

**COMPETITIVE BID SOLICITATION
FIXED-PRICE, DEFINED SCOPE-OF-WORK TO CONDUCT
ADDITIONAL SITE INVESTIGATION AND INTERIM REMEDIAL ACTION
ACTIVITIES**

**Former Wrendale Service Station Facility
1950 Greensburg Road,
New Kensington, Plum Borough, Allegheny County, PA**

PADEP FACILITY ID # 02-83218; USTIF CLAIM # 1999-295(M)

August 5, 2011

ICF International (ICF), on behalf of the Pennsylvania Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Fund (USTIF) and the claimant for the above-referenced claim, is providing this Request for Bid (RFB) to prepare and submit a fixed-price proposal for a defined scope-of-work (SOW) to conduct additional site investigation and interim remedial action activities at the Former Wrendale Service Station Facility (Site).

A petroleum release at the site was confirmed in November 1997 following the closure of three underground storage tanks (USTs) (two 1,000-gallon and one 2,000-gallon). All three USTs contained unleaded gasoline at the time of closure. Excavated soil, presumed to be contaminated at the time of closure, was returned to the excavation following the collection of thirteen soil and two groundwater confirmation samples. A Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR) for soil was disapproved by the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) in correspondence dated August 3, 2010. On November 22, 2010, Groundwater Sciences Corporation (GSC), on behalf of ICF, submitted a Proposed Scope of Work to the PADEP. The Proposed Scope of Work was intended to address the comments in the RACR disapproval letter and specified a defined soil excavation to remove the soil from the Site that was presumed to be contaminated during the UST closure, the collection of soil attainment samples, and possible replacement of groundwater monitoring wells. In correspondence dated January 7, 2011, the PADEP approved the Proposed Scope of Work.

The SOW for this RFB is to perform the activities outlined in the Proposed Scope of Work described above. The SOW includes the following components (additional details are provided later in this RFB):

- Soil excavation
- Collection of post-excavation/soil attainment samples
- Backfilling of excavation
- Replacement of destroyed groundwater monitoring wells
- Preparation of a Remedial Action Completion Report for Soil

The Solicitor (Former Wrendale Service Station) 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, and necessary costs up to claim limits for the corrective action work described in this RFB will be provided by USTIF.

Should your company elect to respond to this RFB, 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 (as a single file including attachments in Adobe PDF format) on a CD to be included with the hard copy bid package to the ICF Claims Handler. No bid packages will be accepted via e-mail. **The outside of the package must be clearly labeled with “Bid – Claim 1999-295(M)”.**

The signed response to this RFB (both hard copy and electronic copy) must be provided as directed above and received by ICF no later than close of business (5 p.m.) on September 22, 2011.

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 cost will 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> ¹
Kozuch Estate c/o: Sam Coury, Esq. 1725 5th Avenue Arnold, PA 15068-4417	Linda Crabb ICF International, Inc. 4000 Vine Street Middletown, PA 17057 Phone: 800.888.7843 lcrabb@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 “WRENDALE SERVICE STATION 1999-295(M) – RFB QUESTION”. Bidders must neither contact nor discuss this RFB Solicitation with the Solicitor, USTIF, PADEP, or ICF unless approved in writing 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 September 15, 2011.**

¹ Subcontractor to ICF.

B. ATTACHMENTS TO THIS RFB SOLICITATION

Attachment 1	Previous Environmental Reports and Supporting Documents
Attachment 2	Standard Bid Format
Attachment 3	Standard Fixed-Price Remediation Agreement

C. SITE SETTING AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Corrective action activities are being conducted 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 / Location: Former Wrendale Service Station Facility, 1950 Greensburg Road, New Kensington, Plum Borough, Allegheny County, PA. The approximate latitude and longitude of the Site are: 40d 31m 34.81s / 79d 42m 15.79s.

Site Use Description: The Site is currently vacant.

Current Petroleum Storage on Site: Based on the characterization activities conducted at the Site to date, there are no petroleum storage tanks on the Site

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).

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.

The property has historically been used as a filling and service station with retail fuel distribution ending in 1997 with the closure and removal of the USTs on the property. Confirmation sampling performed at the time of closure confirmed a reportable release of unleaded gasoline. The soil presumed to be contaminated at the time of the UST excavation was reportedly "backfilled into the excavation for removal at a later date". This soil has not yet been re-excavated from the former UST area.

Characterization activities were initiated in December of 2000 with the collection of eight soil samples from six soil borings (SB-1 through SB-6) that were subsequently constructed as groundwater monitoring wells (MW-1 through MW-6). One soil sample collected from permanently-saturated soil contained concentrations of benzene above the Statewide Health Standard Medium Specific Concentration (SHS MSC). Concentrations of petroleum substances above the SHS MSC were detected in groundwater samples as well.

In May of 2001, two additional groundwater monitoring wells (MW-7 and BMW-1 (also known as RW-1)) were installed to characterize petroleum impacts to groundwater.

Characterization activities continued in 2002 with the installation of eight soil borings (TP-1 through TP-8) in the vicinity of the former USTs. Sixteen soil samples were collected from the eight soil borings and two soil samples contained petroleum substances at concentrations above the SHS MSCs in permanently-saturated soil. Also in 2002, four off-site groundwater monitoring wells (MW-8 through MW-11) were installed on the adjacent property to the north of Greensburg Road.

A Site Characterization Report (SCR) and Remedial Action Plan (RAP) were submitted in 2003. The PADEP approved the SCR with comments and disapproved the RAP in correspondence dated February 23, 2004. In March 2004, a revised RAP (specifying soil excavation) and Remedial Feasibility Report was submitted to the PADEP. The PADEP approved the RAP and Remedial Feasibility Report with modifications in correspondence dated December 7, 2004. One of the PADEP's modifications was the inclusion of attainment sampling following the proposed soil excavation.

Additional investigation activities were requested by USTIF prior to the implementation of the RAP. In February 2005, fifteen soil samples were collected from fifteen soil borings (SB-8 through SB-13, SB-15, SB-16, SB-18 through SB-22, SB-26, and SB-28) advanced at the Site to refine the proposed area of excavation. Concentrations of petroleum substances were detected above the SHS MSC in two soil samples located in permanently-saturated soil.

At the request of ICF, GSC supervised the installation of two additional bedrock monitoring wells (MW-101R and MW-102) and the collection of six soil samples from five soil borings (SB-1 through SB-5) in August 2006. During the installation of MW-101R and MW-102, three soil samples were collected. Concentrations of petroleum substances were detected above the SHS MSC in permanently-saturated soil from both monitoring wells. The concentrations of all analyzed substances from the unsaturated, saturated, and permanently-saturated soil samples collected from the soil borings were below SHS MSCs.

In June 2008, bedrock monitoring well MW-103 was installed to the southwest of the Site building.

In July 2008, three soil gas sampling points (SG-1 through SG-3) were installed and sampled. Soil gas sampling points SG-1 and SG-2 were installed near the northwest corner of the Site building and SG-3 was installed within the former UST excavation near soil boring SB-3. A second soil gas sampling event was conducted in October 2008. The samples were analyzed for unleaded gasoline parameters by USEPA Method TO-15. The laboratory analytical results for all analyzed substances for both sampling events were below the appropriate soil gas MSCs.

In June 2009, bedrock monitoring well MW-104 was installed as a replacement well for BMW-1/RW-1 which will likely be destroyed during the soil excavation activities.

In July 2009, the consultant submitted a Supplemental SCR and Revised RAP to the PADEP. The PADEP disapproved the Supplemental SCR and Revised RAP in correspondence dated October 8, 2009 primarily due to the lack of soil samples collected from depths shallower than eight feet. The PADEP disapproval correspondence also

suggested that soil excavation activities should be carried out prior to groundwater remedial activities. Additionally, the PADEP agreed to allow soil and groundwater be addressed separately.

In November 2009, fifty-two soil samples were collected from twenty-six soil borings (SB-29 through SB-54) at the Site. No soil sample was collected at a depth greater than eight feet below grade. All soil analytical results were below SHS MSCs.

In April 2010, the consultant submitted a Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR) for soil. The RACR stated that “the soil characterization samples demonstrate that the soil impacted by the 1997 release is in compliance with the applicable soil-groundwater UARSHS MSCs” and relief-of-liability for soil at the Site was requested. The PADEP disapproved the RACR in correspondence dated August 3, 2010, specifically commenting on the unknown depth of soil sample S1-N (collected during the UST closure from within the soil excavation) and the returning of soil presumed to be contaminated to the excavation following the UST closure.

In correspondence dated November 22, 2010, GSC, on behalf of ICF, prepared a Proposed Scope of Work to address the two deficiencies identified by the PADEP in the 2010 RACR. In correspondence dated January 7, 2011, the PADEP stated that the two soil-related issues (which led to the disapproval of the April 2010 soil RACR) will be considered “adequately addressed if the plan is carried out as planned”. Addressing the soil related issues identified by the PADEP is the focus of the SOW in this RFB.

Current Conditions: Groundwater sampling has been conducted at least annually between 2001 and 2008. The last groundwater sampling event was conducted in April 2010. The four most-recent Remedial Action Progress Reports have been included in Attachment 1. These documents include summaries of the chemistry, groundwater elevations, groundwater elevation and contour maps, and narratives of activities conducted during the reporting period.

D. OBJECTIVE / SCOPE OF WORK

This RFB seeks competitive bids from qualified contractors to perform the activities in the SOW specified below. This defined SOW has been reviewed by the PADEP and is designed to demonstrate attainment of/compliance with the Statewide Health Standard for soil by soil excavation and attainment sampling. This SOW also includes three consecutive quarterly groundwater sampling events. The first quarterly sampling event shall occur prior to the initiation of excavation activities and the second and third quarterly sampling events shall occur after the excavation activities have been completed. The intent of the quarterly sampling events is to evaluate pre- and post-excavation groundwater quality. Additionally, this SOW includes the potential for the replacement of groundwater monitoring wells destroyed during the excavation. Following the completion of these activities, the remaining corrective action activities necessary for the Solicitor to obtain relief from liability for groundwater will either be competitively bid or the Solicitor may choose to retain the consultant selected for this RFB.

TASK 1. Pre-Excavation Groundwater Sampling and Reporting: Groundwater samples shall be collected from the sixteen (16) monitoring wells (MW-1, RW-1, MW-2, MW-3, MW-4, MW-5, MW-6, MW-7, MW-8, MW-9, MW-10, MW-11, MW-101R, MW-102, MW-103, MW-104) and the water supply well before the soil excavation occurs. The groundwater samples shall be analyzed for the COCs by a PA-certified laboratory using EPA Method SW846 8260. A quarterly progress report shall be prepared and submitted to the PADEP in accordance with 25 PA Code 245.312(b). This groundwater sampling event shall be conducted within 30-days of the execution of the Remediation Agreement.

TASK 2. Soil Excavation/Disposal/Backfill: The soil excavated during the 1997 UST closure was returned to the open excavation following the removal of the USTs. The approximate footprint of the 1997 UST excavation is provided on Figure 1. The bidder shall provide a cost to excavate and properly dispose of the soil from within the foot print shown on Figure 1 to a depth coincident with the UST excavation (approximately 29 feet by 30 feet by 11 feet below grade (fbg)). The total volume of this proposed excavation is approximately 350 cubic yards. Additionally, the successful bidder is encouraged to over-excavate within the UST closure footprint based on site, excavation, and equipment limitations to a target depth of 13 fbg to assist with the remediation of groundwater by removing additional source material. The total volume of the proposed over-excavation is approximately 70 additional cubic yards. The northeastern sidewall of the proposed excavation (along Greensburg Road) may have to be sloped or benched based on its proximity to the cartway and to preserve the point-of-compliance (POC) monitoring wells that are located along the northeastern property line. Engineering decisions regarding the excavation are the responsibility of the bidder/selected consultant. Due to the spatial constraints on the property, the bidder shall assume that the soil will be loaded directly from the excavation into trucks for immediate transportation to a disposal facility (so-called load-and-go). This will likely require pre-authorization by the facility that will receive the excavated material.

Following the collection of the soil attainment samples described in Task 3 below, the open excavation shall be backfilled with uniform engineered stone to a depth of approximately five (5) fbg. Modified 2B stone will be used to fill in the remainder of the excavation in one-foot compacted lifts. Reverse grading of the backfill shall be performed as necessary.

The actual volume of excavated soil is dependant on many factors including benching and sloping, depth to water, and safety considerations. For the purpose of this bid, please assume a total of 420 cubic yards or approximately 630 tons of soil will be excavated. The bidder shall provide a fixed price for the excavation of 630 tons. The bidder must also include a per ton reduction cost if less than 630 tons are excavated and a per ton additional cost if more than 630 tons are excavated. The fixed price and per-ton costs provided by the bidder must include all associated tasks including but not limited to: excavation, backfilling with engineered material, surface restoration, transportation and disposal, waste characterization, traffic control and other safety necessities, and excavation dewatering. During the preparation of the Remediation Agreement with the selected consultant, the anticipated volume and tonnage of the excavation will be agreed upon and a deviation of more than 25% from the agreed upon number will require prior written authorization from the Solicitor and USTIF.

The soil excavation should be scheduled to occur after the first "pre-excavation groundwater sampling event" described in Task 1.

The bidder shall provide a detailed written description of the steps taken and equipment used to ensure the safety of motorists along Greensburg Road and to maintain the integrity of Greensburg Road and the POC monitoring wells throughout the execution of the tasks in this SOW. It is expected that the successful bidder will, at a minimum, accomplish this by working with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT), Plum Borough, and/or County government.

The Solicitor, PAUSTIF and its administrator, and the Technical Contact shall be provided written notice at least two (2) weeks prior to the start date for the excavation activity.

TASK 3. Soil Attainment Sampling: The bidder shall develop two separate systematic random soil sampling plans at the conclusion of the excavation based on the excavation extent. Each sampling plan shall show the locations of the proposed soil attainment samples in scaled plan view with the mapped excavation extent and also in a scaled view in relation to the excavation perimeter (sidewalls) and bottom. The first sampling plan shall include the collection of twelve soil samples from the exposed open soil excavation side walls from within the unsaturated zone and the zone of saturation but not the zone of permanent saturation as those terms are discussed in the Land Recycling Program Q&A Database ID #212 under the Category "Soil-to-Groundwater Values" (0 to 10 fbg) (no samples shall be collected from the bottom of the excavation or on the sidewalls of the excavation below a depth of 10 fbg as part of this plan). The second sampling plan shall include the collection of eight soil samples from the exposed open soil excavation side walls and bottom from within the zone of permanent saturation (below 10 fbg) (assuming the volume of this portion of the excavation is less than 125 cubic yards). The sampling plans shall be submitted to the Technical Contact prior to submittal to the PADEP for review and comment. The soil samples shall be collected in accordance with EPA Method SW846 5035 and analyzed for the COCs by a PA-certified laboratory using EPA Method SW846 8260. Note: the selected consultant should coordinate the excavation schedule with the PADEP and the Technical Contact to facilitate prompt review of the sampling plan thereby limiting the amount of time that the excavation must remain open following the removal activities.

TASK 4. Replacement of Groundwater Monitoring Wells: During the soil excavation described in Task 2 it is anticipated that groundwater monitoring wells RW-1 and MW-1 will be destroyed. These wells do not need to be replaced following the excavation activities. Groundwater monitoring well MW-104 was installed as a replacement for well RW-1 and was constructed with protective casing in an attempt to prevent its destruction during excavation activities (please see well log). As stated above, the excavation activities should be conducted in such a way to preserve the POC monitoring wells located along Greensburg Road (MW-101R, MW-102, and MW-7) and MW-104. In the event that any of these monitoring wells are destroyed, the bidder shall be prepared to replace (and develop and sample) them during the quarter following the excavation activities. Each monitoring well installed shall be completed in a fashion similar to the one it is replacing. In the event that replacement wells are installed at the Site, the wells shall be developed in accordance with standard industry practices and applicable laws, regulations, guidance and PADEP directives. (One of the documents to be considered is the PADEP Groundwater Monitoring Guidance Manual, Document No. 383-3000-001 dated December 1, 2001.) The wells shall not be sampled within 14 days of development. The bidder shall provide a unit cost to install

one bedrock monitoring well with development and one shallow monitoring well with development. Additionally, the wells shall be surveyed to identify locations on the scaled base site plan and to determine top of casing elevations (elevation above mean sea level)(see Item 6 below).

TASK 5. Post-Excavation Groundwater Sampling and Reporting: Following the soil excavation, attainment sampling, excavation backfilling, and the installation of any necessary replacement wells described in Tasks 2, 3, and 4, two consecutive quarters of groundwater sampling shall be conducted. Each quarterly sampling event shall include all monitoring wells (including replacement wells if installed). The first of these two quarterly groundwater sampling events shall occur during the quarter following the pre-excavation groundwater sampling event described in Task 1. For the purposes of this RFB, the bidder shall assume that groundwater samples shall be collected from the fourteen (14) monitoring wells existing after the excavation and the water supply well. The groundwater samples shall be analyzed for the COCs by a PA-certified laboratory using EPA Method SW846 8260. A quarterly progress report shall be prepared and submitted to the PADEP following each sampling event and document the results of the quarterly groundwater sampling including (1) depth to water and groundwater elevation of the water surface in each of the wells; (2) results of the analytical testing of the groundwater in the wells; (3) two groundwater elevation contour maps (one shallow and one deep) ; and (4) groundwater isoconcentration maps for each COC reported at a concentration exceeding the Nonresidential SHS MSC. The post-excavation groundwater sampling events shall occur after the excavation and in the two quarters subsequent to the pre-excavation groundwater sampling event discussed in Task 1.

TASK 6. Preparation of Remedial Action Completion Report for Soil: Upon completion of Tasks 1 through 5 described above, the selected consultant shall prepare a RACR for Soil. The RACR shall contain a description and the results from all the activities conducted under the executed remediation agreement including any modifications and/or change orders. This report shall be signed and sealed by a Professional Geologist licensed 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 RACR before it is submitted to the PADEP.

Additional Considerations

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 management, quality assurance/quality control, scheduling, utility clearance (PA One Call), 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 6, 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 appendix to the RACR. Waste disposal costs shall be included in the fixed prices quoted for Tasks 1 through 6, as appropriate.
- Be responsible for providing the Solicitor and 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 facilitate appropriate access to the areas of the site necessary to complete the SOW. 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 quoted cost for Tasks 1 through 6.

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) to complete the defined SOW. A standard Remediation Agreement is included as Attachment 3 to this RFB. This standard agreement has 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.** This statement should be made in a Section titled "Remediation Agreement". 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. **Note that the Solicitor has deleted Section 6(b)(ii) from the Remediation Agreement which stated:**

Should the Fund be temporarily suspended or permanently terminated, Client shall reimburse Consultant for any unpaid Payment Requests and interest, within 30 days of notification by Consultant of such suspension or termination. Interest is calculated as 0.75% per month on outstanding amounts;

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 and necessary. There may be deviations from and modifications to this SOW during the project. 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

At a minimum, each bid response document must include the following:

1. 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.
2. A Fixed-Price bid pricing using the standardized format in Attachment 2 including a rate schedule for any out-of-scope work.
3. Documentation of the bidder's level of insurance consistent with the levels listed in Attachment 3²;

² 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

4. The names and brief resumes of key project personnel, including the proposed Professional Geologist and Professional Engineer (if any) of Record who will be responsible for overseeing the work and applying a professional seal to the project deliverables.
5. Answers to the following specific questions:
 - a. How many Chapter 245 Corrective Action projects is your company currently the consultant of record for in the State? In the Southwestern Region? Please list up to 10.
 - b. 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 any of the available standards from the Land Recycling and Environmental Remediation Standards Act? Please list up to five. Please include concise case histories of up to two sites that you feel best demonstrate your company's capabilities or most-closely resemble this project.
 - c. 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.
 - d. Has your firm ever been the consultant for a USTIF-funded project that reached its claim limit? If so, please explain.
6. Identification and sufficient description of subcontractor involvement by task.
7. 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 applicable) needed to complete the SOW. Details on any proposed meetings and work product submittals shall also be reflected in the schedule.
8. A description of 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, the evaluation of technical issues that may arise during this project.
9. Identification of key level-of-effort and costing assumptions made in formulating the proposed cost estimate. The use of overly narrow assumptions will negatively impact the scoring of the bid.
10. A list of exceptions or special conditions applicable to the proposed SOW.
11. Quotations from major subcontractors.

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.

G. MANDATORY SITE VISIT

THERE WILL BE A MANDATORY SITE MEETING ON AUGUST 26, 2011 STARTING AT 11:00AM. The Solicitor, the Technical Contact, or their designee(s) will be at the site 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 REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED TO THE TECHNICAL CONTACT VIA E-MAIL BY AUGUST 19, 2011 WITH THE SUBJECT “WRENDALE SERVICE STATION FACILITY 1999-295(M) – SITE MEETING ATTENDANCE CONFIRMATION”.** The name and contact information of the company participant should be included in the body of the e-mail.

SPECIAL NOTICE REGARDING SITE VISIT - Space at the site is limited. Therefore, depending on the number of firms intending to attend the site meeting, different time slots may be assigned to individuals for safety and convenience.