REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

FORT HILL PARK AND TRAILS
CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS
CITY OF PEEKSKILL, NEW YORK

DUE: Thursday, May 17, 2018
  11am

Responses must be submitted in a sealed package to:
Jesica Youngblood, City Planner
Department of Planning and Development
840 Main Street - City Hall
Peekskill, NY 10566

For questions about this RFP, please contact Jesica Youngblood at (914) 293-0916 or jyoungblood@cityofpeekskill.com

This RFP and the following reference materials can be found on-line at www.cityofpeekskill.com/bids-rfps:
- Location Map
- Conceptual Trail Map
- Conceptual Plan
- Proposed Park and Trail Elements
- Fort Hill Apartments, Inn & Spa Subdivision Plan
- Fort Hill Park Survey
- Cultural Resource Report Phase I Archaeological Survey - The Abbey at Fort Hill

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Peekskill is requesting proposals to prepare construction documents to build new trails and upgrade existing natural trails (with the inclusion of amenities and signage) in the existing 10 acre Fort Hill Park and on 52 acres of adjacent land to be donated to the City of Peekskill by Ginsburg Development Companies (the land collectively called “Fort Hill Park”).

Fort Hill Park is located west of Decatur Avenue and north of Paulding Street as shown on the attached map; the land to be donated is roughly between Fort Hill Park and Chateau Rive Apartments (see attached maps).
Fort Hill Park was important during the American Revolution. It was a fortification and lookout for the Continental Army. From March to October of 1777 British forces took control of the Fort. Over a period of two years, raids by the British destroyed wooden barracks on Fort Hill and captured Rebel soldiers. The City completed an archeological study in 2008 that uncovered Revolutionary War artifacts – coins, nails, a spoon – and concluded that a majority of the artifacts were looted over the years. The study determined that the original barracks were likely located in the area that is now the St. Mary’s Cemetery, which is located in the southwest portion of the Project Area. This area also contained various 18th and 19th century artifacts associated with burial ceremonies. The Project does not involve disturbing the historic or archeological site but only seeks to use descriptive signage to interpret the site’s historical significance.

Fort Hill Park and adjacent lands contain unmarked trails that are overgrown and in disrepair. Upgrades to existing trails and the blazing of new trails are needed to enhance the user experience. The trails will be designed to provide a variety of skill levels for users of all abilities. Minor landscaping at the entrances and in the cemetery area, if any, will be sustainable and low maintenance. No lighting is proposed; the park will be open from dawn until dusk. Last year the New York-New Jersey Trail Conference (NYNJTC) assisted the City with preliminary mapping and basic recommendations for upgrades (see Conceptual Plan).

The City seeks a landscape architect or engineer to design and prepare construction documents for the current park and lands to be donated. The intent is to maintain the park’s natural character, upgrade trails, remove invasive species, control erosion, improve the Decatur Avenue entry, and maintain and interpret the cemetery, redoubts and barracks site. Proposed additions include the creation of new trails, a pedestrian entrance between the cemetery and pond, directional signage and trail markings within the park, a trail map for visitors, signs to interpret various historical and archeological features, and construction of a modest lookout platform at the park’s high point. GDC will construct parking spaces in a new lot near the cemetery to be used by the public for access to the park. A charrettes-type workshop will be held early in the process to give Council, City Boards, and the public a chance to provide input on proposed improvements. An initial design and preliminary construction budget will be prepared by the consultant for inclusion in a 2018 CFA grant application that will be prepared by City staff. The proposal should also include the consultant’s fee to provide bidding assistance and construction inspection services, should the City bid the project during the consultant’s contract period.

II. SCOPE OF WORK

General Scope of Work:
- Site/property/topographic survey that is needed to prepare construction documents. See attached survey and subdivision plan that is available for the consultant’s use.
- Layout of proposed trails, re-routing and upgrades to existing trails, and identification of proposed amenities and signage.
- Public workshop and public presentation
- Construction documents including technical specifications (if needed) to bid the construction/repair of trails and amenities, and the fabrication of interpretive signage.
- Cost estimate for project construction and signage fabrication and installation
- Bidding assistance
- Inspection services during construction

Tasks:

A. **Kick-Off Meeting:** The consultant shall attend a kick-off meeting with City staff to review project requirements, site conditions, roles and responsibilities, schedule, information needs and next steps.

B. **Survey:** Topography including the identification of current trails, wetlands, major rock outcroppings, cemetery, redoubts, and necessary information to prepare construction documents.

C. **Initial Design:** The consultant shall suggest potential trail layout, amenities and signage, in preparation of a power point presentation for a public workshop. The consultant will work with the City on developing a conceptual construction and signage budget for a CFA grant application, due on or about July 27, 2018.

D. **Charrettes/workshop:** The consultant shall lead a charrettes-type workshop (with City staff assistance) to gather input from Council members, City Boards, and the public on a vision and suggestions for Fort Hill Park. The consultant will prepare notes from the meeting.

E. **Draft Design Development Documents:** The consultant shall prepare a trail layout and a draft design development document for trail work, amenities, and signage (text, graphics, style and location), including a preliminary cost estimate for construction and signage fabrication and installation. Construction documents may be phased or contain add/alternates, depending on project cost estimate and City budget.

F. **Public Meeting:** The consultant shall present the draft layout with park amenities and proposed signage at a public meeting/Common Council meeting to solicit final feedback.

G. **Construction Documents:** The consultant shall prepare the final design and construction drawings, signage details, technical specifications (if needed), and a detailed professional cost estimate. Signage specifications must be ready for fabrication and installation by the contractor or subcontractor. The City will prepare the front end boiler plate portion of the bid document, except for the Measurement and Payment section and the bid sheet, which will be the responsibility of the consultant. The City will advertise and bid the project.

Additional Tasks:
If the City bids the project during the consultant’s contract period, then the consultant will assist the City:
• During the bidding phase by attending a site visit with bidders and reviewing and evaluating the bids to identify an apparent low bidder. (Bidding Assistance)

• During construction by inspecting the work to be in conformance with the construction documents and to review shop drawings, payment requisitions, and to approve change orders, etc. (Inspection Services)

Work Product Submissions:
• Survey: Four (4) signed and sealed paper copies and in digital format (PDF, 600 dpi or higher).
• Initial Design: One full sized paper copy (Arch D), and in digital format. PowerPoint presentation for the workshop.
• Draft Design Development Documents and Signage: Twelve (12) paper copies at 11”x17”, 1 Arch D paper copy, and in digital format.
• Final Design, Signage Details, Construction Documents and detailed cost estimate: Four (4) full-sized, signed and sealed paper copies, twelve (12) copies at 11”x17”, two (2) paper copies of the technical specifications (if needed), all copied onto 25 USB drives in PDF format for bidding, and transmitted electronically to the City in PDF and Word format.

III. PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

Rating and Selection Criteria:

The City will review proposals, conduct interviews, and hire a consultant to perform the required work, based on the items in this section and detailed in Section V.C below. The contract will be awarded to the responsible Consultant who is the most qualified and whose proposal represents the best value. Past experience with similar projects, professional expertise, and scope, schedule, and fee will be used to evaluate the proposals and select the preferred consultant.

The following criteria will be used to evaluate the responses:
• Quality and completeness of the proposal.
• Evidence of accurate cost estimating.
• Qualifications and relevant experience with this type of project, including sign design.
• Reputation among previous clients.
• Familiarity with Peekskill and Fort Hill Park is a plus.
• Fee and timeframe

IV. INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

The selected consultant will be required to submit evidence of insurance in the types and amounts acceptable to the City at the time of contract execution.
V. PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS

A. Tentative schedule (subject to change):
   o Availability of RFP: 4/24/18
   o Site visit (on your own)
   o All questions due to jyoungblood@cityofpeekskill.com: 5/8/18
   o Responses to questions posted on City website: 5/11/18
   o Proposals due at 11am: 5/17/18
   o Interviews conducted: 5/21 – 5/25/18
   o Possible interview with the Common Council and recommendation: 6/4/18
   o Contract Award: 6/11/18
   o Begin work: 6/15/18

B. Copies:
   Applicants shall submit three (3) paper copies and one USB drive of their proposal by 11am on Thursday, May 17, 2018. Any submission sent by fax, email, or other form of transmission, or received after the deadline, will not be accepted. Submissions shall be sent to the following:
   Jesica Youngblood, City Planner
   Department of Planning and Development
   840 Main Street - City Hall
   Peekskill, NY 10566

C. Submissions shall include the following:
   1. The consultant’s understanding of the project, and a description of your approach to the Scope of Work.
   2. Documentation on the firm and sub-consultants (if any), including qualifications to prepare these construction documents, cost estimate, survey, and sign design.
   3. A list of the consultant’s/sub-consultant’s prior work demonstrating the ability to complete the type of work as required in the Scope of Work, particularly examples of those managed by the project manager and sign designer assigned to this project. The City is interested in construction documents, sign design, and cost estimates that the consultant/sub-consultant has prepared for trail and park projects that have been constructed. Provide name, phone number and email address of client contact for the most relevant projects.
   4. Demonstration of the completeness and accuracy of prior construction documents through evidence of minimal change orders and/or budget overruns on completed construction projects.
5. A description of each staff member and sub-consultant who will be involved with this project and a description of their role in the project. This description should identify the person who will be designated as the day-to-day Project Manager.

6. Demonstration of the consultant’s (or sub-consultant’s) estimating accuracy by providing project cost estimate, low bid, and final construction cost for at least four (4) projects that have been constructed.

7. A schedule (use attached table) detailing when each task will be completed, with a fee for each task.

8. There will be no allowance for reimbursable expenses. Total fee includes all costs including copying, mailings, travel, as well as all site visits and meetings that are necessary to complete this scope of work.

VI. **COST PROPOSAL AND SCHEDULE** (to be submitted with proposal):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Proposed Fee</th>
<th>Date of Completion (Week 1 is the date of Contract signing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Topographic survey</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initial design and conceptual budget</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Charrettes/workshop and presentation</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Draft design development documents and preliminary cost estimate for construction and sign fabrication</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public meeting</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Final design, CDs and detailed cost estimate:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For construction work:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For sign fabrication and installation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fee sub-total and duration of work:</strong></td>
<td>$------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bidding Assistance</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Inspection services estimate</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CULTURAL RESOURCE REPORT

Electronic Phase I Archaeological Survey Conducted at:
The Abbey at Fort Hill: A Possible Revolutionary War American Barracks Location
Peekskill, New York

Prepared by:

Daniel M. Sivilich
President
Battlefield Restoration and Archaeological Volunteer Organization (BRAVO)

Report Date: December 4, 2008
Management Summary

The city of Peekskill, New York was the location of significant events during the Revolutionary War. British forces took control of the city in March and October of 1777 and again in June 1779, capturing or destroying supplies and barracks each time. Five American wooden barracks, arranged in a square "C" shape, were destroyed in the first attack. The exact location of these barracks is not known, but based on historical records, it has been postulated that they are near the Fort Hill redoubt. This area was purchased by Ginsburg Development, hereinafter referred to as the Developer, who plans on constructing a housing complex on the site. However, the Developer has been working with the City of Peekskill to help locate the barracks site and possibly to preserve it. Dana Linck, professional archaeologist, was hired to evaluate two areas shown in Figure 1 as potential locations for the barracks. Dana requested assistance from the Battlefield Restoration and Archaeological Volunteer Organization, hereinafter referred to as BRAVO to locate possible Revolutionary War artifacts that might positively identify the barracks site.

Members of BRAVO have been actively involved in excavating and identifying segments of Revolutionary War sites since 1987. Our primary work has been numerous Phase I metal detecting surveys of Monmouth Battlefield State Park and several surrounding properties (Sivilich, 1995; Stone, Sivilich and Lender, 1996). BRAVO agreed to conduct a metal detecting Phase I survey of the site with Dana Linck as Principle Investigator and Dan Sivilich, President of BRAVO, as Assistant Investigator.

On November 1, 2008, 10 members of BRAVO and one guest conducted a comprehensive survey of approximately half of Priority Area 1. On November 2, 2008, 14 members of BRAVO and two guests conducted a comprehensive survey of the remainder of Priority Area 1 including extending the survey area up the slope and also northwest toward the Fort Hill site. The approximate bounds of each quadrant that was searched was measured by Linck using a Garmin GPSmap 60CSx hand-held GPS (Global Positioning System) unit. These search quadrants were systematically searched. The quadrant locations are shown in Figure 2. Sufficient time was available to also conduct a brief survey of Priority Areas 2 and 3. Approximately 198.5 total metal detecting manhours were expended on the project. Artifacts were located using electronic metal detectors and excavated with hand shovels. Excavation depths did not exceed 12". No previous benchmarks were readily available. The overall site was also moderately forested thus making the use of a total station laser transit slightly difficult. Therefore, it was decided to measure artifact locations using a hand-held GPS unit for the first day. During the course of locating artifacts, a surveying benchmark was found that could be tied back to the geo-referenced aerial photograph and the survey maps provided by Glenn Watson of Badey & Watson, Surveying & Engineering. It was decided to use the total station on the second day for improved accuracy (Sivilich 2007).

The results of the metal detecting surveys indicate no presence of any Revolutionary War barracks in Priority Area 1. However, a significant number of Civil War era expended munitions and related items suggest this area may have been used for training or target practice. Priority Areas 2 and 3 in and around the St. Mary's Abbey cemetery yielded a number of 18th-century artifacts including 13 hand-wrought nails, several of which were thermally altered. This appears to be the site of the burned barracks.
Copies of this report have been distributed to:

Dana Linck  
Archaeologist  
3224 Sandburg Terrace  
Olney, MD 20832

BRAVO  
62 Shady Lane  
Freehold, NJ
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INTRODUCTION:

The city of Peekskill, New York was the location of significant events during the Revolutionary War. British forces took control of the city in March and October of 1777 and again in June 1779, capturing or destroying supplies and structures each time. Five American wooden barracks, arranged in a square "U" shape, were destroyed in March, 1777. The exact location of these barracks is not known, but based on historical records, it has been postulated that they are near the Fort Hill redoubt in a small curved valley. This area was purchased by Ginsburg Development, who plans on developing the site as "The Abbey at Fort Hill" housing development. However, the Developer has been working with the City of Peekskill to help locate the barracks site and preserve it. Several priority areas were established for archeological analysis as shown in Figure 1. Dana Linck, the archaeologist who has done work at the Abbey site previously, was hired to evaluate these areas as potential locations for the barracks. Dana requested assistance from BRAVO to locate possible Revolutionary War artifacts in the proposed impact areas that might positively identify the barracks site.

BACKGROUND RESEARCH:

The specific details of the site history and project impact will be reported separately by Dana Linck.

RESEARCH DESIGN:

Detailed archaeological surveys using conventional 5' x 5' excavation units tend to be time consuming and expensive. Shovel testing can give varied results at military sites, however they can be useful in locating prehistoric sites that are devoid of metal objects. Preliminary Phase I surveys using metal detectors have been employed at many military sites with a great deal of success (Sivilich, 1995 and 1996; Potter 1998; Connor and Scott 1998, 32(4):76-85). Therefore, it was decided to use this technique to determine if there was any activity associated with the 1777 British destruction of the American barracks. The objectives of this study were as follows:

1. Locate metallic artifacts either military or related to the barracks construction. This is accomplished using electronic metal locating equipment and skilled volunteers.

2. Determine if any significant spatial relationship exists between the artifacts. The artifacts are cataloged into specific groups. The precise location of each artifact is plotted on a digital topographic map using GIS (Geographic Information System) software. The map of the site, with the artifact locations precisely marked, is viewed to determine if the data is related to a specific event or structure.

3. If relationships are found, determine if they correspond to the occurrences described in historical text or shown on maps.

METHODS:

The field investigation technique was designed to be similar to that used at Custer Battlefield National Monument (Scott, Fox, Connor, and Harmon 1989:24-27) and is currently being employed at Monmouth Battlefield State Park (Sivilich 1995, Sivilich 2005, 72-85). The
search area was defined to be within the boundaries identified by Linck and the survey team instructed to work only within that area. Metal detectors and visual survey methods were utilized during the inventory collection phase. If artifacts were recovered, each received a unique sequential specimen number, which was logged into a field notebook with the location data.

The current property consists of lightly wooded, undulating hills with rock outcroppings for Priority Area 1 and 3. Priority Area 2 is a stone wall enclosed cemetery with a well maintained grass lawn as shown in Figure 3. Glenn Watson of Badey & Watson, Surveying & Engineering, P.C., provided electronic georeferenced (in New York State Plane NAD 27 coordinates) CAD files of the site. Artifact locations were spatially located by two methods. Since no visible survey points were available, on the first day a Garmin 60 CSx hand-held GPS was used. However, during the course of the collection phase, a survey mark was found that was identifiable on the survey map. A second survey point was indicated on the CAD drawing as being on a rock that was identifiable in the aerial photograph. Although the physical point was not found on the rock, the distance from the first known point was calculated using the GIS software and the actual distance measured using a survey grade Bosch steel tape measure, thus establishing a second point. On the second day, these points were used as benchmarks for a Trimble 5600 total station laser transit with a TDS Ranger 500 data collector. Several other survey points were established from these benchmarks in order to move the transit to measure artifacts that did not have a clear line of sight from the first transit position (Figure 2). Two identifiable points were found in Priority Areas 2 and 3 so the transit was used to measure all artifact locations at those sites (Figure 3).

All data was plotted using ArcView 9.1 GIS software on geo-referenced aerial photographs and two foot interval topographic maps obtained from the New York Geographic Information System Clearing at http://www.nysgis.state.ny.us/ along with the aforementioned surveying files. All units used are New York East State Plane Feet (NAD 27).

On November 1-2, 2008 members of BRAVO surveyed the Priority Areas using electronic metal detectors and extended the search areas as instructed by Linck. Artifacts were excavated immediately upon being located by each volunteer using simple digging tools, i.e., small shovels or garden-type trowels. Each artifact was placed in a specimen bag and assigned a specimen number. The excavation site was marked with a pin flag. At the end of the survey, the location of each artifact was measured as indicated early by either GPS or transit. Modern debris such as aluminum cans, pull tabs, etc. were removed and later discarded.

Artifacts were cleaned with tap water and lightly brushed to remove any soil. Small iron artifacts were treated with Exxon Rustban® after washing to temporarily inhibit further oxidation. All artifacts were weighed to the nearest 0.1 gram using an Ohaus electronic laboratory balance. Diameters of spherical or circular artifacts were measured using Max-Cal electronic digital calipers. The diameter of the slightly deformed musket balls was confirmed using a method published by the author (Sivilich 1996:104):

\[
\text{Diameter in inches} = 0.223204 \times \text{(Weight in grams)}^{1/3}
\]
All of the data collected was entered into Artitrak (artifact database software written by the author). A detailed listing of the artifacts by artifact number is attached as Table 1 and a summary of the artifacts grouped by type for the two survey areas is attached as Table 2.

FIELD RESULTS:

On November 1-2, 2008, members of BRAVO completed a Phase I survey of the areas of potential disturbance using electronic metal detectors. A total of 198.5 BRAVO metal detecting man-hours were spent at the site. This does not include surveying time, lab time, and data analysis via GIS time or report writing time. Excavation depths did not exceed 12". A total of 46 artifacts were recovered in Priority Area 1 and 42 artifacts were excavated in Priority Areas 2 and 3 as listed in Table 1 and Table 2. Figure 4 shows the location of each artifact and its corresponding artifact number for Priority Area 1 and Figure 5 shows all artifacts found in Priority Areas 2 and 3.

Figure 3 shows the key types of 18th-century artifacts found and their spatial relationships. Two loci of artifact concentrations suggest possible 19th - 20th century farm or horse-related activities as shown in Figure 4. The following is the author's suggested interpretation of the results for these artifacts.

Priority Area 1:

**Possible Revolutionary War and/or Civil War Era Artifacts (Figure 6 and 7 and Plate 1):**

Eighteen artifacts were recovered that were identified as being possibly associated with the Civil War. These are categorized as follows:

A. Decorative chain - a fragment of a very ornate ornamental chain, possibly from a sword, was recovered.

B-D. Minie balls - Seven Civil War era Minie Balls were excavated, all of which were expended and impacted. Two were two-ringed, four were three-ringed with conical concave bases and one was three-ringed with a flat base, possibly a Williams Cleaning Minie ball.

E-F. Musket balls - Six musket balls of small diameter (less than 0.60") were excavated. Two were 0.45" in diameter and are most likely from a 19th-century pistol. The 0.53", 0.54" and 0.58" were probably from two or more rifles. Given the significant concentration of Minie Balls, these were also probably from the same time period. The 0.63", 0.66" and 0.68" were most likely from smooth bore musket and could be either Revolutionary War (Figure 7) or Civil War projectiles.

G. Civil War token/coin - a brass penny/token with an image of a statue of George Washington, inscribed "FIRST IN WAR, FIRST IN PEACE" on the obverse and "UNION FOR EVER" on the reverse. Although the date is not readable, it was minted in 1863 as shown in Plate 1G next to a coin from the collection of Jim Barnett of BRAVO.
Other Artifacts of General Interest (Figure 4 and Plate 2):

A variety of artifacts from various time periods were also excavated. The following are several of general interest:

A. Sporting button - a 2-piece, iron-filled, brass button with a figure of a horse and rider on the face was found. It is backmarked "HAMMOND TURNER & SONS". This was a button manufacturer in England that made "sporting" buttons in the mid 19th century.

B. Rosette - a decorative pewter rosette with a hole in the center was recovered. This is possibly a 19th-century bridle rosette.

C. Oxen shoe - this could be 18th or 19th century.

D. Pot holder - a bent iron rod with hooked ends was found. It is possibly a camping pot holder.

E. Toy - a pewter miniature toy cup was found. Based on the style, this is probably 19th-century.

F. Pocket watch plate - a brass jewel plate with the makers hallmark was excavated.

G. Possible pewter projectile - an unusual conical-shaped white metal or pewter object (9-479) was found in Area 1. From the deformation it appears to have possibly been fired and impacted. What is significant is that it bears a striking resemblance to 9-423 (Plate 3H) found in Area 2.

H-I. Amusement tokens - Two tokens were found that are probably from amusement parks or carnivals. 9-469 has a drilled or punched hole for wearing as a good luck charm (probably late 19th - early 20th century).

Priority Area 2:

Possible Revolutionary Artifacts (Figure 8 and Plate 3):

A. Coin - George I halfpenny. The date is not readable, but this style coin was minted between 1722 - 1724. It is also known as a Woods Hibernia token and was minted in England for use in Ireland (Yeoman 1996:23-24), however, it was underweight and unpopular (being of British origin). With no other use for them, they were "dumped" in the colonies in the 1740's.

B. Musket balls - an impacted 0.65" and an impacted 0.75" musket ball were excavated. These are consistent with Revolutionary War musket balls (Sivilich 2004 and 2006).

C. Button - an 18th-century Tombac style pewter button (Olsen 1963) was recovered. It was made of good grade pewter and retained a high level of luster. Buttons of this type and size have been found at numerous other Revolutionary War sites by BRAVO.
D. Pocket knife - a rusted pocket knife with a pistol grip style handle was found. This style was common in the Revolutionary War.

E. Knife guard - a fragment of a cast brass knife guard was found.

F. Spoon handle - a pewter spoon handle was found with an impressed star-like design. The material and thickness of this artifact is consistent with 18th century spoons.

G. Kettle fragment - 5 fragments of a kettle were found, but 9-452 had a piece of iron "welded" to it. This is an indication that this piece may have been in an intense fire.

H. Possible pewter projectile - an unusual conical-shaped white metal or pewter object (9-423) was found in Area 2. What is significant is that it bears a striking resemblance to 9-479 (Plate 2G) found in Area 1.

In addition to the artifacts shown in Plate 3, 20 nails were recovered. Eighteen were hand wrought and only two were machine cut. Several of the wrought nails appear to have been thermally altered.

CONCLUSIONS:

BRAVO's involvement with this project was to locate, identify and interpret Revolutionary War military artifacts that may be associated with the 1777 burning of the American barracks by British troops. It was believed that the site had been metal detected by relic hunters. Relic hunters typically loot artifacts of value such as buttons, coins and musket balls. They tend to discriminate against ferrous objects, such as nails, which have very little monetary value and are also not very collectable due to heavy rusting. If this were the case, it was anticipated that quantities of wrought nails would be found to identify the barracks site. The topography of Priority Area 1 fit the topography of a period map and was searched systematically for one and a half days. No wrought nails or other identifiable 18th-century artifacts were found to identify this as the area of the barracks. Sufficient Civil War era (non-ferrous) artifacts were found to indicate that very little looting had taken place on the site. An 1863 coin/token was the only artifact found that provided a potential date for the site. However, the origins of these artifacts are a puzzlement.

Just before leaving the property, BRAVO spent less than half of a day at Priority Areas 2 and 3. A significant quantity of artifacts was found in and around the convent cemetery that appear to be related to the American occupation and British destruction of the site. Eighteen wrought nails were found, several of which appear to have been in a fire. A George I half cent was the only artifact found that provided a potential date for the site. This appears to be the potential site of the American barracks. However, this is a small sampling of artifacts that may be present based on the time available to survey the site.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It is recommended that an additional metal detecting survey of Priority Areas 2 and 3 be conducted as part of a systematic Phase II archaeological survey. More precise barracks locations may be determined and the information that could be gained would significantly improve site interpretation.
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