

## CHECKLIST TO DESIGNATE AREAS OF EVALUATION FOR REQUESTS FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

MDOT PROJECT MANAGER James A. Robertson, Ph.D.			JOB NUMBER (JN) 111936 Phase 00	CONTROL SECTION (CS) N/A
DESCRIPTION IF NO JN/CS Phase 2/3 Investigations of Two Prehistoric Archaeological Sites				
<b>MDOT PROJECT MANAGER:</b> Check all items to be included in RFP.  WHITE = REQUIRED GRAY SHADING = OPTIONAL			<b>CONSULTANT:</b> Provide only checked items below in proposal.	
Check the appropriate Tier in the box below				
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>TIER I</b> (\$25,000-\$99,999)	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>TIER II</b> (\$100,000-\$250,000)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>TIER III</b> (>\$250,000)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Understanding of Service	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Innovations</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Safety Program</i>	
N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Organization Chart	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Qualifications of Team	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Past Performance	
Not required as part of official RFP	Not required as part of official RFP	<input type="checkbox"/>	Quality Assurance/Quality Control	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Location:</b> The percentage of work performed in Michigan will be used for all selections unless the project is for on-site inspection or survey activities, then location should be scored using the distance from the consultant office to the on-site inspection or survey activity.	
N/A	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	Presentation	
N/A	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	Technical Proposal (if Presentation is required)	
3 pages (MDOT forms not counted) <b>(No Resumes)</b>	7 pages (MDOT forms not counted)	19 pages (MDOT forms not counted)	Total maximum pages for RFP <b>not including key personnel resumes</b>	

The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) is seeking professional services for the project contained in the attached scope of services.

If your firm is interested in providing services, please indicate your interest by submitting a Proposal, Proposal/Bid Sheet or Bid Sheet as indicated below. The documents must be submitted in accordance with the latest "Consultant/Vendor Selection Guidelines for Service Contracts" and "Guideline for Completing a Low Bid Sheet(s)", if a low bid is involved as part of the selection process. **Referenced Guidelines are available on MDOT's website under Doing Business > Vendor/Consultant Services > Vendor/Consultant Selections.**

## RFP SPECIFIC INFORMATION

BUREAU OF HIGHWAYS  BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING \*\*  OTHER

THE SERVICE WAS POSTED ON THE ANTICIPATED QUARTERLY REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS

NO  YES DATED \_\_\_\_\_ THROUGH \_\_\_\_\_

**Prequalified Services** – See page 8 of the attached Scope of Services for required Prequalification Classifications.

**Non-Prequalified Services** - If selected, the vendor must make sure that current financial information, including labor rates, overhead computations, and financial statements, if overhead is not audited, is on file with MDOT's Office of Commission Audits. This information must be on file for the prime vendor and all sub vendors so that the contract will not be delayed.

**Qualifications Based Selection** – Use Consultant/Vendor Selection Guidelines

**For all Qualifications Based Selections**, the section team will review the information submitted and will select the firm considered most qualified to perform the services based on the proposals. The selected vendor will be contacted to confirm capacity. Upon confirmation, that firm will be asked to prepare a priced proposal. Negotiations will be conducted with the firm selected.

**\*\*For RFP's that originate in Bureau of Transportation Planning only**, a priced proposal must be submitted at the same time as, but separate from, the proposal. Submit directly to the Contract Administrator/Selection Specialist, Bureau of Transportation Planning (see address list, page 2). The priced proposal must be submitted in a sealed envelope, clearly marked "**PRICE PROPOSAL.**" The vendor's name and return address **MUST** be on the front of the envelope. The priced proposal will only be opened for the highest scoring proposal. Unopened priced proposals will be returned to the unselected vendor(s). Failure to comply with this procedure may result in your priced proposal being opened erroneously by the mail room.

**For a cost plus fixed fee contract**, the selected vendor must have a cost accounting system to support a cost plus fixed fee contract. This type of system has a job-order cost accounting system for the recording and accumulation of costs incurred under its contracts. Each project is assigned a job number so that costs may be segregated and accumulated in the vendor's job-order accounting system.

**Qualifications Review / Low Bid** - Use Consultant/Vendor Selection Guidelines. See Bid Sheet Instructions for additional information.

For Qualification Review/Low Bid selections, the selection team will review the proposals submitted and post the date of the bid opening on the MDOT website. The notification will be posted at least two business days prior to the bid opening. Only bids from vendors that meet proposal requirements will be opened. The vendor with the lowest bid will be selected. The selected vendor may be contacted to confirm capacity.

**Best Value** - Use Consultant/Vendor Selection Guidelines. See Bid Sheet Instructions below for additional information. The bid amount is a component of the total proposal score, not the determining factor of the selection.

**Low Bid** (no qualifications review required - no proposal required.) See Bid Sheet Instructions below for additional instructions.

## BID SHEET INSTRUCTIONS

A bid sheet(s) must be submitted in accordance with the "Guideline for Completing a Low Bid Sheet(s)" (available on MDOT's website). The Bid Sheet(s) is located at the end of the Scope of Services. Submit bid sheet(s) separate from the proposal, to the address indicated below. The bid sheet(s) must be submitted in a sealed manila envelope, clearly marked "**SEALED BID.**" The vendor's name and return address **MUST** be on the front of the envelope. Failure to comply with this procedure may result in your bid being opened erroneously by the mail room and the bid being rejected from consideration.

**PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL INFORMATION**

REQUIRED NUMBER OF COPIES FOR PROJECT MANAGER 4	PROPOSAL/BID DUE DATE 1/10/11	TIME DUE 5:00 pm
--	----------------------------------	---------------------

**PROPOSAL AND BID SHEET MAILING ADDRESSES**

Mail the multiple proposal bundle to the MDOT Project Manager or Other indicated below.

MDOT Project Manager

James A. Robertson, Archaeologist  
MDOT, Bureau of Transportation Planning, B340  
PO Box 30050  
Lansing, Michigan 48909

MDOT Other

OR:  
425 West Ottawa Street  
Lansing, Michigan 48933

Mail one additional stapled copy of the proposal to the Lansing Office indicated below.

**Lansing Regular Mail****OR****Lansing Overnight Mail**

Secretary, Contract Services Div - B470  
Michigan Department of Transportation  
PO Box 30050  
Lansing, MI 48909

Secretary, Contract Services Div - B470  
Michigan Department of Transportation  
425 W. Ottawa  
Lansing, MI 48933

Contract Administrator/Selection Specialist  
Bureau of Transportation Planning B470  
Michigan Department of Transportation  
PO Box 30050  
Lansing, MI 48909

Contract Administrator/Selection Specialist  
Bureau of Transportation Planning B470  
Michigan Department of Transportation  
425 W. Ottawa  
Lansing, MI 48933

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

Any questions relative to the scope of services must be submitted by e-mail to the MDOT Project Manager. Questions must be received by the Project Manager at least four (4) working days prior to the due date and time specified above. All questions and answers will be placed on the MDOT website as soon as possible after receipt of the questions, and at least three (3) days prior to the RFP due date deadline. The names of vendors submitting questions will not be disclosed.

MDOT is an equal opportunity employer and MDOT DBE firms are encouraged to apply. The participating DBE firm, as currently certified by MDOT's Office of Equal Opportunity, shall be listed in the Proposal

**MDOT FORMS REQUIRED AS PART OF PROPOSAL SUBMISSION**

- 5100D** – Request for Proposal Cover Sheet
- 5100G** – Certification of Availability of Key Personnel
- 5100I** – Conflict of Interest Statement

(These forms are not included in the proposal maximum page count.)

# Michigan Department of Transportation

## SCOPE OF SERVICE FOR PLANNING SERVICES

### **CONTROL SECTION:**

CS# 70114

### **JOB NUMBER:**

Job Number 111936 Phase 00

### **PROJECT LOCATION:**

The project is located from M-45 north to I-96/M-104 in Ottawa County. The project length is 2.235 miles.

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

#### **Overview of Work to be Performed**

In Summer 2010, Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) archaeologists conducted an Archaeological Phase 1 survey and identified the two prehistoric archaeological sites that are the subject of this Request for Proposals (RFP). The results of the Archaeological Phase 1 survey are presented in a Management Summary report that provides the basis for responding to this RFP. Because of its large file size and the sensitivity of the archaeological information presented in the Management Summary, the document has not been posted electronically. Instead, the Management Summary has been sent to all consultants that are prequalified by MDOT to conduct investigations of prehistoric archaeological sites. If a consultant has not received the Management Summary, they should contact the MDOT Project Manager listed above.

MDOT has consulted with the Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA) regarding the results of the Archaeological Phase 1 survey. MDOT and the OSA agree that both sites are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. MDOT, therefore is seeking the services of a consultant to develop and execute an Archaeological Phase 2 research design and testing strategy to evaluate the significance of the archaeological deposits associated with each site within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the project and develop and execute an Archaeological Phase 3 research design and excavation strategy to mitigate the adverse effects to one or both sites.

If one or both of the sites prove to have significant archaeological deposits based on the Archaeological Phase 2 field results, the MDOT Project Manager will authorize the consultant to immediately begin the Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery field work. Uninterrupted

field work may be necessary to meet the MDOT November 11, 2011 project milestone for the completion of all archaeological field work at these two sites. The duration of the field work authorized by MDOT, will be determined by the MDOT Project Manager and subject to termination based on the field results and consultation with the OSA. Since the exact level of effort for the data recovery field work and the level of effort to complete the necessary Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery laboratory processing and analysis, research, report preparation, and public outreach activities to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act are not known at this time, the consultant will prepare an Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery research design and excavation strategy scope of work and budget based on the Archaeological Phase 2 field results while Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery fieldwork is underway. After reviewing the proposed scope of work and budget, MDOT will negotiate the final scope of work and cost to establish the terms of an amendment to the contract, including the duration of field work.

If in the event that MDOT determines, in consultation with the OSA, that Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery work is unnecessary based upon the Archaeological Phase 2 field work, MDOT will request that the consultant prepare a scope of work to complete the necessary Archaeological Phase 2 laboratory processing and analysis, research, and technical report preparation. The consultant will prepare the scope of work and budget based on the Archaeological Phase 2 field results. After reviewing the proposed scope of work, MDOT will negotiate the final scope of work and cost to complete the Archaeological Phase 2 research, laboratory processing and analysis, and report preparation to establish the terms of an amendment to the contract.

Finally, if the consultant's performance of the Archaeological Phase 2 field work is determined to be substandard, no additional work will be authorized and the contract will be terminated.

Selection of the consultant to conduct the work described in this RFP will be a Best Value selection (see Consultant/Vendor Selection Guidelines). The RFP is divided into three tasks, each of which the consultant shall address in their technical proposal. The tasks are 1) develop and execute an Archaeological Phase 2 research design and testing field strategy to evaluate the significance of the archaeological deposits associated with each site within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the project; 2) complete Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery excavations at one or both sites; and 3) develop and execute an Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery research design and excavation strategy scope of work to mitigate the adverse effects to one or both sites. For the cost proposal, the consultant shall prepare separate costs for each of the three tasks described above, as well as an overall project cost.

### **Task 1: Archaeological Phase 2 Field Work to be Performed**

The two prehistoric archaeological sites identified by MDOT archaeologists span all or parts of the proposed right of way. As described in the Management Summary and as currently understood, the APE for the proposed project is a 100-foot wide corridor. The boundaries for the APE are depicted on the site maps in the Management Summary.

The first site described in the Management Summary report, heretofore referred to as Site A in this RFP, is relatively small and located on a triangular-shaped projection of an upland terrace. The edges of the terrace form the south, east, and west boundaries of the site. While previous Archaeological Phase 1 survey efforts in 2001 did not reveal evidence of this site, additional testing to confirm the northern boundary of Site A was not possible in Summer 2010, as the MDOT archaeologists did not have permission to survey the property located beyond the northern limits of the 2010 Archaeological Phase 1 survey. Therefore, additional shovel testing to unambiguously define its northern boundary within the proposed right of way will be required; the consultant shall include this task in developing their proposal and cost. Based on the currently known site boundary, the total area of the site within the 100-ft wide APE is 0.16 acres (650 m<sup>2</sup>), which includes eight positive shovel tests.

The second site, heretofore referred to as Site B in this RFP, is a spatially extensive site that spans the edges of two distinct upland terraces. Site B, based on MDOT's Archaeological Phase 1 survey analysis, appears to be comprised of four contiguous, and at times overlapping, artifact clusters separated by topographic features and/or shovel tests with low frequencies of artifacts. Additionally, the northern boundary of Site B is clearly demarcated by sloping topography and the southern boundary by negative shovel tests. Total area of Site B within the 100-ft wide APE is 2.36 acres (9550 m<sup>2</sup>). The total area of Cluster 1 within the APE is approximately 0.52 acres (2100 m<sup>2</sup>), within which 31 positive shovel tests are located that are relatively even distributed in space. Another three positive shovel tests that may be of interest are located within four feet of the APE; these include STT1.5 STU10.5, STT1.5 STU12.5, and STT1.5 STU14. The total area of Cluster 2 within the APE is approximately 0.39 acres (1580 m<sup>2</sup>), within which 16 positive shovel tests are located. All but one positive shovel test are located along the southbound centerline and/or in the east half of the APE. Another two positive shovel tests that may be of interest are located within 3.5 feet of the APE; these include STT3.5 STU16.5 and STT3.5 STU19. The total area of Cluster 3 within the APE is approximately 0.31 acres (1254 m<sup>2</sup>) within which five positive shovel tests are located. One additional positive shovel test of interest, STT2 STU16, is located within four feet of the APE. With the exception of this latter shovel test, which is located at the extreme north end of Cluster 3, all of the positive shovel tests are located at the southern end of the cluster. The total area of Cluster 4 within the APE is approximately 1.14 acres (4617 m<sup>2</sup>) within which 37 positive shovel tests are relatively evenly distributed. Another eight positive shovel tests that may also be of interest are located within 5.5 feet of the APE; these include STT1.5 STU22, STT1.5 STU26, STT1.5 STU27, STT1.5 STU28, STT1.5 STU28.5, STT4 STU26.5, STT3.5 STU27.5, and STT4 STU29.

While the National Register eligibility of both Sites A and B has been determined, the consultant will develop and carry out an Archaeological Phase 2 research design and testing strategy to determine if significant archaeological deposits are present within the APE for each site and define the areas where these significant archaeological deposits are present. The sampling strategy and sample size for the Archaeological Phase 2 excavations proposed by the consultant should be explicitly defined and developed based on the unique setting and characteristics of each site as presented in the Management Summary. The consultant should provide the proposed total sample (in square meters and as a percentage of the total area to be sampled) that will be excavated at each site and, for Site B, the proposed total samples for

each Cluster. The anticipated placement and size(s) of the excavation units shall also be specified and discussed. Expectations based on the published literature, the state archaeological site files and reports on file at the OSA, and information presented in the Management Summary should be factored in to the sampling strategy as well. Mechanized deep testing will not be required.

The consultant shall also propose a methodology for distinguishing between significant archaeological deposits and those deposits not worthy of further investigation; this proposed methodology must be dovetailed with the sampling strategy. While MDOT understands that such a methodology may require refinements based on interim field results, the consultant's proposed methodology shall include, to the extent possible, unambiguous evaluation criteria and how the criteria will be employed to rigorously justify the decisions in defining the types of deposits where no further investigation is warranted and the types of deposits warranting further investigation, and, when present, the horizontal and vertical boundaries for each area with significant deposits. Data and interpretation from this effort will also serve as the basis for developing the Archaeological Phase 3 research design and excavation strategy scope of work and budget (see Task 3, below), which is critical to meeting the project schedule.

MDOT requests that the consultant present one or more examples of similar research designs and testing strategies and evaluation methodologies that they have successfully employed on past projects. The consultant must also assign key personnel, including the Principal Investigator and Field Director for each site and/or Cluster for Site B, who will be responsible for carrying out the research design, sampling strategy, and evaluation methodologies.

The consultant shall propose a plan for analyzing and interpreting the Archaeological Phase 2 field data, including any preliminary artifact analysis, needed to carry out the proposed evaluation methodology, while still in the field. The plan must also include written status updates summarizing the data and justifications used to define areas lacking significant deposits and the areas where data recovery may/will be recommended. The status updates will also identify any concerns that may have a bearing on the project level of effort, cost, and/or schedule and include the amount of excavation completed and average crew size. The consultant must identify the key personnel who will be responsible for the analysis and interpretation of the field data and artifacts recovered, and who will prepare the status updates. For the purpose of estimating costs, the consultant should assume the preparation of weekly status updates.

The consultant should also anticipate field reviews that will be conducted by the MDOT project manager and/or his representatives; representatives of the OSA may also attend these field views. Field views may be initiated by the MDOT project manager and/or initiated by the consultant at critical points in the field work. The consultant must identify which key personnel will attend field reviews on a regular basis. For the purpose of estimating costs, the consultant should plan on weekly field reviews and two meetings with MDOT and OSA staff in Lansing.

All field methods employed shall meet current professional standards, as well as best practices for safety. All excavation units (e.g., shovel tests, measured test units, trenches, etc.) will be

backfilled upon completion and the ground surface restored. If an excavation unit(s) will need to be left open, the consultant shall secure the area using snow fencing or similar barrier and/or cover the unit with a temporary cover. Field data will be recorded by employing electronic mapping techniques using a GPS receiver(s) with sub-meter accuracy and/or Total Station or by employing a combination of traditional and electronic techniques. GIS shape files created to document the field work must employ the Michigan GeoRef Coordinate System. The shape files must include a projection file (for information about this coordinate system the consultant should refer to [http://www.michigan.gov/documents/DNR\\_Map\\_Proj\\_and\\_MI\\_Georef\\_Info\\_20889\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/DNR_Map_Proj_and_MI_Georef_Info_20889_7.pdf)).

The project schedule requires that the Archaeological Phase 2 field work be completed no later than May 13, 2011. The consultant should, therefore, demonstrate that they have the staff and organizational capability to complete the Archaeological Phase 2 field work within the estimated time frame. The consultant should provide a narrative and/or tabular presentation of examples of successfully completed Archaeological Phase 2 site evaluation projects. The consultant should include pertinent details such as, but not necessarily limited to, the project location, site type and size, total area excavated (including details pertaining to middens, features, etc. as appropriate), average crew size, relevant milestones and duration, and a project reference, including contact information. The roles and accomplishments of personnel that will be assigned as key personnel for this project should be highlighted for these examples wherever possible. The consultant should provide at least three examples.

For the Archaeological Phase 2 field work cost proposal, the consultant shall prepare a detailed cost estimate with raw labor, expenses other than labor, overhead, and fee broken out. Key personnel identified above, including but not necessarily limited to the consultant's Project Manager, and Principal Investigator and Field Director for each site and/or each Cluster at Site B, should be identified by name and job classification, while other staff may be identified by job classification only.

## **Task 2: Archaeological Phase 3 Data Recovery Field Work to be Performed**

MDOT anticipates that Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery field work will be required. Field methods will be the same as those specified for the Archaeological Phase 2 field work. For estimating costs, logistics and staffing requirements, and other considerations, the consultant shall employ the following conditions:

- Hand excavation of up to 600 1 m x 1 m test units to an average depth of 40 cm
- Hand excavation of up to 150 pit features with an average volume of 0.24 m<sup>3</sup>
- Hand excavation of up to 300 post molds
- Recovery of up to 43,500 artifacts
- Completion of excavations in eight weeks

The consultant shall continue executing the Archaeological Phase 2 evaluation methodology developed for distinguishing between significant archaeological deposits and those deposits not worthy of further investigation during the Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery excavations. The consultant also shall continue to carry out the Archaeological Phase 2 plan for analyzing and interpreting field data, including the preparation of status updates, while still in the field.

The Archaeological Phase 3 status updates will be modified to describe areas lacking significant deposits and justification for stopping data recovery excavations in these areas, and to describe areas where significant deposits extend into new areas and justification for expanding data recovery excavations into these areas. The status updates will also identify any concerns that may have a bearing on the project level of effort, cost, and/or schedule and include the amount of excavation completed and average crew size. The consultant must identify the key personnel who will be responsible for the analysis and interpretation of the field data and artifacts recovered, will prepare the status updates, and who will be the MDOT point(s) of contact for the field effort. For the purpose of estimating costs, the consultant should assume the preparation of weekly status updates.

The consultant should also anticipate field reviews that will be conducted by the MDOT project manager and/or his representatives; representatives of the OSA may also attend these field views. Field views may be initiated by the MDOT project manager and/or initiated by the consultant at critical points in the field work. The consultant must identify which key personnel will attend field reviews on a regular basis. For the purpose of estimating costs, the consultant should plan on weekly field reviews and up to four meetings with MDOT and OSA staff in Lansing, and the preparation of weekly status updates.

For the purpose of being responsive to this RFP, the consultant shall demonstrate their ability to complete the data recovery excavations under the above conditions. The consultant also should provide a narrative and/or tabular presentation of examples of successfully completed data recovery projects. The consultant should include pertinent details such as, but not necessarily limited to, the project location, site type and size, total area excavated (including details pertaining to middens, features, etc. as appropriate), average crew size, relevant milestones and duration, and a project reference, including contact information. The roles and accomplishments of personnel that will be assigned as key personnel for this project should be highlighted for these examples wherever possible. The consultant should provide at least three examples.

For the Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery field work cost proposal, the consultant shall prepare a detailed cost estimate with raw labor, expenses other than labor, overhead, and fee broken out. Key personnel identified above, including but not necessarily limited to the consultant's Project Manager, and Principal Investigator and Field Director for each site and/or each Cluster at Site B, should be identified by name and job classification, while other staff may be identified by job classification only. MDOT expects that the consultant will assign the same key personnel to the Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery field work, save for adding supplemental key personnel as needed to accomplish project goals. If this is not the case, please justify each change individually.

**Task 3: Archaeological Phase 2/3 Project Management; Preparation of Archaeological Phase 3 Scope of Work and Budget; Completion of Research, Laboratory Processing and Analysis, and Preparation of Draft and Final Technical Reports and Public Outreach Materials.**

During the course of the project the consultant will undertake several tasks other than field work including 1) overall project management; 2) preparation of the Archaeological Phase 3 research design and excavation strategy scope of work and budget; and 3) Research, Laboratory Processing and Analysis, and Preparation of Draft and Final Technical Reports and Public Outreach Materials.

The research design and excavation strategy scope of work shall be based on analysis of the Archaeological Phase 2 field data and the published and unpublished literature applicable to the archaeological materials recovered. Based on this analysis, the consultant should develop and propose pertinent research questions and research objectives that they expect to address with the information that will be recovered as a result of the excavations. The scope of work shall also discuss the necessary research, laboratory processing and analysis, preparation of field documentation and artifacts for curation according to current OSA standards, preparation of the draft and final technical reports, submittal of all artifacts and field documentation to the Michigan Historical Center, and preparation of public outreach materials.

The Archaeological Phase 3 research design and excavation strategy budget shall be based on the analysis of the Archaeological Phase 2 field data, and include projections of the total area and volume of hand excavated 1 m x 1m test units and pit features, the total number of post molds, and the total number of artifacts that will be recovered. Anticipated analytic needs for absolute dates, flotation, soils analyses, ethnobotanical analyses, faunal analyses, etc. should also be projected. The consultant also shall include costs for research; laboratory processing, analysis, and curation; preparation of the draft and final technical reports; submittal and curation of all artifacts and field documentation to the OSA; and preparation of a popular report.

In completing the Research, Laboratory Processing and Analysis, and Preparation of Draft and Final Technical Reports and Public Outreach Materials, the consultant should make the following assumptions: 1) Laboratory processing and analysis of artifacts shall include the necessary work to prepare all artifacts and field documentation for curation at the OSA lab in the Michigan Historical Center. The consultant will be responsible for contacting the OSA and following the current OSA procedures and standards for collections curation, including the purchase of archivally acceptable materials for storage and preservation; 2) the technical report will integrate and include all Phase 1, 2, and 3 data (MDOT will provide the consultant with the Phase 1 field data, artifacts, and files) in a single comprehensive report; 3) the public outreach effort will be the preparation of a popular report, suitable for use in Michigan's schools.

To prepare the Task 3 cost proposal, the consultant shall estimate 1) the cost of Project Management for Tasks 1, 2 and 3; 2) the cost to prepare the Archaeological Phase 3 Scope of

Work and Budget; and 3) the cost to complete the Archaeological Research, Laboratory Processing and Analysis, and Preparation of Draft and Final Technical Reports and Public Outreach Materials. The consultant shall use the level of effort proposed for the Task 2 field work and the level of effort specified by MDOT as conditions for the Task 2 field work.

The detailed cost estimate should break out raw labor, expenses other than labor, overhead, and fee. Key personnel for this task, including but not necessarily limited to the consultant's Project Manager, Principal Investigator(s), Field Director(s), Lab Supervisor(s), should be identified by name and job classification, while other support staff may be identified by job classification only. In addition, analytical specialists (e.g., lithic, ceramic, faunal, ethnobotanical, etc.), whether in-house personnel or sub-consultants, are considered key personnel and should be identified as such. The consultant shall provide resumes for all key personnel, including analytical specialists, identified in the technical proposal.

**ANTICIPATED SERVICE START DATE:**

April 4, 2011

**ANTICIPATED SERVICE COMPLETION DATE:**

November 11, 2013

**PRIMARY PREQUALIFICATION CLASSIFICATION(S):**

Prehistoric Archaeology

**SECONDARY PREQUALIFICATION CLASSIFICATION(S):**

N/A

**MDOT PROJECT MANAGER:**

James A. Robertson, Ph.D.  
Staff Archaeologist  
Environmental Section  
Project Planning Division  
Michigan Department of Transportation  
425 West Ottawa  
P.O. Box 30150  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Phone: 517-335-2637  
Fax: 517-373-9255  
E-Mail: [RobertsonJ3@Michigan.gov](mailto:RobertsonJ3@Michigan.gov)

**REQUIRED MDOT GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS:**

GIS shape files of field data will be created using the Michigan GeoRef Coordinate System. The shape files must include a projection file (for information about this coordinate system the consultant should refer to:

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/DNR\\_Map\\_Proj\\_and\\_MI\\_Georef\\_Info\\_20889\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/DNR_Map_Proj_and_MI_Georef_Info_20889_7.pdf)).

The shape files will be submitted to accompany the final technical report.

All work shall be in accordance with the attached Michigan Department of Transportation Work Specifications for Archaeological Cultural Resources Investigations.

### **CONSULTANT RESPONSIBILITIES:**

Complete the project including, but not limited to the following:

#### **Safety**

The Consultant must adhere to all applicable OSHA and MIOSHA safety standards, including adherence to the Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) standards.

All excavation units (e.g., shovel tests, measured test units, trenches, etc.) will be backfilled upon completion and the ground surface restored. If an excavation unit(s) will need to be left open, the consultant shall secure the area using snow fencing or similar barrier and/or cover the unit with a temporary cover.

#### **Deliverables**

Deliverables specified above include 1) weekly status updates; 2) draft and final Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery scope of work and budget; 3) draft and final technical reports; 4) draft and final popular reports; 5) shape files of the field data; and 6) field documentation and artifacts prepared according to OSA standards for curation at the Michigan Historical Center.

The weekly status updates will be completed in a format to be determined by the Consultant and MDOT project manager.

The draft scope of work and budget will be a complete and finished product. The consultant will provide the draft scope of work and budget within 7 business days after completing the Archaeological Phase 2 field work. The MDOT Project Manager will review the draft and provide the consultant with written comments within 3 business days. The consultant will revise the draft scope of work to address the MDOT project manager's comments and produce the final within an additional 2 days.

The draft technical report will be a complete and finished product and meet current professional standards for such reports. The MDOT Project Manager will review the draft report and provide the consultant with written comments within 60 days. The consultant will revise the draft report to address the MDOT project manager's comments and produce the

final report and shape files within 30 days. Acceptance of the final report is contingent upon review by the MDOT Project Manager.

The draft popular report will be a complete and finished product and meet current professional standards for such reports. The MDOT Project Manager will review the draft report and provide the consultant with written comments within 30 days. The consultant will revise the draft report to address the MDOT project manager's comments and produce the final report and shape files within 30 days. Acceptance of the final report is contingent upon review by the MDOT Project Manager.

The draft and final Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery scope of work and budget, draft and final technical reports, and draft and final popular reports will be produced and submitted in hard copy (two copies) and electronically as pdf files on CDROM or DVD. The shape files of the field data will be submitted electronically on CDROM or DVD.

As noted above, GIS shape files of field data will be created using the Michigan GeoRef Coordinate System. The shape files must include a projection file (for information about this coordinate system the consultant should refer to:

[http://www.michigan.gov/documents/DNR\\_Map\\_Proj\\_and\\_MI\\_Georef\\_Info\\_20889\\_7.pdf](http://www.michigan.gov/documents/DNR_Map_Proj_and_MI_Georef_Info_20889_7.pdf)).

The shape files will be submitted to accompany the final technical report.

The contract will not be considered complete until the field documentation and artifacts prepared according to OSA standards for curation are accepted by the OSA. The consultant shall obtain a signed receipt from the OSA and provide a copy to the MDOT project manager.

## **Project Schedule**

The project will consist of three stages. Stage 1 (April 4-May 13, 2011) will include all tasks required to complete the Phase 2 research design and testing field work. Stage 2 (May 14-November 11, 2011) will include completion of the Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery scope of work and budget no later than 7 business days after the completion of Archaeological Phase 2 field work. Completion of all Archaeological Phase 3 data recovery field work must be completed no later than November 11, 2011. Stage 3 (November 12-November 11, 2013) will include research, laboratory processing and analysis, preparation of field documentation and artifacts for curation according to current OSA standards, preparation of the draft and final technical reports, submittal of all artifacts and field documentation to the OSA, and preparation of a popular report.

Critical dates are listed below:

- May 13, 2011                      Complete Archaeological Phase 2 Field Work
- May 24, 2011                      Submit Draft Archaeological Phase 3 Data Recovery Scope of Work and Budget
- June 1, 2011                      Submit Final Archaeological Phase 3 Data Recovery

## Scope of Work and Budget

- November 11, 2011 All Field Work Completed
- June 28, 2013 Submit Draft Technical Report
- August 30, 2013 Submit Draft Popular Report
- October 30, 2013 Submit Final Technical Report, Final Popular Report, and GIS shape files of field data
- November 8, 2013 Submit Signed Receipt from the OSA Verifying Acceptance of Artifacts and Field Documentation for Permanent Curation

### **MDOT RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- The MDOT Project Manager will review the Draft Archaeological Phase 3 Data Recovery Scope of Work and Budget and provide the consultant with written comments within 3 business days.
- The MDOT Project Manager will review the draft technical report and provide the consultant with written comments within 60 days.
- The MDOT Project Manager will review the draft report and provide the consultant with written comments within 30 days. The consultant will revise the draft report to address the MDOT project manager's comments and produce the final report and shape files within 30 days. Acceptance of the final report is contingent upon review by the MDOT Project Manager.

### **PAYMENT SCHEDULE**

Compensation for this Scope of Services shall be on an actual cost plus fixed fee basis.

### **CONSULTANT PAYMENT – Actual Cost Plus Fixed Fee:**

Compensation for this project shall be on an **actual cost plus fixed fee** basis. This basis of payment typically includes an estimate of labor hours by classification or employee, hourly labor rates, applied overhead, other direct costs, subconsultant costs, and applied fixed fee.

All billings for services must be directed to the MDOT Project Manager. Invoices shall be submitted monthly and shall be accompanied by monthly progress reports that will summarize work completed and work remaining. The progress reports shall also document any issues that may have a bearing on the project level of effort, cost, and/or schedule.

Payment to the Consultant for services rendered shall not exceed the maximum amount unless

an increase is approved in accordance with the contract with the Consultant. Typically, billings must be submitted within 60 days after the completion of services for the current billing. The final billing must be received within 60 days of the completion of services. Refer to your contract for your specific contract terms.

Direct expenses, if applicable, will not be paid in excess of that allowed by the Department for its own employees in accordance with the State of Michigan's Standardized Travel Regulations. Supporting documentation must be submitted with the billing for all eligible expenses on the project. The only hours that will be considered allowable charges for this contract are those that are directly attributable to the activities of this project

The use of overtime hours is not acceptable unless prior written approval is granted by the MDOT Region Engineer/Bureau Director and the MDOT Project Manager. Reimbursement for overtime hours that are allowed will be limited to time spent on this project in excess of forty hours per person per week. Any variations to this rule should be included in the priced proposal submitted by the Consultant and must have prior written approval by the MDOT Region Engineer/Bureau Director and the MDOT Project Manager.

The fixed fee for profit allowed for this project is 11.0% of the cost of direct labor and overhead.

December 2, 2010

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

WORK SPECIFICATIONS FOR

ARCHAEOLOGICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

INVESTIGATIONS

1. PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS:

The principle investigator and the project manager for all archaeological projects shall meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology as set forth in 48 FR 44716 (Sept. 1983) and published in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR Part 61. These qualification standards may be accessed through the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation website at [http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch\\_stnds\\_9.htm](http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm).

The archaeological work is also expected to be carried out in accordance with the Code of Conduct and Standards of Research Performance as established by the Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA). All project work will be evaluated in light of these standards. While RPA accreditation is not mandatory, all principal investigators are encouraged to join RPA. The RPA website may be accessed at <http://www.rpanet.org/>.

2. PHASE I ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE LOCATION SURVEY:

The objective of this research is to locate all archaeological sites within the study area. Professional standards and techniques are expected to be sufficiently rigorous to demonstrate the presence or absence of sites within the study area.

3. PHASE II ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE EVALUATION:

The objective of this research is to gather additional archaeological site data in order to determine the potential eligibility of the site(s) for the National Register of Historic Places. The basis for such determination is established in the National Register of Historic Places, Criteria for Evaluation (Department of the Interior, National Park Service 36CFR60.4). These criteria may be accessed at <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/regulations.htm#604>.

4. PHASE III ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITE MITIGATION:

The objective of this research is the scientific recovery of the archaeological site data from the area of planned construction. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has established a procedure whereby the salvage of sites determined significant for the data they contain effectively

mitigates the potential adverse effect of a proposed construction project. The highest standards of professional conduct and fitness are expected for this level of research.

## 5. REPORTING STANDARDS FOR PHASE I PROJECTS:

The following outline from Niquette (1981) represents a synthesis of the existing guidelines or standards utilized by public agencies. The outline also includes some of the recommendations made by the Society for American Archaeology's House Report (McGimsey and Davis 1977) for the preparation and evaluation of archaeological contract reports and draft report outlines proposed by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Documentation (NPS 1983) can also provide guidance and may be accessed at [http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch\\_stnds\\_7.htm](http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_7.htm). Although the following outline may appear rigid, these expectations are not intended to dictate format or to stifle creativity. The outline remains flexible in that organization may change from one report to the next. The outline provides a checklist of basic information that MDOT and the SHPO fully expect to find in reports of this type. If certain information listed in the outline is not present, the reason(s) for the omission should be clearly stated.

### **A. STANDARD REPORT - LONG FORM - ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES ARE LOCATED**

#### **I. Title Page**

- A. Report title (indicate if the report is a draft)
- B. Type of investigation (e.g., Phase I Survey)
- C. Location of investigation (e.g., county and state)
- D. Contracting sponsor
- E. Principal investigator and research organization
- F. Author(s)
- G. Date of report
- H. State Historic Preservation Office Environmental Review Number and MDOT Job Number (both can be found on the Work Authorization form)

#### **II. Abstract (should not exceed one page)**

- A. Identify specific type of project (e.g., road widening) and purpose of investigation (e.g., Phase I Survey).
- B. Provide concise summary of report's content including location, research orientation (which includes methodology), conclusions, number and nature of resources located, and any new information that may have resulted from this work.
- C. Provide reference to significance and National Register eligibility of site(s).

#### **III. Table of Contents**

- A. Appropriately arranged and paginated
- B. Should include list of tables, maps, and figures

#### **IV. Introduction**

- A. Sponsor and contract number and/or permit number, expiration date, and other appropriate agency specific information such as the disclaimer statement.
- B. Geographical limits of project area
- C. Description of proposed project, nature and extent of ground disturbance anticipated
- D. Purpose of study
- E. Discussion of Management Objectives (e.g., Scope of Work, agency's program authority, and applicable implementing regulations)
- F. Constraints on the investigation (non-budgetary)
- G. Dates of investigation
- H. Personnel and work organization
- I. Disposition of field notes and artifacts
- J. Project location map
- K. Number of acres surveyed

#### **V. Environment**

These data should not be provided pro forma and without an attempt to relate them to the archaeological potential of the area. They must present a framework in which to determine how the natural resources may have been used through time or how soil and geomorphological characteristics have affected the ability to identify sites. These data must be integrated into the study through the research design.

- A. Description of physiographic province (e.g., topography, drainage)
- B. Microenvironment of the project area
  - 1. Flora
  - 2. Fauna
  - 3. Geology
  - 4. Soils (type should correspond to U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soils Survey Data)
- C. Relevant climatic history
- D. Historic land use patterns
- E. Current condition of land within project area (e.g., land in crops--specify type of crops, pasture, timber, swamps)
- F. Prehistoric and historic resource utilization potential (e.g., availability of raw lithic resources)

#### **VI. Research Design**

- A. Research objectives
- B. Theoretical orientation
- C. Justification of problem selection
- D. Definition of "site" and "isolated find" used for purposes of the survey
- E. An explicit discussion of the survey and/or testing strategy, expected results, and relationship to research objectives
- F. Hypotheses to be tested, test implications, and analytical techniques required to test hypotheses

## **VII. Existing Data and Literature Review**

- A. Dates, purpose, intensity, and results of previous research
- B. Historic documents and records (e.g., deeds to historic sites, records, and files of federal, state and local governments, research institution files, maps and published material)
- C. Informants and their addresses (when used)--both amateur and professional as well as procedures used to locate these persons
- D. Location and nature of field notes, unpublished manuscripts, and collected materials from previous investigations
- E. Relevant ethnographic and/or ethnohistoric data of the project area
- F. Relevant data obtained from satellite or other remote sensing imagery
- G. Information on historic properties in the area already included in the National Register of Historic Places or in state or local inventories
- H. The project area should be placed in its regional setting in regard to the known culture history. This is to include a description of the major outlines of prehistoric and historic cultures of the project area and should include chronology, settlement subsistence patterns, and other significant data available.

## **VIII. Field Methods**

- A. Predictive models used, where applicable.
- B. Sampling systems used, where applicable.
- C. Surface survey techniques--both site specific and general (e.g., level of survey and where accomplished, deployment of survey crew, site recording techniques, site marker placement.
- D. Subsurface testing techniques--both site specific and general (e.g., testing methods, excavation levels, locations and size of test pits, trenching, and/or auger tests.
- E. Specify transect intervals and number of transects done.
- F. Describe what was done to determine the approximate extent of any sites found during the survey.
- G. Description of any non-disruptive techniques used for survey or testing (e.g., proton magnetometer, aerial photography, soil).
- H. Description of interdisciplinary methods (e.g., geomorphology, palynology) when used.
- I. Description of data collection techniques (e.g., surface collection techniques, artifact provenience recording techniques a size of screens recovery of soil samples) and measuring devices and circumstances when used or not used.
- J. Constraints on investigation (e.g., limitations of access, poor ground visibility or other environmental limitations such as adverse weather conditions, etc.).
- K. Controls for personal bias.
- L. Justification of any in-field modifications of research strategy.
- M. Provide maps showing locations of shovel tests and/or test pits. Indicate whether the results of the tests were possible or negative. Indicate areas surveyed at different levels of intensity or those suggesting variable deployment of crew members. Any areas not surveyed or not tested should be clearly delineated. Provide justification for not surveying a given area as well as not testing below the surface.

## IX. Site Descriptions, Analysis and Evaluations

Provide the following information for each site found.

### A. Site Description

1. Physical characteristics of the site
  - a. Location (legal description and UTM)
  - b. Site extent must be clearly delineated on a site map. For Phase I testing a sketch map of every site found must show the relationship of the site to surrounding features, whether natural or man-made, and the locations of positive and negative shovel tests.
  - c. Site distribution within project area must be plotted on a U.S.G.S. 7.5 minute topographic map, if available.
  - d. Site size (both vertical and horizontal)
  - e. Appropriate photographs of the adjacent environment
  - f. Topographic setting
  - g. Vegetation
  - h. Proximity to water
  - i. Elevation
  - j. Soil descriptions with appropriate graphics (Munsell soil color chart designation)
2. Cultural/Temporal characteristics of the site
  - a. Material cultural
  - b. Site type with supporting evidence
  - c. Site function with supporting evidence
  - d. Intrasite structure
  - e. Artifact provenience data
  - f. Distribution of artifacts by type (horizontal and vertical)
  - g. Cultural/temporal placement within regional chronology
  - h. Appropriate photographs of features
3. Nature and extent of previous disturbance
4. Relationship between site location and probable project impacts
5. Site specific research activities conducted and results (e.g., for testing there must be a full description of the site, number, and location of shovel tests and/or test pits relative to the site datum. All shovel tests and/or test pits should be graphically displayed and accompanied with appropriate description/interpretation)

### B. Laboratory Results

1. Classificatory (topological) scheme(s) used in artifact description and analysis--give rationale for decisions
2. Method of chronological determination (topological, radiometric, etc.)

3. Other special analytical methods and techniques (e.g., functional analysis of lithic tools through edge-angle studies, predictive model(s))
4. Description of all natural material observed (e.g., soils descriptions and profiles graphically displayed)
5. Description of other potential paleoecological data
6. Description of assemblage(s) with illustrations, distribution tables, weights, and other measures
7. Scaled photographs and/or line drawings of all diagnostic or a representative sample of each type and class of artifacts
8. Justification for any changes in research strategy

C. Site Evaluations

1. The National Register criteria for significance must be explicitly addressed. Provide a concise discussion of known and potential contributions of site or district to current, regional, archaeological research. The rationale for significance as well as non-significance evaluations should be clearly stated.

**X. Summary and Conclusion**

A. Provide an evaluation of the research performed covering the following topics when appropriate.

1. Reliability of data (e.g., potential for unlocated or unidentified resources within project area)
2. Relationship between results of analysis and stated goals
3. Identification of changes in research goals
4. Synthesis and comparison of results of analysis
5. Integration of ancillary data
6. Identification and discussion of perceived patterns and relevant cultural processes
7. Contribution of this project to the state research plan and/or theoretical and substantive concerns

B. Summarize the results of the study. For large projects include a table showing the site number, the recommended National Register status of the sites, and a brief description of site's temporal component (prehistoric/historic, etc.)

C. Assess the project impact(s) on a site by site and/or district basis

1. Provide professional opinion concerning the kind and degree of project impacts (both direct and indirect)
2. Assessment of the potential loss of information should the site(s) be destroyed
3. Recommendations for avoidance or alternative mitigation measures for affected properties

**XI. References -- Use the *American Antiquity* Style Guide accessed through the following link: <http://saa.org/publications/StyleGuide/styFrame.html>.**

## **XII. Appendices--as appropriate**

- A. Supporting Data (e.g., computer readouts, copies of site forms)
- B. A copy of the Work Authorization (should be included in all reports)
- C. Ancillary Studies (e.g., palynological report)

### **B. ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT- SHORT FORM - ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES ARE NOT LOCATED**

#### **I. MDOT Archaeological Report Short Form (AR-SF), Form # 1707 (05/01):**

The AR-SF, and required attachments, is to be used as the archaeological report format in those instances where no archaeological sites are located as a result of Phase I Archaeological Site Location (Reconnaissance) Survey. This form shall not be used if any archaeological resources are located, including isolated finds and/or structures, and/or if directed by MDOT. The MDOT form # 1707 and instructions in its use are attached to these specifications (Attachment A) and made a part hereof. This form is also available as a fillable form on the MDOT website and may be accessed at <http://mdotwas1.mdot.state.mi.us/public/webforms/index.cfm>.

#### **6. REPORTING STANDARDS FOR PHASE II PROJECTS:**

There is no established format for Phase II archaeological reports. The consultant is referred to *The Airlie House Report* (McGimsey and Davis 1977) and *Archaeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines* (NPS 1983) for guidance. The latter may also be accessed at [http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch\\_stnds\\_7.htm](http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_7.htm). The preceding Phase I survey report outline may also contain portions relevant to a Phase II report. The report must address the National Register criteria for eligibility. Both the nature of the site's significance and its integrity must be established. *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (NPS 1990) is an excellent resource for addressing significance. These criteria may also be accessed at <http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb15/>.

#### **7. REPORTING STANDARDS FOR PHASE III PROJECTS:**

There is no established format for Phase III archaeological reports as the requirements for each project are usually unique. The consultant should consult *The Airlie House Report* (McGimsey and Davis 1977) and *Archaeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines* (NPS 1983) for guidance. The latter may also be accessed at [http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch\\_stnds\\_7.htm](http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_7.htm). There are, however, certain requirements for the final report.

- The cover format will be supplied by MDOT and the SHPO.
- Copy will be typed single spaced, double spaced between paragraphs, and printed on both sides of the paper.

Additional copies of the final report are required for Phase III projects. The exact number is prescribed in the RFP. In addition, one print ready copy is required.

8. PROJECT PERFORMANCE:

While the highest standards of archaeological research are expected, this must not be at the expense of other responsibilities. Contractual responsibilities and the obligations to clients and the public in conducting Public Archaeology are equally important. FAILURE TO PERFORM ADEQUATELY ON ANY PORTION OF A PROJECT WILL BE CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING FUTURE PROPOSALS, AS WILL A SUPERIOR PERFORMANCE. More serious violations of professional standards or contractual obligations may result in removal from the approved bidder list, professional charges, or civil action.

## References Cited

McGimsey, Charles R. III and Hester A. Davis

1977 *The Airlie House Report*. Special Publication of the Society for American Archaeology.

National Park Service

1990 *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Revised 1997. National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Washington, D.C.

National Park Service

1983 Archaeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. National Park Service, Department of the Interior. *Federal Register* 48(190):44716-44742. Washington, D.C.

Niquette, Charles M.

1981 *Guidelines for the Preparation of Archaeological Contract Reports*. Division of Parks and Historic Preservation, Department of Natural Resources, State of Missouri.