth to groundwater readings during sampling events and in an effort to establish groundwater flow at the Site, tops of casing for the existing monitoring wells are to be surveyed to facilitate the construction of a Site wide groundwater flow map. In addition, the presence of SPL (if detected) needs to be taken into consideration when calculating the static water levels in the wells and constructing a Site wide groundwater flow map. Groundwater elevation data collected following the installation of the additional monitoring wells along with data from the site survey will be utilized to produce a series of summary figures which will provide additional information as to the groundwater flow direction in both the overburden and bedrock aquifers.

Task 2.4 Aquifer testing – Slug tests, Step test and Pump test –

Task 2.4.1 Slug Tests – Rising head slug testing will be conducted on three (3) of the monitoring wells at the Site. A PVC slug will be used to displace the static water level in the well while a transducer will record water levels before the slug is placed in the well, during the recovery of the water level back to the original static water level, and following the removal of the slug. Transducers should be used to monitor the water levels in the wells during each of the slug tests. The data collected by the transducer during the slug tests, the selected consultant will calculate Site-specific

hydrogeologic values including permeability. All of the calculated values will allow for the modeling efforts and risk assessment activities to be conducted with Site specific data rather than using published values. In addition, the data collected during the slug testing of the monitoring wells will be evaluated to determine the appropriate monitoring well to be used for the step test and the eight (8) hour pump test. Results from the slug testing activities are to be summarized and included in the SCR to be submitted to PADEP.

Task 2.4.2 Step Test – The monitoring well demonstrating the highest permeability during the slug test will be used for the step test and the subsequent eight (8) hour pump test. The selected consultant will conduct a two-hour step test on the well determined by the slug test results to have the highest permeability. The data collected during the step drawdown test will be used to determine an optimal pumping rate and yield for the constant rate pumping test. Results from the step testing activities are to be summarized and included in the SCR to be submitted to PADEP.

Task 2.4.3 Pump Test – Once the pumping rate has been determined, an eight (8) hour constant rate pumping test will be conducted by the selected consultant on the selected monitoring well at the Site. Transducers will be used to monitor the resultant water levels in the pumping well and surrounding overburden and bedrock monitoring wells to be determined at a later date. Also, the remaining monitoring well network should be gauged periodically throughout the test to provide additional aquifer characterization data. Data collected during the constant rate pumping test will be analyzed and used to calculate Site specific aquifer values including hydraulic conductivity, transmissivity, storage capacity, and groundwater seepage velocity. All of the calculated values will allow for the modeling efforts and risk assessment activities to be conducted with Site specific data rather than using published values. Results from the pump testing activities are to be summarized and included in the SCR to be submitted to PADEP. The IDW waste and purge water should be disposed of per the PADEP Northwest Regional Office (NWRO) guidance; check with the NWRO for current requirements. Bidders will be responsible for arranging any offsite waste disposal (if required) and including costs in their bid response to cover the disposal of all potential waste related to the tasks included in the SOW. In an effort to eliminate or minimize the need for change orders on a fixed price contract, please include costs to dispose of all anticipated volumes of waste in your bid response. ICF and PAUSTIF will not entertain any assumptions on the contract with regards to a volume of waste (i.e. Project costs assume that no more than 1,000 gallons of groundwater will require disposal after the completion of the pump test). Bidders will be responsible for including costs in their bid response to cover the disposal of all potential waste related to the tasks included in the SOW. Please estimate the volume of waste using your professional opinion, experience, and the data provided. Invoices submitted to cover additional costs on waste generated as part of activities included under the fixed price contract for this Site will not be paid. The groundwater may be temporarily stored on site, but should be removed from the Site in a timely manner.

Task 3.0 Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling:

For this RFB, please assume the total number of groundwater monitoring and sampling events that will be needed is two (2) events. Please note that USTIF will only pay the winning firm for the actual number of events conducted (i.e. if a firm includes the costs to complete two (2) events, but only one (1) event is conducted; then the firm will only be paid for the one (1) event completed). The selected consultant should be prepared to conduct the first groundwater sampling event at the Site approximately two (2) weeks after the installation of the proposed monitoring wells and conduct the second event approximately four (4) weeks after the first event. During each of the groundwater monitoring and sampling events, the selected consultant will collect a sample from the supply well located at the Site.

Each event should include the following:

- Collect water level readings from each of the monitoring wells using an interface probe capable of distinguishing water and/or the presence or absence of product to the nearest 0.01 feet;

- Record the depth to water readings from the monitoring wells and then use the data to determine water level elevations such that groundwater flow direction can be confirmed;

- Groundwater sampling activities should be conducted in accordance with generally accepted practices as outlined in the final version of the PADEP Groundwater Monitoring Guidance Manual;

- Prior to the collection of groundwater samples, the water column in each of the monitoring wells should be purged by either the removal of approximately three (3) volumes of the water column or via low flow sampling method;

- Sampling equipment should be decontaminated prior to sample collection in accordance with generally accepted industry practices;

- Following purging activities, groundwater samples should be collected as quickly as practical from each of the wells directly from a bailer into laboratory supplied bottleware;

- The IDW waste and purge water should be disposed of per the PADEP Northwest Regional Office (NWRO) guidance; check with the NWRO for current requirements. Bidders will be responsible for arranging any offsite waste disposal (if required) and including costs in their bid response to cover the disposal of all potential waste related to the tasks included in the SOW;

- Samples should be properly handled under chain of custody documentation protocol and kept cold from sample collection until the samples are relinquished to the accredited laboratory;

- Groundwater samples should be analyzed for the PADEP short list of diesel parameters using laboratory methods 5035/8260B in accordance with Pennsylvania's Storage Tank Regulation procedures and cleanup standard criteria as specified in Pennsylvania's Act 2 (BTEX; cumene; naphthalene; MTBE; 1,2,4-trimethylbenze; 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene).

- The supply well sample collected during each of the events will be sent to an accredited laboratory to be tested for the required constituents of concern in accordance with Pennsylvania's Storage Tank Regulation procedures and cleanup standard criteria as specified in Pennsylvania's Act 2. Specifically, each sample will be analyzed for PADEP diesel short lists (benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, total xylenes, MTBE, naphthalene, isopropylbenzene, 1,3,5-trimethylbenzene, and 1,2,4-trimethylbenzene). Results from the supply monitoring and sampling events will be summarized and presented to the PADEP in the SCR. Please note that if the SRS activities indicate the presence of more than one (1) supply well currently located at the property, additional supply well sample(s) will be collected at the same per sample laboratory rate as the one (1) supply well sample (per event) included in the RFB. As such, please specify in your bid the total cost for one (1) supply well sample to be analyzed.

- In addition to the samples collected from the monitoring wells, one (1) duplicate sample and one (1) equipment blank sample will be collected and submitted per day of sampling.

- The laboratory to be utilized should be identified in the bid package. Upon receipt of the results, the consultant should forward a copy of the analytical data to the solicitor and PAUSTIF (or its designated representative).

Task 4.0 Fate and Transport Modeling and Site Characterization Report:

Task 4.1 Fate and Transport Modeling – Fate and Transport evaluations shall be completed as appropriate and consistent with Act 2 guidance documents in order to assess the potential for contaminant migration. This evaluation should take into consideration both the groundwater and soil exceedances at the Site. Each firm should evaluate the data and site specific information provided and determine the most applicable model or models needed to complete appropriate fate and transport modeling for the Site. Please specify which modeling software will be used to predict fate and transport of the constituents of concern exceeding the PADEP statewide health standards in groundwater at the release location and its applicability to the Site.

Task 4.2 Preparation of an Amended Site Characterization Report - Following the completion of the activities proposed in Task 1.0 and Task 2.0 as well as the two (2) groundwater sampling events from Task 3.0 and the Fate and Transport Modeling noted in Task 4.1, the selected consultant will prepare an ASCR for the Site. The information gathered during the aforementioned tasks should be incorporated into a comprehensive ASCR that will be submitted to the PADEP and will facilitate the objective to complete regulatory requirements governing the ASCR and gain PADEP approval for the report. Specifically, the report should summarize the results of the recent investigations, the findings of the previous investigations, a comprehensive Site history, sensitive receptor information, risk assessment, geologic data, results and analysis of the aquifer testing, discussion on the completed remediation efforts, summary of the predictive modeling efforts completed, and a series of summary tables, appendices, and figures illustrating the information provided in the report.

The Report will be completed following the guidelines specified in Pennsylvania Code, Title 25, Chapter 245 and the Land Recycling Program (Act 2) Technical Guidance Manual for a Site Characterization Report. The selected consultant will also present significant conclusions and make recommendations for future work at the Site in the SCR. The report will be appropriately signed and sealed by a licensed Professional Geologist.

Within 120 days of contract execution, a draft ASCR and all AutoCAD maps / plans included in the report (e.g., site plan / base map, groundwater elevation maps, dissolved plume maps, soil contaminant distribution maps, etc.) and appendices (e.g., boring logs, tables, waste disposal documentation, aquifer testing and analysis, transducer survey results and analysis, and sensitive receptor information) shall be submitted electronically (in Adobe PDF format) and in hard copy to the Solicitor, ICF / USTIF and the Technical Contact for review / comment prior to finalizing the ASCR. Once the selected consultant has addressed comments on the draft, the selected consultant shall finalize and issue the report to the PADEP. The draft report is to be submitted no later than the date specified in the schedule presented by the winning bidder.

Task 5.0 Risk Assessment and Feasible Remedial Alternatives Analysis:

Task 5.1 Risk Assessment Evaluation – A risk assessment evaluation shall be completed consistent with the guidelines provided in the Act 2 Guidance Manual (applicable portions of *Sections II.C.4 IV.G and IV.H*). These sections provide general information on risk assessment; developing site appropriate standards; discuss potential for pathway elimination; and guidance on site-specific human health assessment procedures. This guidance should be followed to conduct a risk assessment. Results of the risk assessment should be taken into consideration when developing a feasible remedial strategy and determining which standards would be appropriate for the Site. Results of the evaluation should be discussed in the Risk Assessment and Feasible Remedial Alternatives Analysis Report.

Task 5.2 – Remedial Alternatives Analysis - A Remedial Alternatives Analysis should be completed for the Site to compare cleanup alternatives and evaluate which remedial action is most appropriate for the Site. The evaluation should specifically focus on eight (8) key considerations including cost-effectiveness, proven performance, public and environment protectiveness, regulatory compliance, reliability, practical implementation, health & safety and effects on public health and the environment. The findings of the Remedial Alternatives Analysis will be summarized and presented as part of the Risk Assessment and Feasible Remedial Alternatives Analysis Report. Information/data generated during the interim remedial activities conducted at the Site should be taken into consideration.

Task 5.3 – Risk Assessment and Feasible Remedial Alternatives Analysis Report - Following the completion of the proposed Risk Assessment Evaluation and Remedial Alternatives Analysis, a Risk Assessment and Feasible Remedial Alternatives Analysis Report should be prepared for the Site. The report should detail the procedures and findings from the completed baseline risk assessment and describe the calculations and resultant estimate of the amount of hydrocarbon mass present in the Site's subsurface. It should also take into consideration and summarize the assumption, parameters, and predictions from the predictive modeling scenarios included in the ASCR. Figures and appendices supporting the findings of the report should be attached to further illustrate the current condition of the Site. The report should appropriately evaluate the Site and assess the risks as well as provide a proper closure strategy and remedial alternative for the Site. Information/data generated during the interim remedial activities conducted at the Site should be incorporated into this task.

All AutoCAD maps / plans included in the report (e.g., site plan / base map, proposed remediation location map, dissolved plume maps, soil contaminant distribution maps, etc.) and appendices (e.g., boring logs, tables, remediation technology information, fate and transport modeling, risk assessment and sensitive receptor information) shall also be submitted electronically on CD and in hard copy to Solicitor and Technical Contact for review / comment prior to finalizing it. Once the selected consultant has addressed comments on the draft, the selected consultant shall finalize and issue the report to the PADEP.

Task 1.0 through Task 5.0 above represents the base Scope of Work for this RFB solicitation. These tasks have been specifically developed in an effort to complete the PADEP's site characterization requirements. In addition to the base Scope of Work tasks, ***Optional Cost Adders*** are being requested for the following tasks:

- ***Optional Cost Adder #1*** **–** Provide a Unit Cost to complete an additional groundwater monitoring and sampling event. The scope of work for this cost adder should follow Task 3.0. The cost provided should be to complete only one (1) event with all wells in the network being sampled.

- ***Optional Cost Adder #2*** **–** Provide a Unit Cost to Prepare a Summary Progress Report for submittal to the PADEP. The Progress Report should detail the observations documented

during the event, summarize the analytical results, map the groundwater flow direction for the Site, provide iso-concentration maps for compounds exceeding the SWHS, provide hydro-graphs, discuss the interim remediation efforts (if any), and provide additional scheduling details for upcoming events. Once the report is approved by the Solicitor, the report can be finalized and submitted to the PADEP. The progress reports discussed are being proposed to meet the PADEP obligation on progress reporting before RAP approval.

- ***Optional Cost Adder #3 –*** Provide a Unit Cost to extend the Pump test for four (4) additional hours at the Site. The pump test would be extended if stabilization does not occur by the end of the eight (8) hour pump test.

- ***Optional Cost Adder #4 –*** Provide a Unit Cost to install one (1) overburden groundwater monitoring well. The scope of work for this cost adder should follow Task 2.2 construction guidelines, but would be completed during a separate event.

- ***Optional Cost Adder #5 –*** Provide a Unit Cost to update the Site's survey to include the additional well location(s). The scope of work for this cost adder should follow Task 2.3.

SCHEDULING

As part of this RFB, the selected consultant shall be prepared to install the new monitoring wells at the Site within 7 days of the contract being executed and submit the draft SCR to the Solicitor, ICF / USTIF and the Technical Contact within 90 days of the contract being executed. In addition, a detailed schedule indicating when specific activities and reports (soil investigation, aquifer testing, report submittal, groundwater sampling, well installation activities, etc.) will be completed needs to be prepared and included in the bid response. All on-site work should be completed during the normal working days and hours of 8 am to 5 pm from Monday through Friday.

RESPONSIBILITY

The selected consultant will be the consultant of record for the Site. They will be required to take ownership and responsibility for the project and will be responsible for representing the interests of the Solicitor and ICF/USTIF with respect to the project. This includes utilizing their professional judgment to ensure reasonable and appropriate actions are recommended and undertaken to protect sensitive receptors, adequately characterize the Site, and move the Site towards closure.

QUALIFICATION QUESTIONS

Proposals need to provide answers to the five (5) qualifications and experience questions provided below:

- Does your company employ the Pennsylvania licensed Professional Geologist (P.G.) that is designated as the proposed project manager? How many years of experience does this person have?

- How many Chapter 245 projects are your company currently consultant on record for in the Northwest region and all regions of Pennsylvania?

- How many Chapter 245 projects have your company and/or the proposed Pennsylvania licensed P.G. worked on in the Northwest region and all regions of Pennsylvania during the last five (5) years?

- How many Chapter 245 projects have your company and/or the Pennsylvania licensed P.G. closed (i.e., obtained relief from liability from the PADEP) using either the Statewide Health Standards or Site Specific Standards? Please list.

- Has your company ever walked away from a PAUSTIF Fixed Price Contract or Pay For Performance contract without attaining all of the Milestones? If so, please explain why the contract was not fulfilled?

CONTRACT INFORMATION AND BID INSTRUCTION

The Solicitor wishes to execute a mutually agreeable fixed price contract based on unit prices for labor, equipment, materials, subcontractors/vendors and other direct costs. The prices provided in the bid will remain in effect for the duration of the project (i.e. no escalation clause). The total fixed cost quoted by the selected consultant will be the maximum amount to be paid by the Solicitor unless a change of scope is authorized and determined to be reasonable, necessary, and appropriate. *Please note that the total fixed-price bid must include all costs, including those cost items that the bidder may regard as "variable". These variable cost items will not be handled outside of the total fixed-price quoted for the SOW. Any bid response that disregards this requirement will be considered non-responsive to the bid requirements and; as a result, will be rejected and will not be evaluated.* A copy of the proposed fixed price contract is included in Attachment 4.

The bidding firm will need to include the following in their proposal:

- A demonstration of the bidder's understanding of the objectives of the project and the bidders approach to achieving those objectives efficiently based on the existing site information provided in this RFB;

- Provide a clear description, specifics, and original language of how the proposed work scope will be completed. The bid package should specifically discuss all tasks that will be completed under the fixed price contract and what is included (i.e. explain your groundwater sampling method, which guidance documents will be prepared, what will be completed as part of the SRS, etc.);

- A fixed price cost estimate for work through the completion of the characterization activities;

- Provide a detailed schedule of activities for completing the proposed scope of work inclusive of reasonable assumptions regarding the timing and duration of Solicitor reviews (if any) needed to complete the scope of work;

- Indication of whether the bidder accepts or seeks changes to the proposed contract / terms and conditions;

- The bidder's level of insurance;

- The bidder's proposed unit cost rates for each expected labor category, subcontractors, other direct costs and equipment;

- The bidder's proposed markup on other direct costs and subcontractors (if any);

- Identify and describe the involvement of subcontractors;

- Identify any exceptions, assumptions, or special conditions applicable to scope;

- Cost by task and total costs must be defined within the proposal text and on the cost spreadsheets (Attachment 2 and Attachment 3);

- The bidder's total cost by task consistent with the proposed scope of work identifying all level-of-effort and costing assumptions;

- A statement of qualifications including that of any major subcontractor(s);

- Describe your approach to working with the PADEP from project inception to submittal of the SCR. Describe how the PADEP would be involved proactively in the resolution of technical issues and how the PADEP case team will be kept informed of activities at the Site;

- Describe how the Solicitor and ICF/PAUSTIF will be kept informed as to project progress and developments and how the Solicitor (or designee) will be informed of and participate in evaluating technical issues that may arise during this project;

- Answers to the qualification questions discussed in the RFB;

- Complete the provided Milestone Payment Schedules included as Exhibit B and Exhibit C in the contract included as Attachment 4; and

- Identify the names of the proposed project team for the key project staff, including the proposed Professional Geologist of Record who will be responsible for overseeing the work and applying a professional geologist's seal to the project deliverables.

- If a firm feels it is appropriate and necessary to complete hole clearing activities, the cost should be included in their proposal and costs. More importantly, if a firm includes the cost to complete hole clearing, they should specify it in their proposal and discuss why it is appropriate and necessary and indicate which methods will be utilized and to what extent. As discussed in the RFB, cost is not the only factor when evaluating proposals and other factors are taken into consideration during the review process, including appropriate safety measures.

- Bids should provide an appropriate total cost in the summary and detailed cost spreadsheets, milestone schedules, and text to cover the SOW presented in the RFB text. Specifically, if the bid proposes the completion of 2 quarterly groundwater sampling events then the costs to complete both events should be included in cost listed on the spreadsheets for that task. The total costs provided on the cost spreadsheet should not just include the completion of one (1) quarterly event.

- Please make sure that costs provided for each task are consistent between the submitted attachments (i.e. cost provided for the soil boring investigation is listed as $4,000.00 in the cost summary sheet, detailed cost sheet, both milestone payment schedules (Schedule B and Schedule C), and the text of the submitted bid). If a discrepancy in costs is noted during the review of the bids, the costs listed in the summary cost sheet (Attachment 2) will be used as the costs during the bid evaluation.

The bidder shall provide its bid using the format identified in this RFB and will provide brief descriptions of each task in the body of the bid document. In addition, the bidder will complete both the cost summary sheet included as Attachment 2, and the detailed cost sheet included as Attachment 3. An electronic version of the cost spreadsheets included in Attachment 2 and Attachment 3 (in Microsoft Excel Format) have been provided.

In addition to the cost spreadsheets, each bidder should modify the Milestone / Proposed Payment Schedules included as Exhibit B and Exhibit C (in Microsoft Word Format) of the fixed price contract in Attachment 4 to reflect the bidder's anticipated time schedule. The detailed cost spreadsheet and the RFB SOW will be incorporated as attachments to the Fixed Price Contract (also included in Attachment 4). Actual milestone payments will occur after all tasks in the milestone (as documented in Exhibit B and Exhibit C in the Fixed Price Contract) have been successfully completed and results (reports, analytical data package, boring logs, etc.) have been provided to the Solicitor and ICF/USTIF.

Please bid the scope of work as provided in the RFB. Consultants are welcome to propose or suggest a change in the SOW; however the consultant should bid the SOW as presented in the RFB and provide any suggested modification to the SOW and provide the cost difference (+ or -) separately in the proposal.

The scope of work, as described in this RFB, shall be conducted in accordance with industry standards / practices, and consistent with the PADEP requirements and guidelines. The selected consultant's work to complete the tasks discussed will be subject to ongoing review by the PAUSTIF or its representatives to assess whether the work actually completed and the associated incurred costs are reasonable, necessary, and appropriate.

In order to facilitate PAUSTIF's review and reimbursement of invoices submitted under this claim, the Solicitor requires that project costs be invoiced by the tasks identified in the bid. The standard practice of tracking total cumulative costs by bid task will also be required to facilitate invoice review.

The bid responses must clearly and unambiguously accept the provided contract or must clearly cross reference any requested changes.

In an effort to eliminate or minimize the need for change orders on a fixed price contract, please include costs to dispose of all anticipated volumes of waste in your bid response. ICF and PAUSTIF will not entertain any assumptions on the contract with regards to a volume of waste (i.e. Project costs assume that no more than 500 gallons of groundwater will extracted during the aquifer testing and require disposal). Bidders will be responsible for including costs in their bid response to cover the disposal of all potential waste related to the tasks included in the SOW. All waste generated during the completion of tasks related to the SOW may be temporarily stored on site, but must be disposed of offsite in a timely manner. Please estimate the volume of waste using your professional opinion, experience, and the data provided. Invoices submitted to cover additional costs on waste generated as part of activities included under the fixed price contract for this Site will not be paid.

Each bid package received will be assumed to be good for a period of 120 days after receipt unless otherwise noted. Please note that ICF, PAUSTIF, and B&B will treat the bids as confidential, but that limited general information may be released by the solicitor and/or B&B after the bid selection process is completed. In addition for your reference, a copy of the PAUSTIF Competitive Bidding Fact Sheet is provided in Attachment 5. The aforementioned guidance document can provide you with additional information of the bidding process.

MANDATORY SITE VISIT

On Thursday, April 5, 2012, the Technical Contact (or designee) will be at the site at 1:00 pm to answer questions and conduct a site tour for a limited number of participants per firm. Please inform the Technical Contact at least five (5) business days in advance of the aforementioned meeting date as to whether your firm will be in attendance. In order to accurately track meeting participants, the subject line of the email must state the following: BP Stateline RFB Claim No 2009-0002(M). **Any firm that does not attend the April 5, 2012 mandatory site visit will not be eligible to submit a bid response.**

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 – Tables, Figure, Historical Documentation and Correspondence
Attachment 2 – Cost Summary Sheet
Attachment 3 – Detailed Cost Sheet
Attachment 4 – Fixed Price Contract with Milestone / Proposed Payment Schedules
Attachment 5 – USTIF Competitive Bidding Fact Sheet