Exhibit B

PROPOSAL

HISTORIC SURVEY PHASE II

EAST TOWN (ORIGINAL JOPLIN) NEIGHBORHOOD
JOPLIN, MISSOURI

Submitted to the City of Joplin, Missouri

September 23, 2019

Keenoy Preservation
5229 Oleatha Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63139
314-637-6441 / rdkeenoy@gmail.com
http://keenoypreservation.com/

Exhibit B

Contents

1.0 Cover Letter 1
2.0 Executive Summary 2
3.0 Company Background 3
4.0 Company Experience 5
5.0 Responses to Scope of Scope of Services 8
5.1 Scope of Services – General 8
5.2 Scope of Services – Final Products 9
5.3 Scope of Services – Required Public Meetings 10
5.4 Scope of Services - Timeline 10
5.5 Scope of Services – Proposed Costs to Complete Project 11
6.0 Sample Document 12
6.1 Sample for Ruth Keenoy 12
6.2 Sample for Susan Sheppard 13
6.3 Sample for Terri L. Foley 14
7.0 Signature Page Form 16

Exhibit B

1.0 Cover Letter

KEENOY PRESERVATION
5229 Oleatha Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63139
rdkeenoy@gmail.com / 314-637-6441

September 23, 2019

City of Joplin
ATTN: Thomas Walters, Planner
Planning, Development and Neighborhood Services
602 S. Main Street
Joplin, MO 64801

RE: East Town (Original Joplin) Historic Survey Phase II

Dear Mr. Walters:

I wish to submit a proposal to complete the above-referenced project for which the City of Joplin issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) on August 18, 2019 (re-issued September 6, 2019). The proposal would include a survey team consisting of myself, Susan Sheppard, and Terri L. Foley.

The enclosed proposal includes an Executive Summary, Company Background, Company Experience, Response to Scope of Services, Sample Documents and Signature Page Form. A cost proposal has been submitted separately. We have the requisite experience, training and technical competence to complete the project on time (on or prior to July 31, 2020).

We very much appreciate the opportunity to provide this proposal and look forward to hearing of your decision. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Ruth Keenoy

Ruth Keenoy
Historic Preservation Specialist
http://keenoypreservation.com
314-637-6441 / rdkeenoy@gmail.com

Exhibit B

2.0 Executive Summary

The following proposal was prepared for the City of Joplin, which seeks to complete a Phase II intensive survey of properties within the East Town (Original Joplin) Neighborhood. The Phase II survey area is bounded by East Broadway (north), N. St. Louis Street (east), 4th Street (south) and the Kansas City Southern Railroad (west). The survey will identify approximately 230 properties.

If awarded the project, the scope of work will be completed through the services of a three-member team – Ruth Keenoy, Susan Sheppard and Terri L. Foley. All team members meet the Secretary of Interior's Professional Standards of Qualifications for architectural history as published in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR Part 61 (standards available at: https://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm). Ms. Keenoy is a registered WBE in the State of Missouri. Ms. Foley is a registered WBE in the State of North Carolina.

The project will meet the requirements outlined in the State Historic Preservation Office's (SHPO) Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) Products Manual and National Register Bulletin 24: *Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning* (Revised). The final survey report will provide a history of the area and its development contributing to the overall historical understanding of Joplin. The project will focus on identifying properties that may be eligible for local and/or National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) significance. Properties will be evaluated individually and for their potential to comprise one or more local and/or NRHP district(s). Final survey boundaries, level of documentation and number of survey forms will be determined in consultation with the SHPO.

The survey team has the requisite experience, education and qualifications to complete the project, as described under Sections 3.0 (Company Background) and 4.0 (Company Experience).

If awarded the contract, the consultant team will comply with all applicable City, State and Federal provisions pertaining to non-discrimination, Equal Employment Opportunity, Affirmative Action and the American with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Funding for the Joplin East Town (Original Joplin) Neighborhood Survey, **Project Number 29-19-171413-014,** is made available through a grant provided by the U.S. Department of the Interior/National Park Service, Historic Preservation Fund, through the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Division of State Parks, State Historic Preservation Office.

Questions regarding this proposal should be addressed to Ruth Keenoy, 314-637-6441, rdkeenoy@gmail.com.

Exhibit B

3.0 Company Background

Keenoy Preservation is a consulting team composed of three individuals: Ruth Keenoy, Susan Sheppard and Terri L. Foley. The consultants have worked with each other for a number of years. Ms. Foley and Ms. Keenoy have worked as a team for more than 12 years. Ms. Sheppard recently joined the team, bringing her more than 10 years' experience as a historic preservation professional.

- Ms. Keenoy holds a master's degree in historic preservation and has worked as an architectural historian for more than 25 years. She has completed a number of cultural resource surveys in the states of Maine, Missouri, Tennessee, New York, Virginia, West Virginia, Georgia and Alabama.

Education – Ruth Keenoy
B.B.A., Business Administration, Middle Tennessee State University, 1985
M.A., History, Middle Tennessee State University, 1995

Professional Work Experience – Ruth Keenoy
Historic Preservation Consultant, Self-Employed, St. Louis, 2006-2010; 2016-present
Project Manager, Historical Mitigation, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) Relocation, St. Louis, MO, 2016 - present
Preservation Specialist, Landmarks Association of St. Louis, Inc., 2010 – 2016
Senior Preservation Planner, TRC, Atlanta, GA (Nashville branch office), 2000-2006
Historic Preservation Specialist, Tennessee Dept. of Transportation, 1997 – 2000
Architectural Historian, TRC Mariah Associates, Inc., Austin, TX, 1996-1997
Private Consultant/Architectural Historian, Self-Employed, 1996-1997
Preservation Planner, Thomason & Associates, Nashville, TN, 1994-1996

- Ms. Sheppard has a master's degree in history (Southeast Missouri State University) with an historic preservation emphasis and has worked as an architectural historian for 15 years. She has completed surveys in Missouri and South Dakota.

Education – Susan Sheppard
B.A., Art History, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2000
M.A., History, Southeast Missouri State University, Cape Girardeau, 2003

Professional Work Experience – Susan Sheppard
Program Outreach Coordinator, Missouri Main Street Connection, St. Louis, 2019
Project Manager/Assistant Main Street Coordinator, State of Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, Baltimore 2015-2018
Cultural Resource Management Specialist, Michigan State Historic Preservation Office, Lansing, 2009-2013

Architectural Historian, Cultural Resource Department, SCI Engineering, St. Charles (MO), 2006-2008
Preservation Specialist, Landmarks Association of St. Louis, Missouri, 2004-2007

- Ms. Foley holds a bachelor's degree in historic preservation with an emphasis in architectural design. She has worked as a preservation consultant for 17 years, completing cultural resource surveys in the states of Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Missouri, New York and North Carolina.

Education – Terri L. Foley
B.S., Historic Preservation, Southeast Missouri State University

Professional Work Experience – Terri L. Foley
Ms. Foley has been self-employed as a historic preservation consultant since completing her degree in 2002.

Recent architectural survey projects completed by Keenoy Preservation in Missouri include a Phase II Survey of the North Central Neighborhood in Columbia (2019) and an Intensive Re-Survey of Downtown Moberly (2017-2018).

Noted in the Request for Proposals (RFP) are Joplin's African-American and Route 66 resources, which shall be addressed in the proposed Phase II survey. Past projects completed by the consultant team that specifically address similar historical contexts are provided below.

- Garfield Historic District (Foley, 2017), Butler County (Poplar Bluff), MO. Document is available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/SG100001686.pdf
- Salem Baptist Church (Keenoy, 2013), Madison County (Alton), IL. Document is available at: https://www.nps.gov/nr/feature/places/pdfs/13001004.pdf
- Bennett Avenue Historic District (Keenoy, 2008), St. Louis County (Richmond Heights), MO. Document is available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/08000228.pdf

Ms. Keenoy and Ms. Foley co-authored the Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPDF) for Route 66 in Missouri (2008). The document is available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/Route66MPDF.pdf. Individual nominations completed by the consultants for Route 66 properties under the MPDF include the following:

- Meramec River U.S. Route 66 Bridge (Keenoy and Foley, 2008), St. Louis County, MO. Document is available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/09000888.pdf
- Route 66 Steak 'n Shake (Keenoy, 2012), Greene County (Springfield), MO. Document is available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/12000462.pdf

- Devil's Elbow Historic District (Keenoy, 2017), Pulaski County, MO. Document is available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/100000566.pdf
- Piney Beach (Keenoy, 2017), Pulaski County, MO. Document is Available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/100000567.pdf

Each member of the consultant team meets the Secretary of Interior's Professional Standards of Qualifications for architectural history as published in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR Part 61 (https://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/arch_stnds_9.htm).

No team members have failed to meet project deadlines in the past. All projects have been completed on time and within the proposed budget.

4.0 Company Experience

In relation to the scope of services outlined in the City's Request for Proposal (RFP), the consultants have completed multiple survey projects (individually and as a team). Sample projects completed by the consultant team during the past five years are provided below.

Of note is that Susan Sheppard worked during the past five years for Main Street. Professional contacts for Susan include:

- Karen Forbes, Assistant Director of Community Access/Department of Housing and Community Development, Maryland, 410-209-5809
- Diane Tuinstra, Cultural Resources Management Specialist, Michigan State Historic Preservation Office, 517-335-2723
- Becky Axilbund, Executive Director, Main Street Middletown (MD), 301-371-617.

2019 – Barker Neighborhood Intensive Survey, Phase I City of Lawrence, KS (Keenoy, Foley)
Contact: Lynne Zollner, Historic Resources Administration (City of Lawrence), 785-832-3151
Intensive residential survey of 326 properties. Potential for National Register District (pending Phase II survey) and identification of four potentially individually eligible properties.

2019 – North Central Neighborhood Survey, Phase II, City of Columbia, MO (Keenoy, Foley)
Contact: Rusty Palmer, Planner (City of Columbia), 573-874-7394
Reconnaissance level survey, Phase II, of North Central Neighborhood, identified 209 properties (residential, commercial, industrial) of which six were identified as potentially eligible for the National Register.

2019 – Wepprich Winery, St. Charles, MO, National Register Nomination (Keenoy, Foley)
Contact: Bill Elliott, Kenrick Construction Co., St. Louis, MO, 314-865-5204
Completed National Register nomination for former winery in downtown St. Charles, Missouri. Approved by Missouri Advisory Council, August 2019. Pending formal listing with the National Park Service.

2017-2018 – Collins Park Intensive Neighborhood Survey, City of Topeka, KS (Keenoy, Foley) (Survey report: https://www.kshs.org/resource/survey/topeka_collinsparksurvey2018.pdf)
Contact: Tim Paris, Historic Preservation Planner (City of Topeka), 785-368-3013
Intensive survey, Collins Park neighborhood, identified 185 properties (all but one is residential). Survey recommended a historic district for the platted subdivision of Collins Park.

2017 – 2018 – Intensive Survey, Downtown Commercial and Industrial Properties, City of Moberly, MO (Keenoy, Foley)
Contact: Tom Sanders, Director of Public Works (City of Moberly), 660-269-7644
Survey recorded 214 properties including re-evaluation of the city's downtown historic district. Recommendations were to enlarge the existing district. District expansion National Register nomination is currently in progress.

2017 – Garfield Historic District, Popular Bluff (MO) (Foley) (Available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/SG100001686.pdf)
Contact: Nevada Young, City Planning & Inspections, City of Poplar Bluff, 573-686-8615
National Register District completed for ethnic/African American significance.

2017 – Christian Weinrich House, Frederick Weister House and Old Fire Station Chester, Illinois, National Register Nomination (Foley)
Contact: Brenda Owen, 618-830-8569
Individual National Register nominations completed for three buildings in Chester, Illinois in 2017.

2016 – 2017 – Grandview Place, Intensive Survey, Edwardsville, Illinois (Foley)
Contact: Scott Hanson, City Planner, City of Edwardsville (IL), 618-692-7535
Conducted a survey for a mid-century modern residential subdivision developed on historic mine land. The survey included 186 residential buildings, three secondary buildings and approximately 69 objects.

2016 – 2017 – Section 106 Compliance/History Project– National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, City of St. Louis (Keenoy) (Multi-tiered projects available online at: https://www.stlouis-mo.gov/government/departments/sldc/project-connect/nga/history/index.cfm; https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/SG100002334.pdf;

https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/SG100002792.pdf; https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/SG100002038.pdf)
Contact: Russell Halliday, Program Manager Next NGA (City of St. Louis), 314-309-6560
Section 106 mitigation for the City of St. Louis in relation to construction of National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency headquarters. Project included public history project (with displaced residents), three National Register nominations and shoe industry historical overview.

2015 – Brahm-Mitchellette Motor Car Company, St. Louis, National Register Nomination (Keenoy) (Available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/15000442.pdf)
Contact: Berto Garcia, property owner, 314-353-0336
National Register nomination for former automobile dealership that currently houses administrative offices for Garcia Properties, St. Louis, Missouri.

2015 - Cynthia-Kinzer Historic District, Poplar Bluff (MO) (Foley) (Available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/15000441.pdf)
Contact: Nevada Young, City Planning & Inspections, City of Poplar Bluff, 573-686-8615
Completed National Register district nomination for a residential neighborhood consisting of 88 properties.

2015 – Claverach Park, St. Louis County, MO National Register Nomination (Keenoy) (Available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/15000537.pdf)
Contact: Karen Bode Baxter, 314-353-0593
Wrote Section 8 of National Register nomination. District includes 253 residential properties.

2014 – Bellefontaine Cemetery, St. Louis, National Register Nomination (Keenoy) (Available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/docs/14000378.pdf)
Contact: Nancy Ylvisaker, President, Bellefontaine Cemetery, 314-749-9909
Completed National Register nomination for Bellefontaine Cemetery, National Significance, Criterion C: Landscape Architecture.

2014 – Fifth Street Survey, City of Washington, MO (Keenoy/Landmarks Association) (Survey Report available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/survey/FRAS005-R.pdf)
Contact: Bridgette Kelch (no longer in position – was Executive Director of Downtown Washington). Contact for Downtown Washington – 636-239-1743
The intensive survey (completed with Katie Graebe) recorded 178 properties, ten of which were recommended as potentially eligible (individually) for the National Register of Historic Places.

2014 – Downtown Webb City Historic District, Webb City (MO) (Foley) (Available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/docs/DowntownWebbCityHistoricDistrict-14000427.pdf)
Contact: Erin B. Turner-Forcum, Community Development Coordinator (Webb City), 417-499-6367
National Register district nomination completed for properties along North and South Main and adjacent side streets, Webb City.

2014 - HABS/HAER Documentation, LORAN-C Towers, Wilmington, NC (Foley)
Contact: Zac Holmes, Shape Construction, 360-377-6383
Conducted HABS/HAER survey that entailed the documentation of the United States Coast Guard Carolina Beach LORAN-C Station including all buildings and four LORAN-C Towers.

5.0 Responses to Scope of Scope of Services

The following activities will be conducted should Keenoy Preservation be awarded the Phase II intensive historic survey. Funding for the project is made available through a grant (**Project Number 29-19-171413-014**) from the U.S. Department of the Interior/National Park Service Historic Preservation Fund (HPF), through the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Division of State Parks, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). All correspondence related to this project will include the Project Number.

5.1 Scope of Services – General

The intensive level survey will allow for the evaluation of properties as they relate to the neighborhood's history and development. The proposed survey area consists of approximately 230 above-ground properties. Prior to beginning the project, the consultant team will schedule a time to discuss the project's expectations with the SHPO/HPF Grant Manager and the City of Joplin. Ms. Keenoy and Ms. Sheppard will attend two informational public meetings to discuss process, survey results and answer questions and will complete the photography and conduct research while in Joplin. Ms. Foley will assist in preparing forms and the survey report. Meetings will be coordinated by the City of Joplin and the Joplin Historic Preservation Commission. Notices regarding public meetings will be the responsibility of the City of Joplin.
All deliverables will be provided in digital format per SHPO instructions.

Exhibit B

5.2 Scope of Services – Final Products

An **Intensive Survey** of the East Town (Original Joplin) Neighborhood (within the study area) will include:

- A completed **research design** meeting the SHPO's "Standards for Professional Architectural and Historic Surveys", submitted to the SHPO in Word format prior to fieldwork.
- Email documentation for **two public information meetings.**
- **SHPO Architectural/Historic Inventory Forms** meeting SHPO's "Standards for Professional Architectural and Historic Surveys" and following the "Instructions for Completing the Architectural/Historic Inventory Form", completed for each property within the boundary, including vacant lots. This will include:
  - Construction dates of the surveyed properties
  - Documentation of historic character and current conditions of the surveyed properties
  - Addresses/locations of the surveyed properties
  - Basic physical descriptions and conditions of properties
  - Basic archival research – including Sanborn maps, atlases and city directories if available
  - National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility recommendations
- **Digital color photographs** of each surveyed resource provided in JPEG format.
  - Each elevation of the property, including outbuildings *provided that building is visible from street*
  - Photographs will have minimal visual intrusions and include building details
  - Streetscape images (not to replace individual property photographs)
  - JPEG format, pixel dimensions for camera at least 1600 X 1200 and at least 300 dpi.
  - Named image files per SHPO protocol
- **A boundary map**, separate from the final report.
  - The location of each property inventoried will be indicated on a large-scale map (at least 1" = 200).
  - Potential district boundaries, property type, plan or style, and other interpretive information will be included.
  - Individually eligible properties will be noted.
  - Maps will be submitted in digital format.
- **A final survey report** meeting SHPO's "Standards for Professional Architectural and Historic Surveys" will include:
  - A description of the scope and scale of the survey
  - Methodology of the project

- A complete historic context to include an overview of the history of the neighborhood's development, focusing on the period(s) when the inventoried resources were constructed. The context(s) will address the survey area specifically and include outlying areas to evaluate the broader context of the study area.
- Architectural analysis including property types and styles
- Recommendations for NRHP Nominations, local historic designations, and survey activities
- Bibliography

5.3 Scope of Services – Required Public Meetings

The consultant team will conduct a minimum of two public meetings, as described below. Public meeting notices are the responsibility of the City of Joplin.

- First public meeting will explain the objectives and anticipated process of the project, answer questions and solicit information from residents familiar with the project area.
- Second public meeting will provide a refresher of the project's objectives and process, as well as provide findings of the survey that include National Register eligibility recommendations.
- Meetings will take place at Joplin City Hall and may be held in conjunction with regular meetings of the Joplin Historic Preservation Commission.

5.4 Scope of Services - Timeline

The project will be completed no later than July 31, 2020. Following the completion of a signed contract, agreed upon by both the consultant team and City, a notice to proceed will be followed by the initial meeting between the consultant team and the SHPO.

The final timeline will be agreed upon by all parties. A suggested timeline for deliverables is provided below, based upon the assumption that the notice to proceed will be issued no later than November 4, 2019. This schedule will be adjusted per the recommendations of the City and SHPO.

Date (no later than)	Deliverable / Item
November 26, 2019	Contract signed / Notice to Proceed
November 27, 2019	Initial Meetings with SHPO and City
December 16, 2019	Submission of Draft Research Design
January 6, 2020	Submission of Final Research Design
January 13, 2020	First public meeting (on or near this date)
April 3, 2020	Submission of complete draft inventory form, digital color JPEGS, and a digital survey map
June 1, 2020	Submission of final inventory forms, maps, and photos
July 10, 2020	Submission of final survey report
July 31, 2020	Submission of final project report and fiscal data
August 3, 2020	Final public meeting (on or near this date)

5.5 Scope of Services – Proposed Costs to Complete Project

Proposed costs to complete the project are $23,000 – the cost breakdown is provided in the table below.

Cost Proposal - East Town (Original Joplin) Phase II Survey				
Category	**Billing Rate**	**Hours**	**Cost**	**Notes**
SHPO meeting	50	1	$50.00	Project initiation
Research Design	50	4	$200.00	
Field Evaluation	50	40	$2,000.00	Includes photography
Research	50	40	$2,000.00	City offices, archives, libraries
Public Meetings	50	20	$1,000.00	Includes travel time
Writing - Report	50	150	$7,500.00	Survey Report
Production	50	4	$200.00	Survey Report and Forms
Survey Forms	50	150	$7,500.00	
Revisions	50	16	$800.00	
Vehicle expenses			$750.00	Gasoline, mileage
Office Supplies			$200.00	Paper, printing supplies, etc.
Lodging/Meals			$800.00	
PROJECT TOTAL			**$23,000.00**	

Exhibit B

6.0 Sample Document

Writing samples for each member of the consultant team are provided below. Samples for each are as follows:

- Keenoy – Excerpt from North Central Columbia, MO Survey Report, Phase II (2019).
- Sheppard – Excerpt from Tower House National Register Nomination (2005), City of St. Louis, MO (entire nomination available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/nps-nr/05001034.pdf)
- Foley – Excerpt from Downtown Webb City Historic District Nomination (2014) (entire nomination available at: https://dnr.mo.gov/shpo/docs/DowntownWebbCityHistoricDistrict-14000427.pdf)

A sample survey report, completed in 2019 for the City of Columbia, Missouri, is provided under separate cover. Due to the extensive number of pages in this document, only one copy is provided with this submission.

6.1 Sample for Ruth Keenoy

The Phase II North Central Neighborhood survey area is situated immediately north of Columbia College and several blocks north of Columbia's primary downtown east/west corridor, Broadway. Earliest Sanborn maps of this area date to 1908, illustrating the study area's northwest corner (currently the site of Hickman High School, 1104 N. Providence Road), which supported a racetrack and fairgrounds. Sanborn maps also illustrate the study area's southwest corner, which supports the former Hamilton Brown Shoe Factory at 1123 Wilkes Boulevard. Though limited in scope, the 1908 maps indicate that housing did exist in the neighborhood by that time, likely prompted by the shoe factory's construction in 1906-1907. Development was further prompted by annexation of this area to the city's limits in 1906. By 1925, Sanborn maps illustrate a much larger component of the neighborhood and demonstrate that by the mid-1920s, most of the survey area had been developed residentially.

The 1910 federal census confirms the impact that the shoe factory had on the neighborhood's development. By that time, a large percentage of households within the survey area supported shoe factory workers. A snapshot of the 1000 block of N. 8th Street (addressed as the 800 block in 1910) indicates that most properties on the west side of the block supported individuals employed at the shoe factory. Furthermore, some property owners took in boarders who worked at the factory, which was the case for 805 Fairview Avenue. This single-family dwelling supported six boarders in 1910, all of whom worked at the shoe factory as did three family members.

Columbia's shoe factory at 1123 Wilkes Boulevard was the first constructed by Hamilton-Brown outside of the City of St. Louis. In 1906, St. Louis' shoe industry began to build factories in

small towns outside of the city to avoid taxes and labor unions. It was a boon for communities such as Columbia to land a shoe factory and as a result, extremely competitive. Communities attempted to outbid one another by offering factory owners incentives such as free land, free utilities, tax incentives and cash. Columbia's initial investment was $60,000 and in 1913, the city additionally offered to reimburse the factory for constructing its own sewer system. The city's Commercial Club spearheaded the deal with Hamilton-Brown and gained the factory by donating land and paying for all construction costs. In return, Hamilton-Brown agreed to remain in Columbia for a minimum of ten years.

The factory opened in July 1907 and within three years was manufacturing 2,000 pairs of shoes daily. In 1910, the factory employed 408 individuals – more than half were Columbia residents. The remaining workers moved to Columbia or commuted from other communities. This prompted a number of households in the neighborhood - such as that described previously on Fairview Avenue - to take in boarders. It is notable that factory employees formed their own baseball leagues (female workers organized a basketball team) and played/practiced games on the fairgrounds parcel later developed for Hickman High School, 1104 N. Providence Road. This is yet another demonstration of how integral the shoe factory was in spurring development and growth within the study area.

6.2 Sample for Susan Sheppard

The Shingle Style evolved from the Queen Anne style in New England in the early 1880s. With its irregular massing and complicated rooflines, it is quite similar to the Queen Anne style, but unlike its predecessor, the Shingle Style tends to be much simpler in design, with less variety of color and texture, and an emphasis on the horizontal. The monochromatic surfaces of the Shingle Style was a shift from the polychrome textures, and what some were beginning to view as a general fussiness, that characterized the Queen Anne style.

The most identifying feature of the Shingle Style is its shingled exterior wall surfaces, which serves to unify the exterior of the building through the use of surface texture. Shingles can be used in varying degrees of frequency. While some Shingle Style buildings are covered entirely in shingles, often the first floor of the house is stone, with the second floor and above decorated with shingles. The Tower House is brick, with shingles visible at the second floor and at the half story pediments. The relative simplicity of the Shingle Style made it popular with resort "cottages" in Newport and Maine in the 1880s. Vincent Scully calls Henry Hobson Richardson's Watts Sherman House in Newport, Rhode Island, designed in 1884, the first monument of the Shingle Style.6 Richardson and other New England architects were leaders in the development of the style.7 One of Richardson's last works in the style was the Potter House at 5814 Cabanne Avenue in St. Louis in 1886 (demolished). Other New England architects continued to work in the style well into the 1890s, most notably McKim, Mead and White. The style was used much less frequently in the Midwest, although L. Lyman Sislbee and John Wellborn Root were experimenting with the Shingle Style in Chicago in the 1880s.

Newcomb's use of the Shingle Style was unusual for St. Louis, and it shows the influence that other Boston architects such as Richardson were having on his work. Like much of Richardson's Shingle Style domestic architecture of the 1880s, Newcomb's Tower House features asymmetrical massing, which is at the same time ordered and contained. In addition, it has broad low-pitched gables with sweeping ridges, seen on McKim, Mead and White's William Low House (demolished)which was constructed in Bristol, Rhode Island in 1887, two years earlier than the Tower House.

St. Louis' restrictions on frame construction within the city limits following the fire of 1849 contributed to the very few examples of the Queen Anne or Shingle Style, which were characteristically, although certainly not always, constructed of frame. In addition, they are styles that never gained local popularity. Those Queen Anne and Shingle Style houses that were built are constructed of less frequently employed materials such as brick or stone, like the brick Tower House.

A small concentration of Shingle Style houses were built in the West Cabanne Place Historic District (NR 1980) in the late 1880s and 1890s, although a few of those have been lost, including the Theodore Link-designed Lippincott House at 5944 West Cabanne Place. The demolition of Richardson's Potter House was the most unfortunate loss of the Shingle Style in the city. The Tower House is most stylistically similar to the Lippincott House, which was two and a half stories, with brick construction at its lower level and shingles above. It also had a cross gabled roof, although its front porch was much more modest, with a simple gable roof with a pediment end. The Potter House, which had less ornament than the Lippincott or Tower House, was much more horizontal, with a high pitched hip roof and a long low porch. Its primary ornamentations came from its surface shingles, one octagonal turret, and an eyebrow dormer window at its roof. The loss of the Lippincott and the Potter Houses increases the rarity of the Shingle Style in St. Louis, and makes the preservation of the Tower House of added importance.

6.3 Sample for Terri L. Foley

The Downtown Webb City Historic District is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C the area Architecture as an exceptional intact late 19th to mid-20th century commercial district in Webb City. This section of downtown Webb City, located from 34 S Main to Austin Street with the parallel streets, Webb, Tom and Liberty, as well as the side streets, Broadway, Church, Daugherty, Tom comprises a grouping of buildings that create a noteworthy and vital unit, reflecting popular local and national architectural styles. Within the district are several prominent buildings, as well as a few that have a more simplistic design but worthy and contribute to the district. The buildings within the Downtown Webb City Historic District illustrates late-19th to mid-20th century commercial architecture; as well as local and national trends of modernization and renovation of pre-existing buildings when new building materials merged in the building industry. While some buildings reflect the modernization and renovation which commonly occurred in historic downtowns over the years, many buildings endured and are relatively unaltered. The buildings within the district not only depict architectural elements and construction techniques common during the time, but also additionally express the significance of the commercial corridor role in the local community as a business, mixed-use neighborhood, and destination or local/regional residents and workforces.

Two-part commercial blocks (17) and one-story (16) buildings are dominant within the Downtown Webb City Historic District streetscape with, 4 two-story buildings, a multiple-front corner block, 2 corner block buildings as well as a small quantity (9) featuring stylistic overtones of Italianate or Italian Renaissance Revival, Romanesque, Classical Revival Streamline Moderne and Art Deco styles. Brick is the prevailing exterior wall cladding and a substantial number of commercial buildings utilize patterned masonry designs or detailing for architectural appeal. While several of the buildings are devoid of a visibly identifiable architectural style, elements like cornices, designed parapets, corbelled brickwork, brick or stone window headers or sills, stringcourses, and quoins intermix to produce architectural importance on the facades and elevations. Some of the buildings in the district retain their original cast iron storefronts and prefabricated metal cornices. The storefronts in the district generally have an entrance flanked by display windows and transoms. Entrances are flush with the storefront or recessed. Some of the bulkheads are wood panel while others are brick or feature Carrera glass. Several storefronts feature a cast iron header or other elements to delineate the lower levels from the upper levels. A few of the buildings feature prismatic glass transoms (111 W. Daugherty; 12 S. Main).

Originally, the Downtown Webb City Historic District was comprised of framed buildings and functioned as commercial establishments and as residential housing for business owners or other residents. Like so many towns, frame structures were less expensive, faster to construct, and wood building materials more accessible, which resulted in. In addition, frame construction did not require the skill of a brick mason or a stonemason. Brick construction slowly started to replace the frame structures starting in the late 1880s. The district's earliest extant building is the Middle West Hotel, a corner block, three-story building constructed 1883. Originally, the building fronted E. Broadway (historically E. Main) but was realigned and remodeled to front S. Main (historically S. Alan) in 1902 to accommodate the Electric Railway. The Middle West Hotel still anchors the S. Main and E. Broadway intersection. The corner block building type was designed to be an impressive building that has solid, compelling, shape, strong massing, with defined lines on the facade and the secondary street facing elevation. As with the majority of corner block buildings, the Middle West Hotel was not uniform in designed, to allow the facade to be larger, as well as exhibiting a different design.

During the early development of the district the Italianate and Italian Renaissance styles were utilized in the design of four buildings, all located at the intersection of N. Main and Daugherty streets. The second oldest building in the district, 201-207 N. Main (Hatten and Raymond Block ca. 1887) originally, interconnect but at a later unknown date, the buildings were separated to create two buildings. The 1925 Sanborn maps, depict the buildings were still connected. The 201 N. Main building exhibits an upper level metal facade with Italianate Renaissance characteristics, a popular style in commercial storefronts along with the Italianate style from the 1870s–1880s, but extended into the early 1900s. 55 The second level features double arched centered windows with transoms and is flanked by windows with transoms held in the same opening to give the appearance of tall windows. The upper level also features decorative cast iron pilasters and an ornate cornice line with brackets, which runs the length of this block building highlighting the 203-207 building as well. The first level features a cast iron storefront, stamped with "Carthage

& Co. with a chamfered entrance, cast iron column, and pilasters. The 203-207 building features a cast iron storefront with stained-glass transoms.

7.0 Signature Page Form

Attachment B

THE CITY OF JOPLIN

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM

RFP # 29-17-151350-05

Company Keenoy Preservation

Address 5229 Oleatha Avenue · St. Louis, MO, 63139

Contact Person Ruth Keenoy

Telephone Number 314-637-6441

Email rdkeenoy@gmail.com

NOTE TO RESPONDENTS: SUBMIT ENTIRE SECTION WITH RESPONSE. THIS EXECUTION OF OFFER MUST BE COMPLETED, SIGNED, AND RETURNED WITH THE RESPONDENT'S QUALIFICATIONS. FAILURE TO COMPLETE, SIGN AND RETURN THIS EXECUTION OF OFFER WITH THE QUALIFICATIONS MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF THE QUALIFICATIONS.

SIGNING A FALSE STATEMENT MAY VOID THE SUBMITTED QUALIFICATIONS OR ANY AGREEMENTS OR OTHER CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS, WHICH MAY RESULT FROM THE SUBMISSION OF RESPONDENT'S QUALIFICATIONS, AND THE RESPONDENT MAY BE REMOVED FROM ALL PROPOSER LISTS. A FALSE CERTIFICATION SHALL BE DEEMED A MATERIAL BREACH OF CONTRACT AND, AT THE JRC'S OPTION, MAY RESULT IN TERMINATION OF ANY RESULTING CONTRACT.

By signature hereon, Respondent acknowledges and agrees that (1) this RFP is a solicitation for Interest and is not a contract or an offer to contract; (2) the submission of Responses by Respondent in response to this RFP will not create a contract between the City and Respondent; (3) Neither the City or the Committee, or any of their representatives, have made a representation or warranty, written or oral, that one or more contracts with the City will be awarded under this RFP; and (4) Respondent shall bear, as its sole risk and responsibility, any cost which arises from Respondent's preparation of a response to this RFP.

By signature hereon, Respondent offers and agrees to furnish to the City all of the products and/or services more particularly described in its Responses, and to comply with all terms, conditions and requirements set forth in the RFP documents and contained herein.

By signature hereon, Respondent affirms that they have not given, nor intends to give at any time hereafter, any economic opportunity, future employment, gift, loan, gratuity, special discount, trip, favor or service to a public

6

servant, elected officials, leadership or staff of the City or partner organizations in connection with the submitted Responses.

By signature hereon, the Respondent hereby certifies that neither the Respondent nor the firm, corporation, partnership or Developer represented by the Respondent, or anyone acting for such firm, corporation, or institution has violated the antitrust laws of this state, or the Federal antitrust laws, nor communicated directly or indirectly the Responses made to any competitor or any other person engaged in such line of business.

By signature hereon, Respondent represents and warrants that:

Respondent is a reputable company regularly engaged in providing products and/or services necessary to meet the terms, conditions and requirements of the RFP;

Respondent has the necessary experience, knowledge, abilities, skills, and resources to satisfactorily perform the terms, conditions and requirements of the RFP;

By signature hereon, Respondent certifies that the individual signing this document and the documents made part of the RFP is authorized to sign such documents on behalf of the company and to bind the company under any agreements or other contractual arrangements, which may result from the submission of the Response.

By signature hereon, Respondent affirms that no compensation has been received for participation in the preparation of the specifications for this RFP.

By signature hereon, Respondent affirms that it has not violated any of the noted No-Lobbying provisions or specification contained in this RFP.

By signature hereon, Respondent agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City and the Committee, all of their officers, agents and employees from and against all claims, actions, suits, demands, proceedings, costs, damages, and liabilities, arising out of, connected with, or resulting from any acts or omissions of Respondent or any agent, employee, subcontractor, or supplier of Respondent in the execution or performance of any agreements or other contractual arrangements which may result from the submission of these Responses.

Submitted and certified this 23rd day of September 2019.

BY:

Signature Date: 9-23-2019

Name (Printed): Ruth Keeney

Title: Owner, Keeney Preservation

Signature: Ruth Keeney

7