

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES

## I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The James River Water Authority (the “JRWA”) is developing the James River Water Supply Project (Project). The purpose of the proposed project is to provide a new and reliable raw water supply of sufficient quantity to meet the short and long-term needs of Fluvanna and Louisa Counties for delivery to an agreed-upon T interconnection point planned for use by Fluvanna and Louisa Counties. The proposed project is necessary to meet the near-term and long-term water demands associated with the Counties of Fluvanna and Louisa.

The current Project site was recently relocated to resolve objections from consulting parties regarding impacts on cultural resources at the previous site. The currently proposed Project design would situate the intake structure beneath the water surface in the James River, approximately 2.2 miles upstream of its confluence with the Rivanna River and will convey water from an aboveground pump station on the adjacent floodplain in a northerly then easterly direction approximately 4.1 miles to a point north of Route 6 west of the town of Columbia. More information about the background and history of JRWA’s project can be found at the following link: <https://www.fluvannacounty.org/bc-jrwa>.

The JRWA is seeking proposals from qualified firms to provide archaeological and historic architectural studies. This includes Phase I survey in a limited portion of the Project and Phase II archaeological testing and architectural evaluation at select resources. The consultant would be an independent contractor to the JRWA and would be responsible for conducting research, fieldwork, analyses, and report production necessary to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and guidelines of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR). Attachment 1 to this request for proposals (RFP) is the Phase I report (and two DHR review letters) documenting archaeological and architectural survey and geoarchaeological coring and trenching conducted in 2021. Attachment 2 is a work plan prepared by Gray & Pape, Inc. based upon the Phase I investigations. Attachment 3 documents a conference call among JRWA, DHR, and Monacan Indian Nation representatives to refine the work plan. **Serious bidders can request a link to download these three attachments from the JRWA’s counsel, Brendan Scott Hefty (contact provided in Section VII).** The proposal for the current investigation should be closely based on these documents. Deviations proposed from the work plan and the meeting notes should be highlighted in the proposal with appropriate justifications for the deviations.

## II. SCOPE OF WORK

### A. Historic Architectural Investigations

Five aboveground resources require additional investigation and/or analysis. The proposed investigations include survey of two properties that were inaccessible during the initial Phase I cultural resources survey and one access road bridge/culvert that was previously assigned an archaeological site number, as well as assessing possible Project effects to two other NRHP-eligible/listed resources.

## **1. Bridge/Culvert**

The Bridge/Culvert was previously assigned an archaeological site number (44FV0052) by a study unrelated to the current Project. This resource is a stone-masonry bridge/culvert over the James River and Kanawha Canal (DHR #032-5152) and related to the existing access road crossing of the Rivanna Subdivision Railroad (DHR # 032-5150). These two related resources have been determined National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligible. The existing access road over the Bridge/Culvert is proposed to be utilized for the Project, thus this resource needs to be assessed for its NRHP-eligibility, and possible effects related to the Project.

## **2. House at 7421 Bremono Road (DHR #032-5141)**

The House at 7421 Bremono Road is a large agricultural property with a circa 1800 primary dwelling. The legal parcel was also the former location of the now demolished Shepard Tobacco Barn (DHR #032-0236). As appropriate, this property needs to be assessed for its inclusion in the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and possible impacts related to the Project (if any), NRHP-eligibility, and Project effects.

## **3. Reynolds House (DHR #032-5006)**

The Reynolds House is a large agricultural property with a circa 1800 primary dwelling. This property needs to be assessed for its NRHP-eligibility and Project effects. Information collected to date suggests the property has the potential to meet NRHP eligibility criteria, but access to the property was not acquired. If access is not possible, the JRWA likely will stipulate it as NRHP eligible and need to have an assessment of effects related to the Project. Bidder should include scope and cost for both an NRHP evaluation as well assessment of effects.

## **4. Rivanna Farm (DHR #032-0261 / NRHP 01000147)**

The Rivanna Farm is a large agricultural property with an 1880 primary dwelling and a large collection of domestic and agricultural outbuildings. Rivanna Farm is listed in the NRHP under Criterion A in the areas of agriculture and transportation (in association with the adjacent Rivanna Subdivision Railroad [DHR # 032-5150] mentioned above), and under Criterion C for its collection of outbuildings and association with a local builder and his son, D. Wiley Anderson, who became a prominent architect. As currently proposed, a small portion the Project workspace will be physically located within the mapped boundary of this resource, and the proposed pump station on the floodplain likely will be visible from the primary farmstead buildings. Therefore, an assessment of effects related to the Project on the Rivanna Farm needs to be performed. The JRWA has preliminary designs for surface treatments to the pump station to reduce visual effects; these will need to be considered and addressed when performing the Project effect assessment.

## **5. Rivanna Canal Navigation Historic District (DHR #032-0036)**

The Rivanna Canal Navigation Historic District is a mid-nineteenth-century linear resource associated with the Rivanna Canal. The Rivanna Canal Navigation Historic District was determined NRHP eligible in 1974, 1994, and 1996 under Criteria A and C

in the areas of transportation and architecture/engineering. The DHR's online Virginia Cultural Resources Information System (V-CRIS) maps the resource as following the Rivanna River channel, while in reality this section of the canal is situated along the back edge of the floodway. Currently, the proposed workspace will be located adjacent to the canal and the waterline will cross the original path of the canal but within a corridor previously studied and disturbed for a road realignment unrelated to the current Project. This resource needs to be revisited, have its current condition and position accurately recorded, and assess the Project's possible effects, if any, to these canal remnants.

## **B. Phase I Archaeological Survey**

Two areas across a road from each other, combined measuring approximately 1.4 hectares (3.5 acres), require Phase I archaeological survey. These areas are located within the mapped boundary of the Rivanna Farm (VDHR #032-0261; NRHP 01000147) that is listed in the NRHP. Assume that appropriate survey of this portion of the Project will require excavation of shovel test pits (STPs) at 15-meter (49-foot) intervals, plus radial STPs at closer intervals around archaeological finds, if any.

## **C. Phase II Archaeological Evaluation**

### **1. Site 44FV0276 and Site 44FV0280**

Sites 44FV0276 and 44FV0280 are precontact artifact scatters located on the secondary floodplain terrace of the James River. Due to the recovery of diagnostic materials and identified potential to contain intact cultural deposits below the plowzone and/or modern/historical post-settlement alluvium (PSA), these sites warrant Phase II evaluation of their NRHP eligibility. Further, given their proximity to each other and the lack of prior deep testing between these sites, limited deep testing between the sites is also required to better delineate the sites or combine them.

These sites would be directly impacted by waterline construction and extra workspace, with deep impacts associated with the waterline trench itself ranging in depth between 1.8 meters (m) (6.0 feet [ft]) and 2.4 m (8.0.0 ft), while outside the waterline trench ground disturbance will not exceed 50.0 centimeters (cm) (19.7 inches [in]) deep. At Site 44FV0276, the depth of the PSA with little to no potential to contain significant cultural resources was defined during the geoarchaeological investigations as ranging dramatically, between approximately 40.0 cm (15.7 in) and 250.0 cm (98.4 in) below ground surface. The depth of the archaeological deposits identified underlying the PSA averaged 95.0 cm (37.4 in), with apparent archaeological potential, based on soil types, down to 305.0 cm (120.1 in) below ground surface. At Site 44FV0280, the depth of PSA is approximately 30.0 cm (11.8 in). The depth of the identified archaeological deposits underlying the PSA ranged from 30.0 cm (11.8 in) to 130.0 cm (51.2 in) below ground surface.

Given the thickness of the PSA, additional close interval STPs are not a feasible component to the sampling strategy. Bidders should assume the following:

- a) At Site 44FV0276, mechanically strip the PSA from three 5.0-by-5.0-m (16.4-by-16.4-ft) blocks and hand excavate a 2.0-by-2.0-m (6.6-by-6.6-ft) test unit within each

- stripped block, extending potentially to 145.0 cm (57.1 in) below ground surface.
- b) Mechanically re-excavate all or a portion of three Phase I trenches (Deep Test Trenches [DTT] 13, 14, and 15) to guide stratigraphic definitions during hand excavation. The three initial strip blocks should be placed adjacent to these trenches.
  - c) Excavate one additional “if needed” 5.0-by-5.0-m (16.4-by-16.4-ft) strip block and 2.0-by-2.0-m (6.6-by-6.6-ft) test unit to allow further exploration of Site 44FV0276 if warranted by initial results.
  - d) At Site 44FV0280, mechanically strip the PSA from three 3.0-by-3.0-m (9.8-by-9.8-ft) blocks and hand excavate a 2.0-by-2.0-m (6.6-by-6.6-ft) test unit within each stripped block, extending potentially to 130.0 cm (51.2 in) below ground surface.
  - e) Mechanically re-excavate all or a portion of three Phase I trenches (DTTs 10, 11, and 12) to guide stratigraphic definitions during hand excavation. The three initial strip blocks should be placed adjacent to these trenches.
  - f) Excavate one additional “if needed” 3.0-by-3.0-m (9.8-by-9.8-ft) strip block and 2.0-by-2.0-m (6.6-by-6.6-ft) test unit to allow further exploration of Site 44FV0280 if warranted by initial results.
  - g) Between the currently defined boundaries of sites 44FV0276 and 44FV0280, mechanically strip the PSA from two 2.7-by-7.6-m (9.0-by-25.0-ft) blocks and hand excavate a 1.0-by-1.0-m (3.3-by-3.3-ft) test unit in each stripped block, extending potentially to 130.0 cm (51.2 in) below ground surface.

## **2. Site 44FV0278**

Site 44FV0278 is a large, precontact, artifact scatter located on the tertiary terrace above the floodplain on the left descending bank of the James River. Based upon the Phase I investigations, it appears this site represents a relatively intense occupation, with potential for intact sub-plowzone/PSA contexts.

This site would be directly impacted by waterline construction and extra workspace, with deep impacts associated with the waterline trench itself ranging in depth between 1.8 m (6.0 ft) and 2.4 m (8.0 ft), while outside the waterline trench ground disturbance will not exceed 50.0 cm (19.7 in) deep. The depth of PSA was defined during the geoarchaeological investigations as ranging between approximately 15.0 cm (5.9 in) and 25.0 cm (9.8 in) below ground surface. The depth of the archaeological deposits identified underlying the PSA averaged 40.0 cm (15.7 in), with an apparent archaeological potential, based on soil types, down to 0.9 m (3.0 ft) below ground surface.

Because the PSA is not as thick and the identified cultural deposits are relatively near the surface, additional close interval STPs are a viable sampling method prior to deep testing. Bidders should assume the following:

- a) Hand excavate 40 STPs on a 7.5-m (24.6-ft) interval grid across the site.
- b) Mechanically strip the PSA from two 5.0-by-5.0-m (16.4-by-16.4-ft) blocks and hand excavate a 2.0-by-2.0-m (6.6-by-6.6-ft) test unit within each stripped block, extending

- potentially to 85.0 cm (33.5 in) below ground surface.
- c) Mechanically re-excavate all or a portion of two Phase I trenches (DTTs 8 and 9) to guide stratigraphic definitions during hand excavation. One of the initial strip blocks should be placed adjacent to DTT 9.
  - d) Excavate one additional “if needed” 5.0-by-5.0-m (16.4-by-16.4-ft) strip block and 2.0-by-2.0-m (6.6-by-6.6-ft) test unit to allow further exploration of the site if warranted by initial results.

### **3. Site 44FV0282**

Site 44FV0282 is a multicomponent artifact scatter, including both precontact and historical components, located on the floodplain terrace of the Rivanna River. Given that artifacts were recovered from multiple soil horizons, the site appears to have potential for intact cultural deposits below the PSA.

This site would be directly impacted by waterline construction and extra workspace, with deep impacts associated with the waterline trench itself ranging in depth between 1.8 m (6.0 ft) and 2.4 m (8.0 ft), while outside the waterline trench ground disturbance will not exceed 50.0 cm (19.7 in) deep. The depth of PSA was defined during the geoarchaeological investigations as ranging between approximately 20.0 cm (7.9 in) and 55.0 cm (21.6 in). The depth of the archaeological deposits identified underlying the PSA averaged 55.0 cm (21.6 in), with an apparent archaeological potential, based on soil types, down to 180.0 cm (70.9 in).

Although the PSA is shallow enough to consider excavating close interval STPs to further sample the near-surface deposits, the Phase I shovel testing did not encounter artifacts; therefore, no further shovel testing is proposed. Bidders should assume the following:

- a) Mechanically strip the PSA from two 3.0-by-3.0-m (9.8-by-9.8-ft) blocks and hand excavate a 1.0-by-2.0-m (3.3-by-6.6-ft) test unit within each stripped block, extending potentially to 130.0 cm (51.2 in) below ground surface.
- b) Mechanically re-excavate all or a portion of two Phase I trenches (DTTs 6 and 7) to guide stratigraphic definitions during hand excavation.
- c) Place one of the initial strip blocks adjacent to DTT 6. The other initial strip block should be placed staggered to the north and/or west to provide additional coverage and better define the site boundary.
- d) Excavate one additional “if needed” 3.0-by-3.0-m (9.8-by-9.8-ft) strip block and 1.0-by-2.0-m (3.3-by-6.6-ft) test unit to allow further exploration of the site if warranted by initial results.

### **4. General Methods**

- a) Methods to meet requirements of the DHR guidelines.
- b) During mechanical stripping, apply appropriate stabilization measures (e.g., silt fencing) to excavation areas to prevent erosion of sediments entering the James or Rivanna Rivers.

- c) Surface exposed by stripping to be cleaned to identify cultural features.
- d) Test units and cultural features to be hand-excavated, with sediments screened through 0.6-cm (0.25-in) hardware cloth for systematic artifact recovery.
- e) Artifacts to be processed according to DHR standards and guidelines.
- f) A standardized sample of feature fill to be recovered from each cultural feature, if appropriate, and reserved for flotation processing and analysis. Bidders should specify assumed size and number of samples.
- g) Carbon samples from feature fill to be recovered for possible radiocarbon assays, Bidders should specify assumed number of samples sent for analysis.
- h) Cultural features to be bisected and only excavate half the fill if that sample provides enough data to determine feature type/use. Bidders should specify assumed number of features.
- i) If soils in a test unit below cultural features assessed to have archaeological potential, then the portions of features exposed in the floor of the test unit to be fully excavated to allow the underlying soils to be investigated.
- j) Stripping boundaries, test unit locations, and cultural feature locations to be recorded using some form of geographic positioning system (GPS).
- k) Principal Investigator (PI) to be in the field during all stages of excavation to allow immediate decisions about test unit placement, excavation expansion, amount of cultural feature excavations, etc.
- l) A geoarchaeologist, or other supervisor with demonstrated experience identifying soils, to be present to direct the mechanical stripping.
- m) A geoarchaeologist to intermittently (per PI direction) visit the project to provide additional expertise during the hand excavation stages, and for the report reconstruct past and current landform development and how that relates to site potential and interpretations of the Phase II results.
- n) Based on DHR comments on the work plan, the consultant to develop a robust precontact-period context specific to the James River and other current research (circa last 20 years) related to the immediate vicinity and Monacan culture and how that informs the site components investigated during this Phase II.
- o) Consultant expected to consider if an archaeological district is present, with these four sites potentially contributing to an eligible district (justification for a district, if appropriate, and specific site recommendations to be based on the robust context).

#### **D. Alternative Approaches**

For purposes of comparing proposals and expediting the DHR review process, we have offered a proposed scope of work including some basic details. While the bidders' primary proposal (scope and cost) estimates should be based on the scope of work presented above, we also offer and welcome the opportunity for bidders to suggest alternative approaches and/or methods they believe are more cost-effective or more beneficial to the research without substantially increasing the cost. If desired, please present alternative scope and costs

as a separate section in the proposal, clearly indicating what portions of the scope would be replaced or modified and how that would affect the costs.

### III. PROJECT SCHEDULE

JRWA anticipates selecting a consultant and awarding the contract at the September 14, 2022, board meeting. The selected team is expected to begin fieldwork on October 3, 2022, and plan to complete the investigation by October 28, 2022, weather allowing. To assist in maintaining the schedule and budget, daily reports are required that summarize each day's progress and results.

The draft report of the investigation is due December 30, 2022. Following receipt of client comments, a revised draft will be due within two weeks for submittal to the DHR and other consulting parties for comments. Following receipt of comments, a final draft will be prepared addressing consulting party comments.

### IV. PROCESS FOR SUBMITTING PROPOSAL

Sealed proposals will be due in the office of Fluvanna County Administrator, attention Eric Dahl, at **132 Main Street Post Office Box 540 Palmyra, VA 22963**, no later than 2:00 p.m. on September 2, 2022. The proposals shall be marked "Cultural Resources and Archaeological Consultant Proposals for James River Water Authority" on the outside. Seven copies of the proposal shall be submitted. Digital copies of the proposal should be provided as well.

Proposals will comprise three separate bound documents in one envelope:

- a) Technical proposal with firm and staff names ONLY on the title page (no identifying information should be included in the text of the technical proposal)
- b) References and resumes for key staff
- c) Cost proposal and rate schedule

Proposals shall include, at a minimum, the following information:

- d) Background, experience, and credentials of the firm and key personnel, listing the key personnel (including anticipated specialized subconsultants) and indicating who will be the Principal Investigator(s) [may have more than one to fit the type of study] and who will be the primary point of contact on this project.
- e) The firm shall have personnel available that meet the minimum professional qualifications in archaeology and architectural history, as established by the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards*.
- f) Experience excavating stratified sites or at least working with similar sites/settings in Virginia and the region.
- g) References from at least three projects that the team feels would be most relevant to this project.
- h) Availability of the firm to meet accelerated schedules.
- i) Rate schedule of staff to perform the work.

Proposals are limited to a total of 30 pages plus resumes. Resumes are to be no longer than three pages and highlight relevant experience.

## **V. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

The proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

- a) Background and experience with similar excavation setting and similar sites (20%).
- b) Regional experience and qualifications of personnel (20%).
- c) References (10%).
- d) Ability to meet schedule (10%).
- e) Cost of services (40%).

## **VI. PROCESS FOR EVALUATING PROPOSALS**

Following the receipt of proposals, selection shall be made on the basis of the factors involved in the RFP, including price. Negotiations may be conducted with one or more bidders. The bidder shall state any exception to any liability provisions contained in the RFP in writing within the proposal, and such exceptions shall be considered during selection. The public body shall select the bidder which, in its opinion, has made the best proposal and provides the best value, and shall award the contract to that bidder. Should the public body determine in writing and in its sole discretion that only one bidder is fully qualified, or that one bidder is clearly more highly qualified than the others under consideration, a contract may be negotiated and awarded to that bidder.

In negotiations regarding the terms of the contract, the JRWA has no legal authority to indemnify the bidder. Firms submitting proposals agree that they will not ask the JRWA to indemnify them in any resulting contract.

## **VII. QUESTIONS**

Questions about the RFP are due in writing by August 19, 2022. They can be submitted to the JRWA's counsel, Brendan Scott Hefty, Hefty Wiley & Gore, P.C, at [brendan@heftywiley.com](mailto:brendan@heftywiley.com).

Responses to the questions will be posted on August 24, 2022, on the JRWA website.