

# **COMPETITIVE BID-TO-CLOSURE SOLICITATION FOR SITE CLOSURE ACTIVITIES**

**CS Myers and Son Former Texaco Facility  
380 West College Avenue (S.R. 26),  
Benner Township, Centre County, PA**

**PADEP FACILITY ID #14-70518; USTIF CLAIM # 2000-0334(F)**

**August 16, 2010**

---

ICF International (ICF), on behalf of the Pennsylvania Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Fund (USTIF) and the claimant for the above-referenced claim, is soliciting bidders for a fixed-price contract project with performance milestones. Specifically, this Request for Bid (RFB) is seeking qualified firms to prepare and submit a fixed-price proposal to complete the tasks necessary to obtain relief from liability from the PADEP for the facility (Site).

A petroleum release at the site was reported on November 13, 2000. Approximately 3,000 gallons of unleaded gasoline was released to the subsurface from a hole in the UST resulting from an improperly-installed strike plate. A Site Characterization Report (SCR) / Remedial Action Plan (RAP) was approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) on March 9, 2004. An SCR addendum providing the results of additional characterization activities was submitted to the PADEP in August 2009.

The Scope of Work (SOW) for this RFB Solicitation is to perform all tasks necessary to secure relief from liability under the Statewide Health Standard (SHS) without the use of activity and use limitations (environmental covenant) for the Solicitor for the petroleum release at the site (i.e., demonstrating attainment of the Used-Aquifer, Residential Medium Specific Concentrations). The Solicitor, (CS Myers and Son), has an open claim (claim number referenced above) with USTIF and the corrective action work will be completed under this claim. Reimbursement of Solicitor-approved, reasonable, necessary, and appropriate costs up to claim limits for the corrective action work described in this RFB will be provided by USTIF.

The corrective action work of this solicitation will generally include the following components (additional details provided later in this solicitation):

- Conduct additional investigation activities;
- Evaluation of receptors and exposure pathways;
- Feasibility/Pilot Testing of remedial alternative;
- Preparation of a Remedial Action Plan;
- Implementation of remediation;
- Assessment of potential vapor intrusion;
- Groundwater attainment sampling;
- Preparation of a Remedial Action Completion Report; and
- Well abandonment and site restoration.

Should your company elect to respond to this RFB Solicitation, One (1) copy of the signed bid package must be provided directly to the ICF Claims Handler at the address indicated below. In

addition to this hard copy submittal, the bid package must also be submitted in electronic format (Adobe PDF format) on a CD to be included with the hard copy bid package to the ICF Claims Handler. **The signed response to this RFB (both hard copy and electronic copy) must be provided as directed above no later than close of business (5 p.m.) on October 15, 2010. In addition, the outside of the package must be clearly labeled with “Bid – Claim 2000-0334(F)”.** Please note that ICF and USTIF will no longer be accepting the electronic version via e-mail and that the signed bids (electronic and hard copy) for this RFB must be received by the ICF Claims Handler no later than the provided deadline for the submitted bid to be considered. **To reiterate, no bid responses should be e-mailed. The electronic version must be provided on a CD and delivered with the hard copy to the ICF Claims Handler by the provided deadline.**

On behalf of ICF and USTIF, the Technical Contact will assist the Solicitor in evaluating the bids; however, it is the Solicitor who will ultimately select the consultant with whom it will negotiate a mutually-agreeable remediation agreement. The bid evaluation will consider, among other factors, total bid cost, schedule, discussion of technical approach, qualifications, and contract terms and conditions. The technical approach shall be the most heavily weighted criteria in the evaluation. The bidders will be informed of the Solicitor’s selection via e-mail.

#### A. SOLICITOR, ICF CLAIMS HANDLER, AND TECHNICAL CONTACT INFORMATION

<u>Solicitor</u>	<u>ICF Claims Handler</u>	<u>Technical Contact</u> <sup>1</sup>
CS Myers and Son 650 West Cherry Lane State College, PA 16803	Gerald Hawk ICF International, Inc. 4000 Vine Street Middletown, PA 17057 Phone: 800.888.7843 jerryhawk@comcast.net Cc: jcramer@icfi.com	J. Neil Ketchum, P.G. Groundwater Sciences Corporation 2601 Market Place Street Suite 310 Harrisburg, PA 17110 Phone: 717.901.8197 Fax: 717.657.1611 nketchum@groundwatersciences.com

**NOTE:** Submitted bid responses are subject to Pennsylvania’s Right-to-Know Law. All questions regarding this RFB Solicitation and the subject site conditions must be directed via e-mail to the Technical Contact identified above with the understanding that all questions and answers will be provided to all bidders. The e-mail subject line must be “CS MYERS AND SON: PG TEXACO 2000-0334(F) – RFB QUESTION”. Bidders must neither contact nor discuss this RFB Solicitation with the Solicitor, USTIF, PADEP, or ICF 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. **All questions must be received by close of business on October 6, 2010.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Subcontractor to ICF.

## **B. ATTACHMENTS TO THIS RFB SOLICITATION**

Attachment 1	Previous Environmental Reports and Supporting Documents
Attachment 2	Standard Bid Format
Attachment 3	MODIFIED Remediation Agreement

## **C. SITE LOCATION / BACKGROUND**

Corrective action activities are being conducted at this site in response to a confirmed petroleum release at the site. Specific site background information can be found in the documents provided in Attachment 1. The following information summarizes, and is derived from, relevant information provided in the previous environmental reports that are included as Attachment 1. If there is any conflict between the summary provided herein and the source documents, the bidder should defer to the source documents.

### **Site Name / Address:**

CS Myers and Son, Former Pleasant Gap Texaco / 380 West College Avenue (S.R. 26), Benner Township, Centre County, PA.

### **Site Use Description:**

The site building is currently leased by the claimant to Robert's Oxygen who run a commercial welding gas business.

### **Nature of Confirmed Release and Subsequent Activities:**

The following information is based on the documents provided in Attachment 1. This information has not been independently verified by ICF or the Technical Contact.

On November 13, 2000, PADEP was notified of a UST release of an estimated 3,094 gallons of plus-grade gasoline that occurred on the previous day, November 12, 2000. After failing a vacuum test, the 4,000 gallon plus-grade UST was removed on November 16-17, 2000. Inspection of the UST identified an improperly installed strike plate as the cause of the release. No soil impact was noted at the time of UST removal.

Seven monitoring wells (MW-1 to MW-7), were installed in December 2000 to assess impacts to groundwater from the UST release. The wells were installed from 75 feet to 102 feet below grade using air rotary and cable tool drilling methods. The presence of gasoline vapors in nearby buildings was noted coincident with drilling activities. Boring logs and well construction diagrams indicate depth to water varied from 38 feet to 48 feet below grade. Lithologic descriptions, provided for MW-1 and MW-2 soil borings, identify 1 to 3 feet of fill overlying gray limestone bedrock. No soil investigation was performed. No petroleum-impacted soil has been identified at the site and therefore is not of concern.

In the initial groundwater sampling event on December 27, 2000, separate phase liquid (SPL) was reported in MW-1, MW-2, and MW-4. Laboratory analyses of groundwater samples collected from MW-3, MW-6, and MW-7 detected toluene and total xylenes at

concentrations below PADEP Statewide Health Standards (SHS) medium-specific concentrations (MSCs).

In February 2001, pump-and-treat pilot testing was performed at the site in the form of a pump test on well MW-5. This well is located approximately 150 feet to the west-northwest of the location of the release. Due to problems with sedimentation in the treatment system, the pumping rate was lowered from 10 gallons per minute (gpm) to 1 gpm for the test. The test was reportedly run for six days and a total of 6,971 gallons of water was removed, treated, and discharged. No drawdown was observed in any of the nearby wells at this reduced pumping rate. The description of this aquifer test in the MRLLC Site Investigation/Work Plan submitted in October 2001 stated that the flow rate was manually adjusted periodically to “maintain sufficient drawdown within MW-5”. This statement appears to imply that the test was a constant-drawdown test. Drawdown of approximately 9 to 10 feet was maintained in the pumping well during the test and approximately 2 feet of separate phase liquid (SPL) accumulated in the well. No hydraulic parameter estimates were reported based on this aquifer testing.

On March 22, 2001, operation of a total fluid extraction system (SPL and groundwater) began at the site. Wells MW-1, MW-2, MW-4, and MW-5 are used as extraction wells. The fluids from these wells was conveyed via underground piping to a treatment shed attached to the former car wash portion of the site building. The treatment system has since been moved to a shed at the rear of the site building. Inside the treatment shed, the extracted fluids are pumped to a 1,000-gallon oil-water separator. The water is then transferred to a 50-gallon sump where it is pumped through a mechanical filter and through granular activated carbon units before being discharged to the local sanitary sewer system under a discharge permit. Effluent samples are collected and analyzed on a monthly basis. This system continues to be used at the site.

Quarterly monitoring and sampling of most of the wells on site began in April 2001 and was expanded in January 2002 to include all wells. SPL was reported in MW-1 and MW-2 at each sampling event through October 3, 2002, and occurred intermittently in MW-4 during the same period. Groundwater analytical data from quarterly sampling events in 2002 and 2003 indicate one or more PADEP SHS MSC exceedences for benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, total xylenes, cumene, MTBE, and naphthalene in one or more wells.

Three additional monitoring wells (MW-8, MW-9, and MW-10) were installed along the north side of Route 26 in January 2003 to assess impacts to groundwater from the release of gasoline. Wells were installed to a depth of between 60 feet and 70 feet below grade. The direction of groundwater flow inferred from static water level measurements from the new and existing wells was reportedly north to northeast. Well logs from the three newly installed wells indicate that to the north of the site, the depth to bedrock varies from 24 feet to greater than 70 feet below grade. A fourth monitoring well, MW-11, was installed southwest of the release and south of the car wash in September 2003. The well was installed to a depth of 90 feet below grade.

Groundwater analytical data from the additional wells permitted lateral delineation of petroleum constituent plumes. A groundwater contour map prepared from the October 8,

2003 groundwater elevation data suggested that the petroleum constituent plume was laterally confined within the capture zone of the extraction wells.

On March 9, 2004, the PADEP approved the Site Characterization Report (SCR)/Remedial Action Plan (RAP) for the site. The approved remedial action was to continue operation of the existing on-site pump-and-treat system. The system was reported to have recovered 1,350 gallons of product to this point in time. The SCR/RAP indicated that the system was providing apparent hydraulic control of the groundwater plume, and that dissolved concentrations of petroleum constituents generally decreased over time. Monitoring and sampling of the eleven existing wells would continue on a quarterly basis.

Indoor air samples were collected from the site building in 2006. However, the samples were not analyzed for naphthalene or cumene and many of the laboratory reporting limits exceeded the MSCs for indoor air quality.

In May 2008, a fixed-price remediation agreement was entered into by the claimant with Mountain Research, LLC to perform a specified scope of work. In August, 2009 a SCR Addendum was prepared to discuss the results of the activities completed under the fixed-price agreement. A fracture trace analysis and a geophysical survey were completed in June 2008 to identify bedrock features that may influence contaminant migration. Three new monitoring wells (MW-12, MW-13, and MW-14) were installed on April 13-14, 2009.

### **Current Conditions**

The four (4) most-recent Remedial Action Progress Reports have been included in Attachment 1. These documents include summaries of the chemistry, water level, and operation and maintenance of the existing treatment system as well as groundwater elevation and groundwater chemistry contour maps.

Groundwater concentrations of benzene, toluene, MTBE, and naphthalene have been reported in samples at concentrations above the applicable MSCs during the last four quarters of groundwater sampling. These exceedances include samples collected from offsite well MW-2.

Additional information regarding historical detections of separate-phase liquids was requested from Mountain Research, LLC. The following information was provided:

*... the last measureable product observed in any site monitoring well was at MW-5 on 7/24/03 (approximately 0.01 feet). Based on our records MW-1, MW-2 and MW-4 have historically contained measurable product through October of 2002. We don't have the data tabulated so I don't know the maximum thickness. During aquifer testing in February 2001, 2 feet of product was gauged in MW-5 during pumping. Trace amounts of product were observed in MW-5 again on 10/3/02 and 7/24/03. Cumulative product recovery through February 2003 was 1,350 gallons. Product has not been recovered since February 2003.*

**Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) on Site:**

Five USTs currently exist at the site. This includes the four 4,000-gallon former retail petroleum USTs that have since been converted to consumptive-use heating oil storage and one 550-gallon consumptive-use heating oil UST located in the rear of the facility. All of these tanks are STI-P3, single-wall steel tanks.

**Current and Historical Constituents of Concern:**

The constituents of concern (COCs) at this site are the substances on the old PADEP short list for unleaded gasoline (benzene, cumene, ethylbenzene, MTBE, naphthalene, toluene, and total xylenes).

**D. OBJECTIVE / SCOPE OF WORK**

This RFB seeks competitive bids from qualified contractors to perform the activities necessary to secure relief from liability for groundwater (using the Statewide Health Standard without the use of any activity and use limitations) in accordance with the Storage Tank Spill and Prevention Act and associated statutes and regulations for the Solicitor for the identified petroleum release on the property (i.e., bid to a result rather than a fixed-scope of work). Bidders should assume that no corrective action activities are necessary to address soil at the site. Milestones are provided below to facilitate the preparation of a bid response and to maintain consistency among the bid responses for bid evaluation. **NOTE: The existing remediation system at the site will be shut down and winterized upon the execution of a new Remediation Agreement with the selected consultant.**

1. **Quarterly Sampling and Reporting:** Quarterly groundwater sampling shall be conducted at the site including all fourteen site monitoring wells. The groundwater samples shall be analyzed for the COCs by a PA-certified laboratory using EPA Method SW846 8260. Additionally, quarterly progress reports shall be prepared and submitted to the PADEP in accordance with 25 PA Code 245.312(b). This task shall continue from the date that the Remediation Agreement is executed until Task 8 (below) begins.
2. **Site Characterization Confirmation Activities:** Additional characterization activities must be conducted to verify previously-collected data or to address any perceived gaps in the existing characterization data at the site. For consistency, each bidder shall budget \$10,000 for this task. This task shall include the collection of data to confirm any elements of the site characterization or evaluate any site conditions that the bidder chooses. Proposed activities should be described in detail in the bid response document.
3. **Evaluation of Receptors and Exposure Pathways:** An evaluation of receptors and exposure pathways is required in the Remedial Action Plan. At a minimum, the following tasks must be included in this evaluation:
  - a. Review the PA Groundwater Information System (PAGWIS) records available from the PA Topographic and Geologic Survey website. This task shall include

plotting all recorded wells within a ½-mile radius of the Site on a map and including a copy of the database records for that search distance in an appendix to the Remedial Action Plan.

- b. Perform a Pennsylvania Natural Diversity Inventory (PNDI) environmental review to evaluate for the presence of special concern species and resources. This review can be performed over the internet at <http://www.gis.dcnr.state.pa.us/hgis-er/Login.aspx>.

**4. Feasibility / Pilot Testing:** The bidders shall prepare a conceptual remedial action plan including the conceptual design of a remedial system in order to respond to this RFB. It is industry practice to perform a pilot test or remedial feasibility test and provide the results of this testing in the Remedial Action Plan. The bidder shall provide a detailed description of the proposed pilot testing including the use of existing or installation of new data monitoring/collection points, proposed equipment to be used, and the data that is proposed to be collected. Additionally, the bidder shall specify up to five basic, objective criteria that will be evaluated to determine whether the remedial action proposed in the bid response document is feasible. The criteria shall be listed with an upper and lower limit that will define the range of acceptable results. These criteria must be tightly-controlled measurements or calculations that could be independently measured or verified by others during the pilot test. Examples of such criteria include but are not limited to:

- a. Air flow rates from an SVE point(s) at a specific vacuum level;
- b. Vacuum levels in an SVE observation point at a specified distance from the extraction well subjected to a specified vacuum and air-flow rate; and
- c. Sustained groundwater extraction rate required to lower the water table in a well at a specified distance from the extraction well a specified distance.

The criteria selected and the range for each specified in the bid response document will be evaluated by the bid evaluation committee as part of the technical review.

If the results of the pilot testing show that the proposed remedial action is feasible based on the specified criteria and ranges, the selected consultant shall move forward on the project. However, if the results of the pilot testing show that the proposed remedial action is not feasible based on the specified criteria, either the selected consultant or the Solicitor may cancel the Remediation Agreement (See Term 13 in the Remediation Agreement). This stage of the project is referred to as the "Pilot Test Off-Ramp" and is intended to protect the selected consultant and the Solicitor from being obligated to move forward with a remedial action that is expected to be far from optimal or expected to fail. Full documentation of the pilot test including documentation of the specified criteria shall be required following the completion of this task.

For consistency, bidders shall budget 10% of the total bid cost for this task (with a maximum of \$50,000). For example, if the total proposed cost for Tasks 1-12 (excluding Task 4) is determined to be \$300,000, the cost of Task 4 specified in the bid response shall be \$30,000. However, if the total proposed cost for Tasks 1-12 (excluding Task 4) is determined to be \$550,000, the cost of Task 4 specified in the bid response shall be \$50,000.

- 5. Preparation of Remedial Action Plan:** Upon completion of Tasks 2 through 4 described above, the selected consultant shall prepare a new (i.e., not an amended or revised) Remedial Action Plan (RAP) in draft form for review and comment by the Solicitor and USTIF. This RAP shall contain all information required under 25 PA Code 245.311 and other applicable statutes, regulations, and guidance including being signed and sealed by a Professional Geologist and a Professional Engineer registered in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Each bidder's project schedule shall provide two weeks for Solicitor and USTIF review of the draft document. The final RAP shall address comments received from the Solicitor and USTIF on the draft report before it is submitted to the PADEP. The RAP shall be consistent (with regard to approach and level of effort) with the conceptual remedial action plan provided in the selected consultant's bid response.
- 6. Baseline Sampling:** The purpose of the baseline sampling is to provide a metric for the conditions prior to remediation that allows for the evaluation of remedial progress. Specifically, the performance milestones (D1 through D6) will be calculated using the baseline sampling concentrations in accordance with the Remediation Agreement. Baseline groundwater sampling shall include the collection of groundwater samples from each of the key wells identified for this purpose by the Solicitor and selected consultant in the Remediation Agreement. Baseline sampling shall also include the measurement of separate phase liquid (SPL) thickness in each well designated for this purpose in the Remediation Agreement. This baseline-sampling event shall be conducted prior to the startup of the remediation system. All groundwater monitoring well purging and sampling shall be performed in accordance with previously-used techniques (Task 1) for the site and applicable statutes, regulations and guidance. Baseline samples shall be analyzed using USEPA SW-846 8260B by a PADEP-certified laboratory. This shall include trip blanks, one duplicate sample, and an equipment rinse blank if any non-dedicated equipment is used. All SPL thickness measurements shall be made with an electronic interface probe. For consistency, bidders should assume that there will be five key wells at the site (i.e., five wells will need to be sampled under this task).
- 7. Remedial Installation and Startup:** This task shall include all costs associated with the purchase and installation of the corrective action system up to the point in time that it has been installed and daily operation is implemented as described in the selected consultant's PADEP-approved RAP. The Solicitor and USTIF shall have the opportunity to inspect and confirm that the system has been installed as described in the Remediation Agreement and is in daily operation as described in the RAP. Bidder shall describe specific monitoring operation, monitoring, and maintenance procedures proposed to monitor and evaluate the performance of the proposed remediation system and how the system may be adjusted during the implementation of the remediation.
- 8. Implementation of Remediation:** This task shall include all costs associated with the operation and maintenance of the proposed remedial action. This task will also include quarterly groundwater sampling and reporting in accordance with 25 PA Code 245.312.

- 9. Vapor Intrusion Assessment:** An assessment of potential vapor intrusion into buildings shall be conducted in accordance with the Land Recycling Program Technical Guidance Manual – Section IV.A.4.
- 10. Groundwater Attainment Sampling:** Under this task, bidders shall provide a fixed price to complete eight quarters of groundwater monitoring and sampling following the completion of Task 8.<sup>2</sup> Each monitoring event shall include the sampling of all monitoring wells identified in the new RAP (Task 5) for this purpose. Wells should be analyzed for the COCs using USEPA SW-846 8260B by a PADEP-certified laboratory.
- 11. Preparation of Remedial Action Completion Report:** Upon completion of Tasks 1 through 10 described above, the selected consultant shall prepare a Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR) in draft form for review and comment by the Solicitor and USTIF. This RACR shall contain all information required under 25 PA Code 245.313 and other applicable statutes, regulations, and guidance including being signed and sealed by a Professional Geologist registered in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Each bidder's project schedule shall provide two weeks for Solicitor and USTIF review of the draft document. The final RACR shall address comments received from the Solicitor and USTIF on the draft report before it is submitted to the PADEP. The RACR shall request relief from liability for the November 2000 petroleum release by demonstrating compliance with the Residential, Used Aquifer Statewide Health Standard without the use of any activity and use limitations, institutional controls, or engineering controls.
- 12. Well Abandonment and Site Restoration:** Completion of abandonment of all monitoring and remediation wells shall be conducted in accordance with generally-accepted procedures and any applicable regulations or guidance documents. All wells must be properly abandoned and the Site be restored by replacing disturbed concrete, bituminous paving materials or other surface materials in place at the Site at the time of abandonment. The selected consultant shall determine whether the Solicitor wishes to maintain any components of the remedial system (e.g. shed) before removing it from the property. This task shall also include photo-documenting the site restoration work and completion of the well abandonment forms. Copies of these photographs and forms shall be provided for the Solicitor's files.

In addition to the specific tasks specified above, the selected consultant shall also:

- Complete necessary, reasonable, and appropriate project planning and management activities until the SOW specified in the executed remediation agreement has been completed. Such activities would be expected to include client communications / updates, meetings, record keeping, subcontracting, personnel and subcontractor

---

<sup>2</sup> Bidders shall petition the PADEP for a reduction of the number of quarters for attainment from eight to four if data are either non-detect at the reporting limit or below the applicable groundwater MSC.

management, quality assurance/quality control, scheduling, and other activities. Project planning and management activities will also include preparing and implementing any plans required by regulations or that may be necessary and appropriate to complete the scope of work. This may include health and safety plans, waste management plans, field sampling and analysis plans, and/or access agreements. Project management costs shall be included in the fixed prices quoted for Tasks 1 through 12, as appropriate.

- Be responsible for coordinating, managing and completing the proper management, characterization, handling, treatment, and/or disposal of all investigation derived wastes in accordance with standard industry practices and applicable laws, regulations, guidance and PADEP directives. Waste characterization and disposal documentation shall be maintained and provided to the Solicitor upon request and shall be included as an appendices to either the RAP or the RACR. Waste disposal costs shall be included in the fixed prices quoted for Tasks 1 through 12, as appropriate.
- Be responsible for providing the Solicitor and property tenants with adequate advance notice prior to each visit to the property. The purpose of this notification is to coordinate with the Solicitor and tenants to facilitate appropriate access to the areas of the site necessary to complete the Scope of Work. Return visits to the site prompted by a failure to make the necessary logistical arrangements in advance will not constitute a change in the selected consultant's Scope of Work or total quoted cost for Tasks 1 through 12.

All work shall be conducted in accordance with industry standards / practices, and be consistent with the applicable laws, regulations, and guidance (e.g., PADEP Groundwater Monitoring Guidance Manual, Document No. 383-3000-001 dated December 1, 2001).

Each bidder should carefully review the existing site information provided in Attachment 1 to this RFB and seek out other appropriate sources of information to develop a cost estimate and schedule to close the site. There is no prequalification process for bidding. Therefore, bids that demonstrate an understanding of existing site information and standard industry practices will be regarded as responsive to this solicitation.

#### **E. TYPE OF CONTRACT / PRICING**

The Solicitor wishes to execute a mutually-agreeable fixed-price contract (Remediation Agreement) that includes performance-based milestones. A copy of the proposed Remediation Agreement is included as Attachment 3 to this RFB solicitation. This agreement is a combination of the standard Fixed-Price Remediation Agreement and the standard Pay-for-Performance Contract that have been previously employed by other Solicitors on other USTIF-funded claims. The bidder must identify in the bid response document any modifications that they wish to propose to the Remediation Agreement language in Attachment 3 other than obvious modifications to fit this RFB (e.g., names and dates). The number and scope of any modifications to the agreement will be one of the

criteria used to evaluate the bid. **Any bid response that does not clearly and unambiguously state that the bidder accepts the Remediation Agreement included in Attachment 3 "as is," or that does not provide a cross-referenced list of requested changes to this agreement will be considered non-responsive to this RFB Solicitation.** Any requested changes to the agreement should be specified in the bid response, however, these changes will need to be reviewed and agreed upon by both the Solicitor and USTIF.

The Remediation Agreement costs shall be based on unit prices for labor, equipment, materials, subcontractors/vendors and other direct costs. The total cost quoted by the selected consultant will be the maximum amount to be paid by the Solicitor unless a change in scope is authorized and determined to be reasonable, necessary, and appropriate. The Remediation Agreement states that any significant changes to the SOW will require approval by the Solicitor, USTIF, and PADEP.

The bidder shall provide its bid using the format identified in Attachment 2 with brief descriptions provided for each task provided in the body of the bid document. In addition to Attachment 2, the bidder shall provide a unit rate schedule that will be used for any out-of-scope work on this project.

The selected consultant's work under the USTIF claim will be subject to ongoing review by the Solicitor and USTIF or its representatives to assess whether the work has been completed and the associated incurred costs are reasonable, necessary, and appropriate.

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

Each bid package received will be assumed to be valid for a period of up to 120 days after receipt unless otherwise noted. The costs quoted in the bid and the rate schedule will be assumed to be valid for the duration of the contract.

## **F. BID RESPONSE DOCUMENT**

Each bid response document must address the following:

1. Include a demonstration of the bidder's understanding of the existing site information provided in this RFB, standard industry practices, and the objectives of the project including all 12 elements of the Objective/Scope of Work. This information will be a critical component in the bid evaluation because the bidder's understanding and technical approach will be the most heavily-weighted evaluation criteria.
2. Identify the bidder's approach to achieving project objectives efficiently and effectively.
3. Provide Fixed-Price bid pricing using the standardized format in Attachment 2 including a rate schedule for any out-of-scope work.

4. Include documentation of the bidder's level of insurance consistent with the levels listed in Attachment 3<sup>3</sup>;
5. Identify the key project personnel, including the proposed Professional Geologist and Professional Engineer of Record who will be responsible for overseeing the work and applying a professional seals to the project deliverables. **The inclusion of brief resumes of key project team members is required.**
6. Include answers to the following specific questions:
  - a. Does your company employ the PA-licensed Professional Geologist and Professional Engineer that are designated above?
  - b. How many Chapter 245 Corrective Action projects is your company currently the consultant of record for in the State? In the Northcentral Region? Please list up to 10.
  - c. How many Chapter 245 Corrective Action projects has your company and/or the PA-licensed PG closed (i.e., obtained relief from liability from the PADEP following the submission of an SCR, RAP, and RACR) using the Statewide Health Standard and the remedial technology proposed in your bid response? Provide up to two concise case histories including duration of remediation and timing to obtain relief from liability. These case histories should include a description of the nature and extent of contamination at the site prior to the implementation of the remediation (i.e., list of contaminated media and average concentrations in each media).
  - d. Has your firm ever been a party to a terminated USTIF-funded Fixed-Price (FP) or Pay-for-Performance (PFP) contract without attaining all of the Milestones? If so, please explain, including whether the conditions of the FP or PFP contract were met.
  - e. Has your firm ever been the consultant for a USTIF-funded project that reached its claim limit? If so, please explain.
7. Identify and sufficiently describe subcontractor involvement by task.
8. Describe how the bidder will monitor and evaluate the performance of the remediation system and how the system may be adjusted during the implementation of the remediation.
9. Provide a detailed schedule of activities for completing the proposed SOW inclusive of reasonable assumptions regarding the timing and duration of client and PADEP reviews (if any) needed to complete the SOW. Details on such items as proposed meetings and work product submittals shall also be reflected in the schedule.

---

<sup>3</sup> The selected consultant agrees and shall submit evidence to the Solicitor before beginning work that bidder has procured and will maintain Workers Compensation; commercial general and contractual liability; commercial automobile liability; and professional liability insurance commensurate with the level stated in the Remediation Agreement and commensurate with industry standards for the work to be performed.

10. Describe your approach to working with the PADEP, from project inception to site closure.
11. Describe how the Solicitor and ICF / USTIF will be kept informed on the 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.
12. Identify key assumptions made in formulating the proposed cost estimate. The use of overly narrow assumptions will negatively impact the bid.
13. Identify any exceptions or special conditions applicable to the proposed SOW.
14. Include quotations from major subcontractors.

**G. MANDATORY SITE VISIT**

**THERE WILL BE A MANDATORY SITE MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 20, 2010.** The Solicitor, the Technical Contact, or their designee will be at the site between 11:00 am and 1:00 pm to answer questions and conduct a site tour for one participant per firm. This meeting is mandatory for all bidders – no exceptions. This meeting will allow each bidding firm to inspect the site and evaluate site conditions. **A CONFIRMATION OF YOUR INTENT TO ATTEND THIS MEETING IS REQUESTED TO BE PROVIDED TO THE TECHNICAL CONTACT VIA E-MAIL BY SEPTEMBER 13, 2010 WITH THE SUBJECT “CS MYERS AND SON PG TEXACO 2000-0334(F) – SITE MEETING ATTENDANCE CONFIRMATION”.** The name and contact information of the company participant should be included in the body of the e-mail.