COMPETITIVE FIXED-PRICE BID SOLICITATION

SITE CHARACTERIZATION ACTIVITIES AND REPORT

Skelton's Garage
206 South Main Street
Moscow Borough, Lackawanna County, PA 18444

USTIF Claim No. 2009-017(S)
PaDEP Facility ID #35-30873

July 28, 2010

Thank you for your interest in this Request for Bid (RFB). This RFB references a scope of work (SOW) for conducting site characterization activities and completing a site characterization report (SCR) for an active retail gasoline sales and convenience store facility in Moscow, PA. A petroleum release has been confirmed at the Skelton's Garage site (Site) and site characterization work and an SCR are required by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) to address the release under the PaDEP's corrective action regulations (Chapter 245, Subchapter D).

The Solicitor has an open claim [Claim #2009-0017(S)] with the Pennsylvania Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Fund (PAUSTIF) and the work outlined in this RFB will be completed under this 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 claim has not been prorated (funding has been set at 100%)

While certain characterization activities have previously been completed at the Site, the existing database is incomplete for Site characterization approval and for development of a remedial action program capable of Site cleanup. For the purposes of this RFB, it should be assumed that the solicitor has elected to pursue an Act 2 closure based on demonstrating attainment of the used aquifer Statewide Health Standard (SHS) medium-specific concentrations (MSCs) for unleaded gasoline parameters (new shortlist) in soil, in groundwater and for the vapor intrusion pathway in a residential setting (such that an environmental covenant is not required for site closure).

The Solicitor requests a written approach, schedule, and firm fixed-price bid to complete the SOW summarized by the list of Tasks below. The selected consultant will be expected to complete these tasks in accordance with all applicable PADEP rules and regulations.

Task 1. Additional Background Research
Task 2. Geophysical Survey
Task 3. Source Area Soil Delineation
Task 4. Deepen 2 Existing and Install 9 New Shallow Groundwater Monitoring Wells
Task 5. Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling (3 Events)
Task 6. Aquifer Characterization Testing
Task 7. Vapor Intrusion Pathway IAQ Sampling

Task 8. Contaminant Fate-and-Transport Modeling
Task 9. Conceptual Site Model
Task 10. Prepare a Draft and Final SCR

Please note that a bidder's response to this RFB Solicitation Package means it has accepted all the contractual terms and scope of work requirements unless explicitly stated to the contrary in the bid response.

Should your company elect to respond to this RFB Solicitation, one copy of the signed bid package must be provided directly to Chad Ames at ICF International (ICFI), at the address specified in Section 1. below. In addition to this one hard copy submittal, the complete bid response must be submitted to ICFI electronically (Adobe PDF format) on a compact disk (CD) to be included with the hard copy bid response. No electronic bids submitted via email will be accepted. The bidders completed Cost Summary Sheet is to be included in Excel format as well on this submitted CD. **The outside of the bid response package must be clearly marked and labeled with "Bid – Claim #2009-017(S)".**

Please note that the **bid response is to be sent only to ICFI** who will be responsible for opening the bids and providing copies as appropriate to the Technical Contact and the Solicitor. In order to be considered the signed bid package (hard copy and electronic copy) sent to ICFI **must arrive no later than Tuesday, September 28, 2010 at 5 PM.** Bid responses will be opened after the due date/time elapses.

Each bid response will be considered individually and consistent with the evaluation process described in the PAUSTIF Competitive Bidding Fact Sheet, which can be downloaded from the PAUSTIF web site (see www.insurance.pa.gov).

While the Technical Contact will assist ICFI, PAUSTIF, and the Solicitor in evaluating the bid responses, it is up to the Solicitor to select the bidder from those bid responses deemed acceptable to PAUSTIF as reasonable, necessary, and appropriate. ICFI and/or the Technical Contact will assist the Solicitor in communicating its choice of the successful bidder, which is anticipated to occur within six (6) weeks after receiving the bid responses.

1. ICFI, SOLICITOR, AND TECHNICAL CONTACT INFORMATION

ICFI Representative	Solicitor	Technical Contact
Mr. Chad Ames ICF International 4000 Vine Street Middletown PA 17057 (484) 532-7108 cames@icfi.com	Mr. Kenneth Skelton c/o John J. Mercuri Attorney at Law P.O. Box 310 Moscow, PA 18444 570-842-4574	Eric Henry Austin James Associates, Inc. P.O. Box U Pocono Pines, PA 18350 (570) 646-5431 ajaeric@epix.net

There is a single point of contact regarding this RFB Solicitation. All questions regarding this RFB Solicitation must be directed **in written form only via email** to the Technical Contact and must be received no later than seven (7) calendar days prior to the due date for the bid response. Questions and responses will be provided to all bidders via email. To help avoid confusion and increase efficiency, similar questions may be combined and questions may be paraphrased as needed for clarity, brevity, to avoid ambiguity, to correct an incorrect premise, etc.

Bidders must neither contact nor discuss this RFB Solicitation with the Solicitor, PAUSTIF, or ICFI unless approved by the Technical Contact. This RFB Solicitation may be discussed with subcontractors and vendors to the extent required for preparing the bid response. If a bidder has specific questions it wishes to discuss with the PADEP, these questions should also be provided via email to the Technical Contact who will forward them to the PADEP, but the PADEP may elect not to reply to any questions it receives.

Please note that **all submitted questions and responses will be shared with all bidders on a non-attributable basis** unless a question can be successfully demonstrated to be proprietary in nature. A bidder shall specify any questions it regards as proprietary by submitting those questions to the Technical Contact in a separate email with "PROPRIETARY QUESTION" included in the subject header, and a detailed explanation with justification for the request in the body of the email along with a clearly stated preference for either "ANSWER TO ALL" or "ANSWER TO NONE" in the event a question is not accepted as or cannot be treated as proprietary.

2. GENERAL SITE BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

Location
The Site is an active gas station and convenience store located at 206 S. Main Street in Moscow, PA at the intersection of Van Brunt Street and Main Street (Rt. 435) in Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania (See Figure 1 in **Attachment 1**).

Ownership
The Claimant, Kenneth L. Skelton, acquired the southern portion of the property in 1979 and the northern portion of the property in 1984. Lillian M. Skelton was added as an owner in 1995. In August 2009, the property was sold by Kenneth L. Skelton and Lillian M. Skelton to Ronak C&D LLC, 35 Silver Hollow, North Brunswick, NJ 08902 (See 1979, 1984, and 2009 Deeds in **Attachment 1**). The current station owner/operator/contact: is Mr. D. Patel, station phone # 570-842-4447). As of June 2010, the eFacts database includes entries under both "Skelton's Garage" and "Moscow Deli & Food Mart" for the 206 S. Main St. address.

Note that property deeds and associated maps include/describe/reference various right-of-way/access provisions (i.e. access to the property via Van Brunt St.). While not likely to affect the completion of the fieldwork for this RFB SOW, they should be reviewed for relevance/importance to the future remedial action and closure process.

Physical Description and Surrounding Properties

The Site elevation is about 1550 feet above see level. Van Brunt Street to the North is on the order of 8 feet higher than the Site and Van Brunt Creek to the south is on the order of 10 feet lower. Most of the facility property itself is relatively flat due in part to a retaining wall on the northernmost portion of the property, however, local topography slopes to the S/SE towards Van Brunt Creek (see Photo Panoramics in **Attachment 1**). The Site is connected to public sewer and water and is heated by propane.

The Site is bordered by Van Brunt Street then Doc's Café to the north, Rte. 435 then Railroad tracks to the east, the Medicine Shoppe Pharmacy property to the south (with Van Brunt Creek flowing west to east across the southernmost portion of the pharmacy property), and Café Classico to the NW. To the SW is a property identified as "Skelton" on a 1985 tax map (Book 1163, Page 711). Current ownership for this property to the SW has not been confirmed. The Site and surrounding properties are shown on numerous maps, figures and photos in **Attachment 1**. Directly across Route 435 from the dispenser canopy is an underpass (road passes under R.R. tracks).

The northern (currently paved parking area) portion of the Site previously contained a structure (shown in a 1938 aerial image included in **Attachment** 1) and labeled "Showroom" on a surveyed map dated October 17, 1979 (Richard C. Storm, Book 991, Page 309). There is currently a retaining wall roughly corresponding to the northern wall of the former "Showroom" structure.

The Site is a ~0.5 acre parcel including a ~2900 square foot one story block building, four gasoline dispenser islands (2 pumps each) covered by a canopy, and one diesel dispenser island (2 pumps, no canopy). There are three 10,000-gallon gasoline USTs (Tanks 003, 004 and 005), and a 10,000-gallon diesel UST divided into a 4k –Tank 006 compartment and a 6k – Tank 007 compartment for on/off road fuel located on the property. The station and downgradient pharmacy property are almost completely covered with pavement or concrete.

Tank Systems

According to entries in the Environmental FirstSearch Site Detail Report (included in the Datom Products, Inc. Phase I and Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment report [Phase I+II report] included in **Attachment 1**), gasoline Tanks 003, 004 and 005 were first installed in 1983, 1988, and 1988, respectively and Tanks 006 and 007 were installed in 1991 (during which time tanks 003, 004, and 005 were moved).

Portions of some of the **USTs appear to extend substantially outside of the apparent surface concrete so extra care must be taken** by the successful bidder to determine the actual extent. Tank locations and outlines shown on the **Attachment 1** Figures are all approximate/estimated and/or presumed from surface information and a review of generic tank sizing charts. They have NOT been confirmed and should not be relied upon in any way. The successful bidder will be responsible for confirming the locations/extent of all tanks, lines and other subsurface impediments and for taking all necessary precautions to insure that the work is completed safely and without impact to these structures. In addition to the SOW specified tasks, the selected bidder is expected to seek information from persons expected to be familiar with the current layout of the tanks and other subsurface features.

The Phase I + II report indicates that Francis Smith & Sons completed the 1991 facility upgrades as well as piping upgrades in December 2008. The Datom Phase I + II report (page 5) indicates that the three 10,000 gallon (STI-P3) gasoline tanks were "relocated on the property" in 1991, when the new (4K+6K) compartmentalized diesel tank was added. The original locations for these tanks should be confirmed to the extent that it may affect the site characterization work.

On the pharmacy property, there is an old vent pipe exiting the ground at a utility pole along Rt. 435, which appears to access a small tank ~10-15 feet from the pole. The claimant's recollection in 2009 (per the Phase I+II report) was that this tank had not been used for at least 25 years and that the tank was used to fuel vehicles prior to the medicine shop.

<u>January 2009 Soil Borings and Hydrocarbon Release Discovery</u>
On January 8, 2009, Datom Products performed a limited soil boring investigation at the property to address possible environmental concerns associated with the site's underground storage tanks and fuel islands. See Datom's Phase I + II report in **Attachment 1**. The reported release discovery date was January 9, 2009. A total of ten (10) soil borings were completed around the tanks and pump islands on January 8, 2009 with one sample collected per location (from the highest PID interval or the bottom interval when the PID was non-detect). Approximate soil boring locations (generated by AJA using the Datom measurements relative to various building corners provided on a sketch map following page 6 in the Phase I + II report) are provided on Figure 4 in **Attachment 1**.

Three of the ten borings (SB6, SB7 and SB8 - all near the SE property corner) exhibited detectable PID readings (at all depths measured) ranging from 10 ppm to 70.5 ppm with the remaining seven (7) soil boring locations exhibiting "0 ppm" on the PID at all depth intervals. The soil analytical results confirmed contamination exceeding PaDEP action levels (for 4 to 8 of the 9 unleaded gasoline parameters measured) from three (3) samples (SB6 @9-10', SB7 @6-7', and SB8 @3-4') consistent with the PID screening data.

The remaining 7 soil sample results were ND or below SHS criteria for all 9 unleaded gasoline parameters. The release was believed to be associated with the piping associated with dispenser 7/8. This is consistent with the soil data though there is no direct confirmation of a specific release location and the SB exceedence area encompasses the eastern end of two of the 10K gasoline USTs as well as dispenser 7/8 and associated lines.

Note that SB and SS are used interchangeably, which is not problematic since only one soil sample was collected per soil boring location. While not a bid requirement, it is suggested that inclusion of depth information in future soil sample IDs (i.e. SS16 7-9) may increase the efficiency of data review/analysis/handling.

<u>Phase I and Limited Phase II Report</u>
Datom Products, Inc. submitted a report dated February 2009 entitled "Phase I and Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment" to PaDEP. A copy of this Phase I + II report provided to ICFI and reproduced from a PDF file is included in **Attachment 1**.

It should be noted that the soil boring location sketch map following page 6 in the Phase I + II report is extremely rough. For Figure 4 in **Attachment 1**, the measurement information included on the Phase I + II report sketch map was used to locate the borings on a more accurate CAD generated base map relative to the building corners. Even so, the placement of SB8 on Figure 4 remains somewhat questionable since the Phase I + II report measurement data places it under the canopy near or possibly below dispenser 7/8 while the Phase I + II report rough sketch appears to show it about the same distance from Rte. 435 as SB7 which would place it near the outside edge of the canopy. While either location is consistent with a dispenser 7/8 or vicinity source area, a resolution to the SB8 location discrepancy may help to add value/clarity to the SCR.

It should also be noted that Table 1 – Soil Boring Chart in the Phase I + II report indicates that no sample was submitted for analysis at SS2. This is an apparent typo since the data for SS2 is provided on Table 2 and in the laboratory reports (ND for all parameters). The missing entry still leaves the sample interval in question, so bidders should assume (as the pattern indicates) that the SB2 sample was collected at the 6'-7' "refusal" depth. Also the data for SB-10 is missing on Table 3 – Soil Sample Results (SS-6 through SS-10) in the Phase I + II report copy but is available in the included laboratory report (results were ND for all parameters).

<u>PaDEP NOV</u>
PaDEP sent a Notice of Violation (NOV) letter dated 2/5/09 to Skelton's Garage (See **Attachment 1**). This NOV stated "on February 3, 2009, the Department was notified that a Phase II Site Assessment identified petroleum contaminated soil near the dispensers", indicated that a progress report should be provided no later than March 4, 2009, and provided a site characterization report due date of August 5, 2009.

<u>MW1-MW3 Installation/Sampling and 4/3/09 Summary Report Letter</u>
On March 3, 2009 James P. Sposito Associates and Datom completed the installation of shallow monitoring wells MW1-MW3 using a hollow stem auger. These 2" wells were installed to bedrock/refusal at depths of 17', 11' and 11', respectively. On March 20, 2009, DTW measurements were taken in MW1-MW3 and MW1 and MW2 were sampled for unleaded gasoline shortlist parameters. MW3 was not sampled due to insufficient water.

Bidders should note that the 3/20/09 depth to water value reported for MW3 in the James Sposito Associates Summary Report Letter dated April 3, 2009 (provided in **Attachment 1**) might have represented "bottom cap" water rather than the actual water table. This seems possible because the MW3 DTW was reported as 10.3 feet, which is only 0.7 feet above the listed total well depth (TD) of 11'. Well depths are often no more accurate than +or- 0.5 feet and the top of casing may be up to 0.5 feet below grade.

In the event that the MW3 reading was from "cap water" and the true MW3 water table elevation was 1 foot below the recorded level, the inferred direction of shallow groundwater flow would shift by about 45 degrees (more or less) from southeasterly (shown on the map attached to the April 3, 2009 Summary Report Letter) to SSE or Southerly. The 3/20/09 groundwater contour map provided as Figure 2 in **Attachment 1** includes the contours based on the original measurements as well as a separate groundwater flow direction arrow (with a question mark next to the arrow) to identify the potential "cap water" scenario described above (to give bidders

a more complete understanding of the available Site data and potential variability).

Both MW2 and MW3 (each 11' deep) had too little water (<2 feet) to expect sufficient amounts for representative sampling throughout the hydrologic cycle. This is addressed in the SOW well installation task.

Groundwater VOC Concentration Results
Only MW1 and MW2 were sampled on 3/20/09 due to insufficient water in MW3. Upgradient well MW1 was ND for all nine (9) measured VOCs except Benzene and Toluene and met SHS criteria for these two parameters. In contrast, downgradient well MW2 (near soil sample exceedence locations SB6 and SB7) contained SHS exceedences for BTEX, MTBE, Naphthalene, 124-TMB and 135-TMB. The highest SHS exceedence multiples for the March 20, 2009 MW2 sample results were 320X the Benzene SHS (reported at 1600 ppb vs. the SHS criteria of 5 ppb) and 161X the 1,2,4-TMB SHS (reported at 2580 ppb vs. the SHS criteria of 16 ppb).

Water Use
Regarding area water use, information in the file indicates that as of a May 2009 telecom with Moscow Borough Councilman Marc Gaughan, although a public water supply is available, there is no ordinance that would restrict the installation and use of private supply wells in the area. The 1975 PADER publication "*Ground-Water Resources of Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania*" shows Moscow Borough water was being supplied by 13 spring fed streams that had been artificially impounded to form reservoirs.

It also listed records for three supply wells in the Moscow area (identified from a large map included with the publication). Of these three wells, the nearest to the Site (Well #310) is shown to be roughly 1/8 mile NE of the Site and the owner is listed as Ralph Skelton. This well was reportedly drilled in 1967 to 140' total depth with 92 feet of 6" casing. A 4X Enlargement of the map portion containing the Moscow area is included as Figure 9 in **Attachment 1**.

Soils
According to the Lackawanna County Soil Survey the Skelton Site is underlain by Wellsboro channery loam (north of the source area) including the location of MW1 and Wellsboro extremely stony loam (source area and south including the locations of MW2 and MW3 extending south to just beyond Van Brunt Creek). **Attachment 1** includes a USDA Custom Soil Resource Report for the Site vicinity generated on 6/21/2010 using the USDA Web Soil Survey website at http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/.

Additional background information available for this site is included in **Attachment 1**. The best scanned-in version of each document available to the Technical Contact has been provided.

3. OBJECTIVES / SCOPE OF WORK

This RFB seeks competitive, fixed-price bids to complete the ten (10) tasks outlined below. To be deemed responsive, each bid must respond to each of the ten tasks as described. Consequently, each bidder should review the accompanying historical information carefully, and

base its bid upon its own evaluation of the information provided with this RFB. Bidders should note that proposed well and boring locations, etc. that are outlined below were discussed (at least in a general sense) with the PADEP-NERO case manager (Mr. Sean Haggerty) before issuing this RFB. The **Attachment 1** June 2010 email update pdf file includes the draft CAD figure (similar to Fig7ALL.pdf) used for these discussions. The CAD file used to generate Figures 1-8 in **Attachment 1** will be provided to the selected bidder upon request (this is not a professionally surveyed map and no warranty is expressed or implied for its use or suitability for any particular purpose).

It is expected that the selected consultant's approach to completing the SOW will be in accordance with generally accepted industry standards / practices and all applicable federal, state, and local rules, guidance, directives, and regulations, including the requirements of the Storage Tank and Spill Prevention Act (Act 32 of 1989, as amended), Pa. Code, Title 25, Chapter 245 (Administration of the Storage Tank and Spill Prevention Program), the Land Recycling and Environmental Remediation Standards Act (Act 2 of 1995), and Pa. Code, Chapter 250 (Administration of Land Recycling Program).

The Solicitor requires that the SOW covered by Tasks 1 through 10, including submitting a final SCR to the PADEP, must be completed <u>within 6 months following contract award</u>. The bidder's proposed project schedule for Tasks 1 through 10 must meet this requirement. The successful bidder will be required to correct basic errors or deficiencies in the submitted SCR to the extent they are associated with this SOW but will not be required to address (as part of this bid) potential PADEP comments requiring Out of Scope work. Should addressing PADEP comments on the SCR become necessary and require out of scope work, the selected consultant shall define a scope of work and associated cost at that time for approval by the Solicitor and PAUSTIF.

In addition to the SOW tasks specified below, the selected consultant shall also:

- Complete necessary, reasonable, and appropriate project planning and management activities until the SOW specified in the executed contract has been completed. Such activities would be expected to include client communications/updates, meetings, record keeping, subcontracting, personnel and subcontractor management, quality assurance/ quality control, scheduling, and other activities (e.g., utility location, etc.). Project planning and management activities will also include preparing and implementing plans for Health and Safety, Waste Management, Field Sampling/Analysis, and/or other plans that may be required by regulations or that may be necessary and appropriate to complete the SOW, and shall also include activities related to establishing any necessary access agreements. Project management costs shall be included in the fixed-price quoted for Tasks 1 through 10, as appropriate.

- Be responsible for coordinating, managing and completing the proper management, characterization, handling, treatment, and/or disposal of all impacted soils, water, and derivative wastes generated during the implementation of this SOW in accordance with standard industry practices and applicable laws, regulations, guidance and Department directives. Waste characterization and disposal documentation (e.g., manifests) shall be

maintained and provided to the Solicitor upon request. Waste disposal costs shall be included in the fixed-price quoted for Tasks 1 through 10, as appropriate.

- Be responsible for providing the property owner with adequate advance notice prior to each visit to the property. The purpose of this notification is to coordinate with the Solicitor and property owner to ensure that appropriate areas of the property are accessible. 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 SOW or total project cost for Tasks 1 through 10.

- Be responsible for keeping all wells in good condition, with each well properly sealed and locked between monitoring/sampling events. The selected consultant is responsible for repairing any seals or locks that become defective during the period of this contract at its expense; however, should a well become damaged or destroyed through no fault of the contractor, the Solicitor may request that the selected consultant repair or replace the well as an amendment to this SOW subject to the rates provided in the selected consultant's bid response. Any request for Fund reimbursement of the reasonable costs to repair or replace a well will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Task 1 – Additional Background Research

Through review and evaluation of the historical information summarized in Section 2 above and the additional information included in **Attachment 1**, bidders will understand what is currently known about: (i) facility features and setting; (ii) current and historical surrounding land uses; (iii) regional and local geology, hydrogeology, and hydrology; (iv) local groundwater use; (v) utilities; (vi) known or suspected source areas; (vii) sensitive receptors; and (viii) previous environmental investigations, and regulatory issues. However, under this task, bidders shall address any gaps in the current database for the site and surrounding area conditions that may prove important for completing the site characterization. Therefore, each bid shall address at a minimum the following additional background research needs:

a) The ownership of land associated with the locations of the two proposed wells on the opposite side of Rte. 435 is not known. The selected consultant shall determine ownership and prepare access agreements as necessary obtain access for the well installations and/or to coordinate with PaDEP in the event that access is unreasonably denied.

b) The ownership and status (abandoned in place? how?) of the offsite tank associated with the vent line along Rte. 435 is not known. The selected consultant shall make the necessary inquires to determine the ownership and status of this tank in order to be prepared to address it in the event that it affects the ability to complete the SOW or appears likely to affect the ability to obtain Site closure with relief of liability for the Skelton Site.

c) The previous location of the three (3) 10K gasoline tanks (moved in 1991) is not available from the reviewed files. The selected consultant shall make the necessary inquires to determine the previous location of these tanks and to consider this

information in completion of the SOW. The locations should be identified on one or more maps in the SCR.

d) The SS8/SB8 location is in question as discussed in Section 2. The selected consultant shall make a reasonable effort via inquires to determine whether this boring was completed beneath the canopy very near to dispenser 7/8 or closer to the canopy edge. The resulting approximate location should be adjusted if needed on the CAD file and maps in the SCR.

e) The Environmental FirstSearch Report included, as Appendix E of Datom's Phase I+II report does not appear to have included a search for local supply wells. The selected consultant shall complete or obtain a supply well survey sufficient to satisfy regulatory requirements for the Site. This should include a determination of the status of the 1967 Ralph Skelton well (#310 which appears to be located along Market Street to the NE per the 1975 publication previously discussed). Despite its distance from the source area, the potential for impact to this well can not be ruled out given that the reported (1975 or earlier) water table elevation for this well (1485 feet) is substantially lower that the Site water table elevation (~1540 feet), and given that the regional geologic data indicates that secondary porosity features exist that may allow enhanced hydraulic conductivity in that direction.

Bidders shall provide a firm fixed-price for completing these additional background research activities, the results of which shall be summarized in the SCR (Task 10).

Task 2 – Geophysical Survey
Under this task, bidders shall conduct a limited geophysical survey encompassing the areas proposed for subsurface work at the Site. Ground-penetrating radar and electromagnetic imaging surveys shall be performed to locate product lines, tanks and any buried utility lines in the work area vicinity (extending about 10 to 15 feet beyond proposed boring/well locations to account for adjustments/additions based on field screening / observations). This survey should encompass the onsite USTs, lines and dispensers vicinity and the consultant shall seek approval of the pharmacy property owner to include in the geophysical survey at least the offsite area encompassing the vicinity of the old UST located approximately 40' SSE from MW2.

These survey results shall inform the choice of soil boring and monitoring well locations that might be attempted safely under **Tasks 3 and 4** below (along with inquiries to parties expected to be familiar with subsurface features, the required PA One Call notifications and manual borehole clearing). The proposed soil boring and well locations are indicated on Figures 4 and 5 included in **Attachment 1**. The locations of identified subsurface features shall be marked in a manner and as necessary to guide the subsequent positioning of the soil borings and monitoring wells to be completed under **Tasks 3 and 4**. Results of the geophysical survey shall be included in the SCR.

Task 3 – Source Area Soil Delineation
Under this task, bidders shall provide a fixed-price cost for implementing a soil boring program to assess the magnitude and extent of soil impacts discovered during the January 2009 soil investigation (substantial soil SHS exceedences at SB6-SB8). Each bid shall assume

advancing ten (10) soil borings with 2 sample locations per boring (20 samples total) submitted for analysis. One sample should be collected from the interval with the highest PID reading and the other sample should be collected from near the water table or soil-bedrock interface (whichever is reached first).

In the event that the highest PID result occurs at the water table or bedrock interface interval then one of the samples should be collected from the interval with the second highest PID result. If PID results are all ND then the second sample should be collected from an interval above the bottommost sample and below any interval disturbed by airknife or hand auger clearing.

The data from these soil borings are intended to address the requirement for soil characterization. Proposed locations for these ten soil borings (SB11 – SB20) are depicted on Figure 4 in **Attachment 1**, but the geophysical survey, PA One Call, knowledgeable person inquiries and borehole clearance results shall guide the actual locations.

Soil boring SB11 (proposed location under the canopy about 12-15 feet NW of dispenser 7/8) will need to be completed through concrete. The intent of this location is to better characterize the extent of soil contamination relative to other dispensers/lines, to provide characterization of soils below 4 feet in the direction of previous boring SB10, and to help guide future remedial options evaluation. Vertical delineation is considered lacking in the direction of SB10 due to geoprobe refusal at SB10 occurring at 3'-4' below grade. The ND results for the 3'-4' soil sample interval at SB10, therefore can not be presumed to apply to soils expected below this interval to depths up to 11' to 17' below grade.

For SB11 the consultant is expected to reasonably exhaust all measures to insure safe completion of a boring in this vicinity to bedrock refusal expected no shallower than about 10'-11'. This is to include (if needed) at least two earnest attempts at hand clearing to a depth necessary to insure the safety of all product and other lines via airknife/SoftDig technology (or equivalent) through holes cut in the concrete as needed up to ~12" square with subsequent boring to bedrock expected to occur at ~11'-17'. In the event that geoprobing fails to reach at least 8 feet after two earnest attempts at completing SB11 through concrete under the canopy, the SB11 location may be moved to a location further northwest and outside the canopy/concrete. In this event, the consultant is expected to make an additional earnest attempt to reach a depth of at least 8' before giving up on geoprobe soil characterization below 4' in the NW direction from the suspected source area near dispenser 7/8.

In the event that all earnest attempts fail to reach at least 8' for SB11, but soils with a hydrocarbon odor or above background PID readings are encountered between 4' and 8' below grade, a sample from the highest PID interval shall be collected and submitted for analysis.

In conducting this task, the consultant will need to coordinate with the current station owner/operator and should plan to provide at least (1) week advance notice of major fieldwork. To the extent feasible, the consultant shall complete the soil borings (and other SOW tasks) in such a way as to keep one lane of vehicular access to the dispenser pumps open at all times.

For costing purposes, bidders shall assume that borings will be completed to an average depth of 12 feet bg. [NOTE: DTW measurements ranged from 9.3' to 11.4' in MW1-MW3 on 3/20/09.] In the event that additional drilling footage is required at one or more of the ten proposed soil boring locations, bidders shall provide a unit cost per foot for any additional borehole advancement, logging, and screening. Bidders shall also quote a unit cost per additional soil boring should field screening or visual / olfactory observations suggest that more borings are required to delineate the lateral extent of the impacted soil mass.

In addition to contacting PA One Call and completing the **Task 2** geophysical survey, bidders shall assume clearing and sampling the initial five feet of each boring location using a hand auger or clearing the location using airknife technology (no sampling within the air knife cleared interval). Below 5 feet below grade (bg), each soil boring shall be advanced and sampled using direct-push methods. Continuous soil samples shall be collected beginning immediately beneath any airknife-excavated interval for description of lithologic characteristics and staining or odor indicative of potential petroleum impacts. Direct-push soil core samples shall be screened in the field using a PID and standard headspace methods. Two soil samples per boring shall be submitted for laboratory analysis (20 total). These soil samples shall be collected from the depth intervals described above.

Soil samples shall be analyzed for unleaded gasoline shortlist parameters (i.e., including 1,2,4- and 1,3,5-trimethylbenzenes). Appropriate quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) samples shall also be collected and submitted for laboratory analysis. Based on these analytical results along with the results from the January 2009 soil investigation, the approximate surface footprint and volume of soils exceeding the PADEP Act 2 SHS MSCs shall be determined for inclusion in the SCR.

Activities under **Task 3** shall also include: (i) professional surveying of the soil boring locations and elevations for inclusion in the SCR figure(s); (ii) sealing each boring with bentonite and asphalt or concrete surface patch (as appropriate) after completion; and (iii) managing the drilling and personal protective equipment wastes in accordance with applicable regulations and guidance. The soil boring program methods and results shall be detailed in the SCR prepared under **Task 10**.

The task includes moving all soils/wastes (including any generated during pre-clearing activities) to a single location (designated by the current owner/operator) on the former Skelton property as the work progresses with no soils or wastes to be left overnight next to borings or any other location outside the one designated. Soils/wastes generated under this task are to be managed together with soils/wastes generated during Task 4 (Monitoring well installations). All sampling (for disposal facility acceptance), transportation, and offsite disposal of Task 3 and 4 generated soils/wastes are to be budgeted/completed under Task 4.

Task 4 – Deepen 2 Existing and Install 9 New Shallow Groundwater Monitoring Wells
Under this task, bidders shall provide a firm fixed-price cost for air rotary redrilling / deepening / expanding from 2" to 4" existing wells MW2 and MW3 (from a TD of 11 feet to a TD of 20 feet) and installing nine (9) new 4" groundwater monitoring wells (MW4-MW12) at locations shown (on and off of the subject property) on Figure 5 in **Attachment 1**.

These 2 redrilled and 9 additional monitoring wells are intended to: (a) delineate the horizontal extent of dissolved-phase contaminants in shallow groundwater; (b) refine the interpretation of groundwater flow; (c) enable representative aquifer testing; and (d) facilitate contaminant fate-and-transport modeling. Proposed locations for these wells are depicted on Figure 5 included in **Attachment 1**. These locations are obviously subject to revisions based on the consultant's completion of utility clearances including PA One Call, geophysical survey results, personal inquiries, hand clearing, etc.

Stream bank well

Please note that the well proposed along the stream bank (MW10) is a special case. It will require hand installation (pick/shovel/hand auger) and may not be feasible to install more than a few feet below grade with as little as 1 to 4 feet or so of 2" (acceptable for this well) or 4" (preferred) screen and minimal surface seal. The consultant shall make an earnest attempt to install this well to a depth at least several feet below the reasonably expected seasonal low stream water elevation but shall complete it regardless as long as it intercepts groundwater (which should be roughly the same elevation as the stream surface water. This well shall be installed with approximately 3' of casing extending above grade and this casing shall be stabilized to prevent leaning or substantial elevational change even if the base of the well becomes inundated due to high water levels in Van Brunt Creek. This stabilization may include a 2 ft by 2 ft X 4" thick (or similarly stable) concrete pad.

The purpose of this stream bank well (MW10) is: (a) to permit sampling of groundwater just prior to the point it intersects Van Brunt Creek for future DOA sampling and (b) to provide a surveyed location for the collection of groundwater elevation values that should reasonably approximate Van Brunt Creek surface water elevations. The MW10 well may substantially simplify (avoid the need for complex PENTOX/SWLOAD modeling) completion of closure requirements in the event that detectable hydrocarbon levels from the Site are present in all of the other wells along Rte. 435 and closer to the source area.

Remaining 8 New and 2 to-be-Redrilled Wells

The remaining 8 proposed new wells (MW4-MW9, MW11-MW12) and the 2 wells to be deepened (MW2, MW3) shall be planned for installation as follows:

Method:	Air Rotary (must be capable of drilling through Wellsboro extremely stony loam and bedrock)
Boring Diameter:	~8"
Total Depth:	20'
Screen Interval:	5' - 20'
Screen Diameter:	4"
Screen Slot	0.01" slot
Casing interval:	0' - 5'
Surface Finish:	8" (minimum) flush mount traffic-rated manhole 4" locking plug or cap

Based on the 10.3' average DTW in MW1-MW3 on 3/20/09, the above specification should result in wells extending approximately 10' into the shallow water table (so they may be reasonably expected to provide sufficient water for sampling throughout the hydrologic cycle).

Bidders shall assume advancing all monitoring well borings (except the stream bank well MW10) using standard air-rotary drilling methods. Drill cuttings returned to the surface shall be examined in the field and described for lithology, groundwater occurrence, and potential staining / odor indicative of hydrocarbon contamination. Additionally, soil and bedrock cuttings shall be screened in the field with a PID. In the event that more or less drilling footage is required beyond that estimated above, bidders shall provide a unit cost per foot for any additional borehole advancement, logging, screening and well installation.

The wells shall be constructed in accordance with the PADEP Groundwater Monitoring Guidance Manual. Bidders shall assume constructing each well with 4-inch diameter Schedule 40 PVC casing and .01" slot, 4" well screen. Annulus materials shall consist of #1 morie sand (or equivalent) extending to a height of approximately one foot above the top of the screen, overlain by a minimum ~3.0 feet of hydrated bentonite as a surface seal. Bidders shall assume surface finishing consisting of an expandable locking plug or cap fitted to the top of the PVC riser and a flush-mounted traffic-rated manhole (minimum 8" nominal diameter) with a bolt-on lid. The flush-mounted manholes shall be set into a 2 ft by 2 ft square or 2 ft diameter round concrete pad.

Each bidder's fixed-price cost for this task shall account for: (i) identifying subsurface utilities and other buried features of concern, including, but not necessarily limited to contacting PA One Call and clearing each borehole location to a minimum depth of 5 feet bg using airknife/vacuum excavation; (ii) well development activities, (iii) management and offsite disposal within 90 days of investigation-derived wastes; and (iv) professional surveying of the new well locations and top-of-casing elevations. Well drilling / installation and development activities along with supporting documentation (e.g., waste manifests, boring logs and construction details, etc.) shall be documented in the SCR. Bidders shall manage groundwater generated by the well development activities in accordance with standard industry practices and applicable laws, regulations, guidance and PADEP directives.

The task includes moving all soils/wastes (including any generated during pre-clearing activities) to a single location (designated by the current owner/operator) on the former Skelton property as the work progresses with no soils or wastes to be left overnight next to monitoring wells or any other location outside the one designated. Soils/wastes generated under this task are to be managed together with soils/wastes generated during Task 3 (Source Area Soil Delineation). All sampling (for disposal facility acceptance), transportation, and offsite disposal of Task 3 and Task 4 generated soils/wastes are to be budgeted/completed under this Task (Task 4).

All investigation derived wastes and soils must be disposed within 90 days of the initial accumulation date (per regulatory requirements). No soils or investigation derived wastes are to be left on Site beyond the 90-day regulatory timeframe (from the initial accumulation date) regardless of whether they meet SHS criteria. This Task is to include proper disposal of up to 10 Tons of soils/wastes.

Task 5 – Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling (3 Events)

Under this task, bidders shall provide a firm fixed-price to complete three (3) groundwater monitoring and sampling events assuming 13 samples for each (MW1-MW12 and one QA/QC sample). The results from the first two of these events shall be documented in the SCR.

The first groundwater monitoring and sampling event shall be performed no later than two (2) weeks after installing and developing the additional new and redrilled monitoring wells. The second (confirmatory) monitoring and sampling event shall be conducted no less than four and no more than six weeks after the initial event (to permit expedited SCR completion/submission). The third event shall be completed on a normal quarterly schedule (3 months following the second event).

During each event, the depth to groundwater and any potential separate-phase hydrocarbons (SPH) shall be gauged in all available monitoring wells prior to purging any of the wells for sampling. Groundwater level measurements obtained from the monitoring wells during both events shall be converted to groundwater elevations for assessing groundwater flow direction and hydraulic gradient. Bidders may assume 13 samples (MW1-MW12 and one QA/QC sample) for each event.

Each of the wells designated for sample collection shall be purged and sampled in accordance with the PADEP Groundwater Monitoring Guidance Manual and standard industry practices. Although the presence of SPH is not expected based on historical site information, any well exhibiting more than a sheen of SPH shall not be purged and sampled.

Groundwater samples collected during these three events shall be analyzed for the current March 15, 2008 PADEP short-list of unleaded gasoline UST parameters (i.e., including TMBs) by a PADEP accredited laboratory using appropriate analytical methods and detection levels. Appropriate QA/QC samples shall also be collected during each event and analyzed for the same parameters. Each bidder's approach to implementing Task 5 shall identify well purging and sampling method(s), QA/QC measures, analytes, and other key assumptions affecting the bid price.

Task 6 – Aquifer Characterization Testing

The consultant shall complete rising head slug tests at 10 wells (MW2R, MW3R, MW4-MW9, and MW11-MW12) to provide estimates of average hydraulic conductivity for the shallow water-bearing zone at the site. This list excludes MW1, which will remain a 2" well and thus less amenable to accurate testing and MW10, which is a special case stream bank well, which will have many features making it inadvisable to test. Consultants should expect partially penetrating wells whereby the water table falls within the screen interval.

Bidders shall provide a fixed-price cost for this task inclusive of conducting and evaluating the data from the slug tests. Each bidder shall specify:
(a) Details of how they intend to conduct the tests (slug characteristics, placement/removal, data collection, etc).
(b) The method they expect to use for analyzing the data (i.e. Hvorslev 1951 with effective radius derived from the initial drawdown value which is time lag corrected to account for sand pack drainage effects).
(c) How they will determine the initial drawdown level.

(d) How they will address the occurrence of a highly concave plot under a "straight line solution" method.

The data from each test shall be analyzed to estimate hydraulic conductivity. Raw data from the slug tests shall be reduced using appropriate techniques and the test methods and conclusions shall be described in the SCR including a table of hydraulic conductivity values.

Task 7 – Vapor Intrusion Pathway IAQ Sampling
This Task includes the collection of 5 SUMMA Canister IAQ samples at the approximate locations shown on Figure 6 in **Attachment 1** (one in the Site building, one in the pharmacy building, one outside of each building to serve as background samples along with one duplicate sample to be collected alongside one of the inside samples), using 24-hour flow controllers with analysis of the unleaded gasoline shortlist parameters at a detection level lower than the residential IAQ criteria per the 2004 Vapor Intrusion Guidance document (i.e. benzene must be detectable at .0027 mg/m^3).

The collection and analysis of these samples is to be done in accordance with PaDEP requirements applicable to IAQ demonstration of attainment sampling to determine compliance with the vapor intrusion pathway criteria. The analytical method is to be Method TO-15 unless PaDEP specifies an acceptable alternate method capable of achieving the necessary detection limits.

Under this task, bidders shall provide a fixed-price cost for collecting and having analyzed the 5 SUMMA IAQ samples (2 indoor and 2 background samples and one duplicate sample) consistent with the requirements, guidance, and decision matrices in the *Land Recycling Program Technical Guidance Manual – Section IV.A.4, Vapor Intrusion into Buildings from Soil and Groundwater*. The timing of these samples shall be confirmed as acceptable prior to sample collection via inquiry to the appropriate regional air quality personnel (as identified by the PaDEP case manager).

Each IAQ sample shall be collected in pre-certified Summa canisters supplied by the analytical laboratory. The Summa canisters shall be fitted with a flow-regulator calibrated to allow an approximate 24-hour draw so that each sample represents a 24-hour time-weighted composite (flow times as low as 8-hours are acceptable ONLY with documented concurrence by the appropriate regional PaDEP personnel).

All IAQ samples shall be submitted to a PADEP-accredited laboratory for analysis of the current March 15, 2008 PADEP short-list of unleaded gasoline parameters using appropriate analytical methods and detection levels. The IAQ sampling procedures and results shall be described in the SCR along with any recommendations regarding the necessity for an expanded vapor intrusion assessment that might need to include soil vapor sampling, if appropriate.

Task 8 – Contaminant Fate-and-Transport Modeling.
After the additional (and redrilled/deepened) groundwater monitoring wells have been installed and sampled twice (Tasks 4 and 5) and subsequent to collecting and evaluating the aquifer characterization test data (Task 6), a quantitative contaminant fate-and-transport model shall be developed to address all dissolved-phase constituents whose concentrations exceed the

residential used aquifer SHS-MSCs for groundwater. Bidders shall assume use of the Quick Domenico (QD) model.

Bidders shall provide a firm fixed-price cost to develop a calibrated, fate-and-transport model utilizing data generated from the site characterization tasks described above and any relevant historical site characterization data. This fixed-price quote shall include documenting the QD modeling effort in the SCR (Task 10). This documentation shall include a thorough explanation of model construction, justification for all input parameters, a discussion of the modeling results, and conclusions regarding current and predicted future plume stability (or lack thereof).

This SOW does not include the application of surface water modeling applications such as SWLOAD5B and PENTOXSD to assess potential impacts to Van Brunt Creek. The MW10 proposed location was placed along the stream bank (to monitor groundwater just prior to stream intersection) to minimize the likelihood that complex modeling would be needed to assess this potential receptor. Should additional site characterization data indicate contaminant loading to surface water does need to be evaluated more vigorously, this work would be considered out of scope and subject to the "New Conditions" provision of the Fixed-Price Agreement.

Task 9 – Conceptual Site Model
Under this task, bidders shall provide a fixed-price cost for developing a complete conceptual site model (CSM) for this site and its vicinity based on evaluating the results of the site characterization tasks outlined above. Information contained in the prior Feb09Phase I+II report and the April09 Summary Report Letter may also be referenced.

Information considered in developing the CSM shall consist of, but should not necessarily be limited to, stratigraphic and lithologic characteristics / relationships; groundwater elevations and flow direction; hydrogeologic controls on groundwater movement and contaminant transport; intrinsic aquifer parameters; the distribution of hydrocarbon contaminants in soil and groundwater, a subsurface hydrocarbon mass estimate; evaluation of potential sensitive receptors; and consideration of the contaminant fate-and-transport modeling results. The CSM shall be presented and discussed in the SCR (Task 10).

Task 10 – Prepare a Draft and Final SCR
Upon completing Tasks 1 through 9 described above, the selected consultant will prepare a comprehensive SCR in draft form for review and comment by the Solicitor and PAUSTIF. This SCR shall contain all necessary information required under 25 PA Code §245.309, and 245.310. Each bidder's project schedule shall provide two weeks for Solicitor and PAUSTIF review of the draft document. The final SCR shall address comments received from the Solicitor and PAUSTIF on the draft report before it is submitted to the PADEP for its review.

The SCR shall document, describe, and evaluate all findings provided from Tasks 1 through 9 above and incorporate information and data from the previous site documentation as the selected consultant deems appropriate. The document shall also: (a) contain all necessary figures, tabulated data, and appendices; (b) reference the selected remedial goal for soil and groundwater; and c) identify the proposed point-of-compliance monitoring wells. The SCR shall

be signed and sealed by a Professional Geologist registered in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The successful bidder will be required to correct basic errors or deficiencies in the submitted SCR to the extent they are associated with this SOW but will not be required to address (as part of this bid) potential PADEP comments requiring Out of Scope work. Should addressing PADEP comments on the SCR become necessary and require out of scope work, the selected consultant shall define a scope of work and associated cost at that time for approval by the Solicitor and PAUSTIF.

4. TYPE OF CONTRACT / PRICING

The Solicitor wishes to execute a mutually agreeable, firm, fixed-price, not-to-exceed contract for the SOW addressed by Tasks 1 through 10. A sample Fixed-Price Agreement is included as **Attachment 2**. The selected consultant will be provided an electronic copy of the sample contract in Word format to allow contract-specific information to be added. The Fund will facilitate negotiations between the Solicitor and the selected consultant toward executing this Fixed-Price Agreement.

As noted earlier, **a bidder's response to this RFB Solicitation Package means it has accepted all the contractual terms and scope of work requirements (for example, but not limited to, any report submittal deadlines) unless explicitly stated to the contrary in the bid response.** Therefore, any requested changes to the Fixed-Price Agreement must be specified in the bid response. Please note that these changes will need to be reviewed and agreed upon by both the Solicitor and the PAUSTIF.

Each bid is to clearly identify unit cost rates for labor, other direct costs, and equipment, as well as proposed mark-ups on other direct costs and subcontracted services for SOW Tasks 1 through 10 (See **Attachment 3** Detailed Costs spreadsheet). The by-task quotes are to be entered into the **Cost Summary Sheet** spreadsheet in **Attachment 3** to this RFB. Please note that the total fixed-price bid must include all costs, including those cost items that the bidder may regard as "variable", i.e., these variable cost items will not be handled outside of the Total Fixed Price quoted for the SOW. Finally, please note that referencing extremely narrow or unreasonable assumptions, special conditions, and exemptions may make the bid response too difficult to evaluate and may result in the bid response being deemed "unresponsive."

Payment Milestones: Milestone payments will occur only after successful and documented completion of the work defined for each milestone. Payment milestones under the Fixed-Price Agreement shall be broken out as follows:

- Milestone A – Tasks 1+2 (Additional Background Research and Geophysical Survey).

- Milestone B – Tasks 3+4 (Source Area Soil Delineation and Deepen 2 Existing and Install 9 New Shallow Groundwater Monitoring Wells).

• Milestone C – Tasks 5+6+7 (Groundwater Monitoring and Sampling, Aquifer Characterization Testing, and Vapor Intrusion Pathway IAQ Sampling).

• Milestone D – Tasks 8+9+10 (Contaminant Fate-and-Transport Modeling, Conceptual Site Model, and Prepare a Draft and Final SCR).

Please note that the selected consultant's work may be subject to ongoing review by the PAUSTIF or its representatives to assess whether the proposed and completed work and the associated costs are reasonable, necessary, and appropriate. In order to facilitate review and reimbursement of submitted invoices by PAUSTIF, project costs shall be invoiced following the task structure specified in the selected bidder's bid response. Tracking incremental and cumulative costs by task will also be required to facilitate invoice review.

Unless otherwise noted by the bidder, each bid response received is required to be good for a period of up to 120 days after its receipt. The unit costs quoted in the bid will be assumed to be good for the duration of the period of performance cited in the Fixed-Price Agreement.

5. ADDITIONAL BID PACKAGE REQUIREMENTS

Each submitted bid response must include the following:

• A reasonable demonstration that the bidder (i) understands the objectives of the project, (ii) offers a reasonable approach for achieving those objectives efficiently, and (iii) has reviewed the existing site information provided in or attached to this RFB Solicitation Package.

• Provide an answer to the following questions regarding the bidder's qualifications and experience:

➢ How many Chapter 245/250 sites has your company closed (i.e., obtained a Release of Liability under Act 2) in Pennsylvania?

➢ How many Chapter 245/250 sites has your company or the proposed PA-licensed Professional Geologist (P.G.) closed (i.e., obtained a Release of Liability from the PADEP) under either the SHS and/or the Site Specific Standard? [NOTE: The Solicitor requires the work described herein to be completed under the responsible care and directly supervised by a P.G.]

➢ Has your firm ever terminated work under a fixed-price or pay-for-performance contract before attaining all of the project objectives and milestones? If yes, please list and explain the circumstances of each such occurrence.

• A complete firm fixed-price cost bid for Tasks 1 through 10 by completing the Cost Summary Sheet spreadsheet provided in **Attachment 3** following the SOW task structure specified herein.

• A description and discussion of all level-of-effort and costing assumptions.

• Indicate whether the bidder accepts the proposed contract / terms and conditions (see **Attachment 2**) or has provided a list of requested changes to the Fixed-Price Agreement.

• Provide a statement of applicable / pertinent qualifications, including the qualifications of any proposed subcontractors (relevant project descriptions are encouraged).

• Identify the proposed project team and provide resumes for the key project staff, including the proposed Professional Geologist of Record who will be responsible for endorsing work products prepared for PADEP review and approval.

• Provide a task-by-task description of the proposed technical approach. **Unless explicitly stated to the contrary in its task-by-task description, a bidder's response to this RFB Solicitation Package means it has accepted all the requirements specified herein by task.**

• Identify and sufficiently describe subcontractor involvement by task (if any). Provide a detailed schedule complete with specific by-month dates for completing the proposed SOW, inclusive of reasonable assumptions regarding the timing and duration of client, PAUSTIF, and PADEP reviews needed to complete the SOW. Details on such items as proposed meetings and work product submittals shall also be reflected in the schedule of activities.

• 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 "in the loop."

• Describe how the Solicitor and ICFI / PAUSTIF will be kept informed as to project progress and developments.

6. MANDATORY PRE-BID SITE VISIT

On **Wednesday, August 25, 2010 at 1:00 PM**, the Technical Contact will conduct a **mandatory pre-bid site tour**. Any firm that does not attend this mandatory pre-bid site tour will **not** be eligible to submit a bid response.

While not mandatory, AJA respectfully requests that you send an email to ajaeric@epix.net indicating whether your firm expects to attend the meeting and how many representatives from your firm are expected. Please limit the number of representatives to no more than two (2) per bidding firm and be ready to provide a **single email address per firm** to be used for subsequent email correspondence related to this bid opportunity.

Questions will be entertained as part of the pre-bid site tour. In order to avoid an excessively slow pace or long meeting time, and depending on the number of attendees, a request may be made for some questions to be submitted in writing at the meeting or documented via subsequent email. Please note that referencing extremely narrow or unreasonable assumptions, special conditions, and exemptions in a bid response may make the bid response too difficult to evaluate. Consequently, bidders are strongly encouraged to ask clarifying

questions sufficient to minimize the number of assumptions, special conditions, and exemptions referenced in the submitted bid response.

ATTACHMENT 1

Relevant Project Documents

Filename	**Document**
Attachment 1A_Maps and Figures	• Figure 1 Site Map • Figure 2 Groundwater Elevation Contour Map (3/20/09 Data) • Figure 3 Groundwater Analytical Results (3/20/09 Data) • Figure 4 Historic (1/8/09) and Proposed Soil Boring Locations • Figure 5 Proposed Locations for New and Replacement Monitoring Wells • Figure 6 Proposed IAQ Sampling Locations • Figure 7 All Layers • Figure 8 Aerial Image Overlay Map • Figure 9 1975 Moscow Area Wells Map (Includes #310) • Geologic Map (Moscow Quad) • June 2010 Email Update with Figs to DEP
Attachment 1B_2009Feb Phase I and Phase II ESA	• Feb 2009 Phase I and Limited Phase II Report by Datom
Attachment 1C_Letters	• Feb 2009 PaDEP NOV Letter • Letter to PaDEP Requesting an SCR Extension
Attachment 1D_20090403 Sposito Summary Report Letter	• April 2009 Summary Report Letter
Attachment 1E_USDA Custom Soil Report	• Web Soil Survey Report for Site Vicinity Generated Via http://soils.usda.gov/survey/
Attachment 1F_Property Deeds	• 1979 Deed (Skelton Purchase of Southern Portion of Site w/Tax Map) • 1984 Deed (Skelton Purchase of Northern Portion of Site) • 2009 Deed (Skelton Sale to Ronak D&C)
Attachment 1G_Photographs	• Aerial Images in a PDF Portfolio • Panoramic Site Photos taken 11/01/09

ATTACHMENT 2

Fixed-Price Agreement

(This agreement has been provided in an electronic form that does not permit the user to modify the agreement because only the selected consultant will need to complete the agreement. An electronic version of the agreement that will allow for tracking modifications to the agreement will be provided to the selected consultant at the appropriate time.)

ATTACHMENT 3

Cost Sheets

Filename	**Document**
Attachment 3A_Cost Summary Sheet	• Excel Cost Summary Sheet
Attachment 3B_Detailed Cost Sheet	• Excel Detailed Cost Sheet