Historic Preservation Commission
Agenda
September 16, 2019

REGULAR MEETING
Council Chambers, 2nd floor of City Hall
City Hall, 749 Main Street
6:30 – 9:00 PM

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Approval of Minutes - August 19, 2019
5. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda
   • (Tomeo House)
7. Probable Cause Determination
   • 1133 Main Street
8. Probable Cause Determination
   • 925 Jefferson Avenue
9. Discussion/Pre-Filing Conference
   • 816 Lincoln
10. Discussion/Direction
    • Miner’s Cabins RFP
11. Items from Staff
    • Alteration/Demolition Updates
    • Upcoming Schedule
12. Updates from Commission Members
13. Discussion Items for future meetings
14. Adjourn
Historic Preservation Commission
Meeting Minutes
August 19, 2019
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
6:30 PM

Call to Order – Chair Haley called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.
Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

Commission Members Present:  Chair Lynda Haley
Andrea Klemme
Caleb Dickinson
Hannah Parris
Gary Dunlap

Commission Members Absent:  Michael Ulm
Chuck Thomas

Staff Members Present:  Felicity Selvoski, Historic Preservation Planner
Harry Brennan, Planner
Amelia Brackett, Planning Clerk
Leah Angstman, Historical Commission Liaison

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Klemme made a motion to approve the August 19, 2019 agenda. Dickinson seconded.
Agenda approved by voice vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Dickinson made a motion to approve the July 15, 2019 agenda. Klemme seconded.
Agenda approved by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
None.

NEW BUSINESS – PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS
620 GRANT AVENUE (HARNEY HOUSE) HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND
GRANT REQUEST: A request for a Historic Preservation Fund grant for the
Harney House located at 620 Grant Avenue. (Resolution 1, Series 2019)

Selvoski presented the grant request of the Harney House, which was built around
1905-1906 and owned by the Harney family from Slovakia for 65 years. An HSA was
completed in December 2018 and it was landmarked in April 2018. The request was for $5,315 to add insulation to the walls and attic of the house, which matched the quote. The only grant funds the house had received included the $900 grant for the HSA and the $1,000 Landmark Incentive Grant. Selvoski stated that staff felt the application met the requirements for grant funds under the new language.

Staff finds that the grant request meets the requirements of Resolution 2, Series 2012 and recommends approval of the request.

Haley asked for questions of staff and the applicant. Seeing none, she invited the applicant to speak.

Nicole Schwalm, 620 Grant Avenue, thanked the Commission for their time.

Haley asked for commissioner discussion.

Dickinson stated that the grant was made for this purpose and that the work would make the home a better structure. He was happy that the applicant came back within the 18-month deadline.

Parris agreed and noted that the HSA had done its job of identifying issues with landmarked homes.

Dunlap moved to approve Resolution 1, Series 2019. Klemme seconded. Roll call vote. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

PROBABLE CAUSE DETERMINATION FOR 816 LINCOLN AVENUE: A request to find probable cause for a landmark designation to allow for funding of a historic structure assessment for 816 Lincoln Avenue.

Selvoski shared current photos, historic documents, and the landmark criteria. The principal structure was constructed around 1909 and is an early 20th-century wood frame with a rectangular footprint, a tall front gable roof, and a full-width porch along the front façade, all of which is representative of Louisville architecture from the era. The door and window placements appear original. The structure had changed hands multiple times and represented owners from French, English, and Central European origin and many were tied to the mining economy.

Staff finds that the structure at 816 Lincoln has architectural and social significance and possesses physical integrity. Staff finds that there is probable cause to consider landmarking the property and finds that the property is eligible for the $4,000 grant toward the assessment.

Andy Johnson, with DAJ Design at 922 Main Street in Louisville, stated that the house was a straightforward probable cause determination and he wanted to share research on the house and the characteristics of a Historic Structure Assessment. There was an
original deed at the house from 1875 with pages documenting ownership turnover before 1903, which challenged the date found on the accessor’s card. He noted that the assessment would help determine if the house was built before 1909. The house had structural integrity based on the 1948 assessor’s cards and he believed that the structure was close to its original form. He also explained that the assessor’s card might have as many as three iterations of the house drawn onto it.

Johnson also described the cost breakdown for an assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Observations – 4 hours</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and as-built drawings – 8 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report – 8 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Engineering Report</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He stated that he thought assessments should include footprints and measurements of wall thickness. He explained that there was a full day’s work after a site visit to look through historic photos and write summaries.

Dunlap asked if Mr. Johnson would recommend requiring a structural report in the assessment.

Johnson replied that a structural engineer was particularly important in assessing the foundation. He noted that many of the houses applying for assessments and landmarks would eventually have work done to them and a structural report would help determine how to go about that work.

Haley stated that the cost breakdown was helpful for the Commission. She added that the assessment also served as a record of the historic house on its own. Haley suggested showing the deed to Bridget Bacon at the Louisville Historical Museum.

Parris appreciated the presentation from Mr. Johnson and felt that there was probable cause.

Dunlap noted that the structure as it was in 1948 would still be historic.

Dickinson moved to find probable cause. Klemme seconded. Roll call vote. Motion passed unanimously.

**PROBABLE CAUSE DETERMINATION FOR 701 GRANT: A request to find probable cause for a landmark designation to allow for funding of a historic structure assessment for 701 Grant Avenue.**

Selvoski presented historic photos from the early 1900s and late 1940s, as well as current photos. The Commission had previously voted to find probable cause and
approve the assessment grant. This request was from a new applicant who planned to use the structure as a single-family unit.

Klemme noted that she was not at the previous meeting but she had read the staff report and did not need the full presentation.

Haley wanted to make sure that the assessment be thorough since it was a larger structure than typical residential structures.

Selvoski replied that staff felt the same way and that the applicant had been communicative so far.

Dunlap asked if there was any process to ask for more funds for an assessment.

Selvoski replied that there was nothing written in about providing more money for a larger residential structure.

Dickinson stated that if the assessment ended up costing more money, the grant was still providing a substantial amount toward the total assessment and he would be surprised if a more expensive assessment prevented the applicant from having a thorough assessment.

Haley agreed that the possible amount above the $4,000 grant would be part of the usual expenses in buying a house anyway.

Dunlap moved to find probable cause and Dickinson seconded. Roll call vote. All in favor. Motion approved unanimously.

**ITEMS FROM STAFF**

**Alteration/Demolition Updates**

Selvoski explained that staff and an HPC subcommittee approved two alteration certificates for roof replacements, one at the Austin-Niehoff House at 717 Main and one at the Center for the Arts at 801 Grant, with the rationale that the proposed materials were a reasonably good match to the current materials, the work would not alter the general appearance, and replacing the roof would help preserve the landmarked structure.

Staff and a subcommittee approved one demolition request for 536 La Farge based on the rationale that the structure has been modified over time and therefore had little architectural integrity, making it unlikely to be eligible for landmarking.

Klemme asked what to do when a subcommittee could not make a decision on an application.

Selvoski replied that a subcommittee member could always request to have a full hearing.
Upcoming Schedule

September
4th – Lunch ‘n’ Learn with the Boulder Realtors Association, 12 – 1 PM
16th – Historic Preservation Commission, Council Chambers, 6:30 PM

October
10-12th – PastForward: National Preservation Conference, Denver
21st – Historic Preservation Commission, Council Chambers, 6:30 PM

Dunlap asked if staff wanted commissioners to attend the Association meeting on the 4th.

Selvoski replied that Commissioner Dickinson had expressed interest in attending and one other commissioner could attend without triggering a public hearing.

UPDATES FROM COMMISSION
Klemme asked about the mailings for the Historic Preservation Fund reauthorization.

Selvoski responded that staff had sent the press release to an editor and would send it out soon.

Dickinson asked about the coaster project.

Selvoski replied that it was on pause until the costs for the mailings and other public information became clearer.

DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETINGS
None.

Adjourn:
Klemme moved to adjourn. Parris seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 7:17 PM. Dickinson voted nay. 😊
ITEM: 1001 Main Street Alteration Certificate (Tomeo House)

APPLICANT: City of Louisville
749 Main Street
Louisville, CO 80027

OWNER: City of Louisville

PROJECT INFORMATION:
ADDRESS: 1001 Main Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 1-4, Block 1, Barclay Place
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: circa 1908

REQUEST: A request for an alteration certificate for 1001 Main Street (Tomeo House, part of the Museum Campus).
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:
Information from Bridget Bacon, Museum Coordinator

Felix Tomeo built the structure known as the Tomeo House with the help of his older brothers, Nick and Mike, circa 1904. The house originally had the address of 520 Second St. under Louisville’s old address system that changed about 1939. It was later known as 1013 (or sometimes 1011 or 1009) Main Street.

This building is typical of coal miners’ houses built in Louisville at the turn of the last century. Early wood frame houses were generally one story with two or three rooms and simple exterior detailing. The house has never had running water or a bathroom.

In 1924, the Rossi family (consisting of Grace DiGiacomo Rossi and her six children) moved into the Tomeo house and continued to rent the house from the Tomeo family until 1941. Dominic Tomeo, son of Felix and Michelina, lived briefly in the Tomeo House after the Rossi family moved to Denver, at which point Frank and Rose Kuretich rented the house with their two children until 1943.

Dominic Tomeo then used the building for storage space until his death in 1983, when the City of Louisville purchased Lots 1-4, including the Tomeo House and Jacoe Store, for the purpose of housing a local history museum. The Tomeo House (then known as the Miner’s House) opened as a museum on September 1, 1986. During renovation in the 1980s, electrical outlets, heating, and entrance steps and railings were added to the house.

The Tomeo House was recognized as a Louisville Historic Landmark in 2005 (Resolution No. 41, Series 2005). An alteration certificate was approved in 2014 to install a new cellar door and entry on the south side of the Tomeo House.
1001 Main Street, east side, current.

1001 Main Street, south side, current.
ALTERATION CERTIFICATE REQUEST:
The applicant is applying for an alteration certificate to allow for the construction of a decorative cover for the exiting crawl space access. The current access door was installed in 2014, replacing a smaller wooden hatch in the same place. The cover will be constructed of bead board siding (on the door), lap siding, and asphalt shingles. Per the submitted plans, all work will conform to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, and all existing historic materials will be protected during construction.
Section 15.36.120 of the LMC gives the criteria for evaluating alteration certificates:

A. The commission shall issue an alteration certificate for any proposed work on a designated historical site or district only if the proposed work would not detrimentally alter, destroy or adversely affect any architectural or landscape feature which contributes to its original historical designation.

B. The commission must find the proposed alteration to be visually compatible with designated historic structures located on the property in terms of design, finish, material, scale, mass and height. When the subject site is in an historic district, the commission must also find that the proposed alteration is visually compatible with characteristics that define the district. For the purposes of this chapter, the term "compatible" shall mean consistent with, harmonious with, or enhancing to the mixture of complementary architectural styles, either of the architecture of an individual structure or the character of the surrounding structures.

C. The commission will use the following criteria to determine compatibility:

1. The effect upon the general historical and architectural character of the structure and property.
2. The architectural style, arrangement, texture, and material used on the existing and proposed structures and their relation and compatibility with other structures.
3. The size of the structure, its setbacks, its site, location, and the appropriateness thereof, when compared to existing structures and the site.
4. The compatibility of accessory structures and fences with the main structure on the site, and with other structures.
5. The effects of the proposed work in creating, changing, destroying, or otherwise impacting the exterior architectural features of the structure upon which such work is done.
6. The condition of existing improvements and whether they are a hazard to public health and safety.
7. The effects of the proposed work upon the protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of the property.
8. The proposal's compliance with the following standards:
   a. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
   b. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
   c. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.
   d. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
   e. Distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.
   f. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. When the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. In the replacement of missing features, every effort shall be made to substantiate the structure's historical features by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
   g. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
   h. Significant archaeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
   i. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
   j. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the HPC approve the alteration certificate for 1001 Main Street ("Tomeo House"). The proposed changes to the existing structure are both compatible with the historic character of the property and comply with the requirements of the LMC. Staff recommends approval of the alteration certificate request by approving Resolution No. 02, Series 2019.

ATTACHMENTS:
- Resolution No. 02, Series 2019
- 1001 Main Street Historic Preservation Application and Plans
RESOLUTION NO. 02
SERIES 2019

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN ALTERATION CERTIFICATE FOR THE TOMEO HOUSE LOCATED AT 1001 MAIN STREET FOR EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS.

WHEREAS, there has been submitted to the Louisville Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) an application requesting an alteration certificate for a historic residential structure located on 1021 Main Street, on property legally described as Lots 1-4, Block 1, Barclay Place, Town of Louisville, City of Louisville, State of Colorado; and

WHEREAS, the City Staff and the HPC have reviewed the application and found it to be in compliance with Chapter 15.36 of the Louisville Municipal Code, including Section 15.36.120, establishing criteria for alteration certificates; and

WHEREAS, the HPC has held a properly noticed public hearing on the proposed alteration certificate; and

WHEREAS, the proposed scope of work, outlined in the staff report on September 16, 2019, meets the criteria of Louisville Municipal Code Section 15.36.120 and are historically compatible and do not detract from the historic character of the structure; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE, COLORADO:

The application for an alteration certificate for the Tomeo House is approved as described in the staff report dated September 16, 2019:

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 16th day of September 2019.

__________________________________________
Lynda Haley, Chairperson

__________________________________________
Caleb Dickinson, Vice Chair
Historic Preservation Application

Type(s) of Application

- [ ] Probable Cause/Historic Structure Assessment
- [ ] Landmark Designation
- [ ] Historic Preservation Fund Grant
- [ ] Historic Preservation Fund Loan
- [X] Landmark Alteration Certificate
- [ ] Demolition Review
- [ ] Other:

Property Information

Address: 1001 Main Street, Louisville, Colorado 80027

Date of Construction: Circa 1908

Legal Description: Lots 1-4, Block 1, Barclay Place

Parcel Number: 157508136009

Landmark Name and Resolution (if applicable): Tomeo House, Resolution 41, Series 2005

Owner Information

Name(s): City of Louisville

Address: 1001 Main Street, Louisville, Colorado 80027

Phone:

Email:

Applicant Information

Name(s): City of Louisville

Company:

Address: 749 Main Street, Louisville, Colorado 80027

Phone:

Email:
REQUEST SUMMARY
Install asphalt shingles and bead board on the Bilco door on the south side of the Tomeo House. All work to comply with the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Detailed plans attached.

Additional information will be required for grant and loan requests and alteration certificates.

SIGNATURES AND DATES
Applicant Name (printed): City of Louisville

Applicant Signature: Date:

Owner Name (printed): City of Louisville

Owner Signature: Date:

CITY STAFF USE ONLY:
Date Submitted: August 2019  Case No.: _________________________
Application Complete: yes / no  Comments:
Administrative Review: yes / no
Meeting(s) Required:
  o HPC: 09/16/2019
  o City Council: N/A
GENERAL NOTES

CONCRETE MIX TABLE

SPECIAL INSPECTION NOTES

FOOT IN-PLANT INSTALLATION AND TESTING:

PRESQUE ISLE SPECIALITY CONCRETE PRODUCTS, INC.

POST-INSTALLED ANCHOR NOTES

19

FOOTING/FOUNDATIONS

1. ANCHORS: USE IN-PLANT AND / OR CONCRETE: A.LT. VIII BOLT 12.

2. INSTALLATION REQUIREMENTS:

a. ALL POST INSTALLED ANCHORS SHALL BE INSTALLED ACCORDING TO MANUFACTURER'S PRINTED INSTALLATION INSTRUCTIONS AND PER MANUFACTURER'S OR F.B.T. TRAINING.

b. THE POSITION OF INSIDE REMAINING HOLES IN TIE-NOSE HOLES STRUCTURE SHALL BE LOCATED PRIOR TO INSTALLING FIRST POST-INSTALLED ANCHORS OR REMOVED EXISTING IMPACT HOLES SHALL BE LOCATED USING A SCANNER, XRAY, API, CHIPPING OR OTHER METHODS. NO DIAGNOSIS OR OUTLINING DOCUMENT.

3. SUBSEQUENT REPLACEMENT:

ALTERNATE PRODUCTS MUST BE APPROVED IN ADVANCE BY THE STRUCTURAL ENGINEER PRIOR TO USE. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE CALCULATIONS AND PRODUCT MANUFACTURER Confirms that the SUPPORT FABRIC IS IN COMPLIANCE AND THE RECOMMENDED FABRIC IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE SPECIFIED PRODUCT.
### Structural Masonry Special Inspections (Level B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verify compliance with the approved submission</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>ASTM C41</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in any construction project, verify that the following are in compliance:

- Dimensions of slopes
- Placement of concrete
- Joint reinforcement and anchors
- Placement of reinforcement and anchor bolts

### Structural Concrete Special Inspections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rebars</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>ASTM C332</td>
<td>Varying grade, size, bar quantity, location, spacing, column, beam, member, column and beam, location, width, diameter. Test for surface conformity and support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concrete**

- Mix design
- Each truck
- Verify use of approved design condition for each truck load.

- Placing of concrete
- Each truck
- Specify first point of each type grade and size. (Each load)

### Structural Concrete Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASTM C310</td>
<td>Obtain at point of placement. Portable testing to be done when concrete is under 70°F. Test for consistency and workability. Check for maximum total test for placement but not more than one sample per truck load.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Compressive strength
- 1/2 in. cubes
- ASTM C307

- Slump flow
- ASTM C143

- Temperature
- ASTM C192

- Cold weather curing
- ASTM C192

### Structural Masonry Testing (Level B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSU/SCU</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>ASTM C81</td>
<td>Verify sufficiency and visual stability check.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Structural Masonry Testing (Level B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSU/SCU</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>ASTM C81</td>
<td>Verify sufficiency and visual stability check.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM: 1133 Main Street Probable Cause Determination

APPLICANT: Richard Del Pizzo
2404 Windmill Drive
Longmont, Colorado 80504

OWNER: Richard Del Pizzo
2404 Windmill Drive
Longmont, Colorado 80504

PROJECT INFORMATION:
ADDRESS: 1133 Main Street
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 9-10 Block 2 Barclay Place
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1904

REQUEST: A request to find probable cause for a landmark designation to allow for funding of a historic structure assessment for 1133 Main Street.
SUMMARY:
The applicant requests a finding of probable cause for landmark designation to allow for funding of a historic structure assessment for 1133 Main Street. Under Resolution No. 17, Series 2019, a property may be eligible for reimbursement for a historic structure assessment (HSA) from the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) if the Historic Preservation Commission finds "probable cause to believe the building may be eligible for landmarking under the criteria in section 15.36.050 of the Louisville Municipal Code." Further, "a finding of probable cause under this Section is solely for the purposes of action on the pre-landmarking building assessment grant request, and such finding shall not be binding upon the HPC, City Council or other party to a landmarking hearing."

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

Information from Bridget Bacon, Museum Coordinator

Since its construction, this home has been consecutively owned by three Italian families: the Tomoro family, the LaSalle family, and (since 1926) the DelPizzo family. The house and this area of Main Street in general are strongly tied to Louisville’s Italian residents. This house still exhibits evidence of traditional Italian cultural practices, and the property includes what is believed to be the last beehive-shaped traditional ash pit in Louisville.

Filomena Tomoro, an immigrant from Italy, first purchased the property in 1904 and constructed a three room house there. Following a deadly altercation between her husband, Carlo Tomoro, and her brother, Filomena sold the property to Nicholas LaSalle in 1908.

Nicholas LaSalle, a Louisville miner, purchased the house at 1133 Main Street and lived there with his mother (Mary) and brother (Joe). Following his death in 1916, the house passed to his sisters (Rose and Mary). They rented the property for several years before selling it in 1926.

Rose and Joseph DelPizzo purchased the property in 1926. Joseph immigrated to Louisville from Italy and Rose was born in Louisville to Italian parents. They raised their three children, Lucile, Frank, and Dick, in the house. Joseph worked in the Louisville coal mines until his retirement in 1964. Following his father’s death in 1980, Frank continued to live in the house at 1133 Main. Frank DelPizzo passed away in 2019.

At some point prior to the 1948 assessment, a two room addition was added to the house. The DelPizzo’s used the basement of the house to store wine that they made as well as prosciutto. The grapes from the vines in the back yard were used to supplement their winemaking needs. In the alley, a beehive-shaped ash pit remains. Once common in Louisville, this may be the last remaining example of this structure. The ash pit was used to store coal ashes from the house as well as for burning trash.
Boulder County Assessor records, 1948

816 Lincoln Avenue, east view – Current Photo
816 Lincoln Avenue, north view – Current Photo

816 Lincoln Avenue, south view – Current Photo
816 Lincoln Avenue, west view (rear) – Current Photo

816 Lincoln Avenue, garage and ash pit (rear) – Current Photo
ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY:
The historic structure located at 1133 Main Street was constructed in 1904. It is an early
twentieth century wood frame vernacular house with a front gable roof with exposed rafter tails.
The primary façade faces east to Main Street. There is a wide front porch with a front gable roof
with exposed rafter tails on the front façade. The original structure has a rectangular plan.
According to documents, a two room addition was added to the house prior to 1948. The
windows and doors appear to be in the original location.

Primary changes occurred over time:
- Rear addition (pre-1948);
- Stucco veneer added (timing unknown);
- Roof replaced (2005);

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE ANALYSIS AND CRITERIA FOR FINDING PROBABLE
CAUSE FOR LISTING AS LOCAL LANDMARK:
Under Resolution No. 17, Series 2019, a property may be eligible for reimbursement for a
historic structure assessment (HSA) from the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) if the Historic
Preservation Commission finds “probable cause to believe the building may be eligible for
landmarking under the criteria in Louisville Municipal Code 15.36.050.” Further, “a finding of
probable cause under this Section is solely for the purposes of action on the pre-landmarking
building assessment grant request, and such finding shall not be binding upon the HPC, City
Council or other party to a landmarking hearing.”

Staff has found probable cause to believe this application complies with the following
criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landmarks must be at least 50 years old</td>
<td>The principal structure at 1133 Main Street was constructed in 1904, is 115 years old and meets this criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Landmarks must meet one or more of the criteria for architectural, social or geographic/environmental significance | Architectural Significance - *Exemplifies specific elements of an architectural style or period.*  
  - The structure at 1133 Main Street is an early twentieth century wood frame residential structure. It has a rectangular footprint and features a front gable roof. There is a porch attached to the front façade with a front gable roof as well. The door and window placement appears to be original.  
  - Based on early descriptions of the property, a two room addition was added to the property prior to 1948.  
    **Staff finds the style and integrity of the structure has probable cause to meet the criteria for architectural significance.**  
|                                                        | Social Significance - *Exemplifies cultural, political, economic or social heritage of the community.* |
The structure at 1133 Main Street has changed hands twice since being built. All of the owners showed strong ties to the Louisville’s Italian heritage. The DelPizzo family practiced many Italian traditions in the home including making wine and prosciutto.

The DelPizzo family who owned the structure from 1926 to 2019 had strong ties to the Louisville mining industry.

Staff finds that the structure exemplifies the cultural and social heritage of the community and there is probable cause to meet the criterion for social significance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landmarks should meet one or more criteria for physical integrity</th>
<th>This structure adds character and value to Old Town Louisville. 1133 Main Street is in its original location and the modifications to the original structure do not impact the overall physical integrity of the structure. The structure retains its overall form and appearance from the street and exhibits a high level of physical integrity. Overall staff finds probable cause that the structure meets the criteria for physical integrity.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
The finding of probable cause allows for a grant of up to $4,000 for a Historic Structure Assessment from the Historic Preservation Fund.

The current balance of the Historic Preservation Fund as of 07/31/2019 is approximately $2,312,787. Budgeted expenditures from the HPF for 2019 are estimated to be $549,270.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff recommends that the HPC finds there is probable cause for landmarking 1133 Main Street under the criteria in section 15.36.050 of the LMC, making the properties eligible for the cost of a historic structure assessment. The current maximum amount available for an HSA is $4,000. Staff recommends the HPC approve a grant not to exceed $4,000 to reimburse the costs of a historic structure assessment for 1133 Main Street.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
- 1133 Main Street Historic Preservation Application
- 1133 Main Street Social History Report
**HISTORIC PRESERVATION APPLICATION**

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

Address: **1193 MAIN STREET**

Date of construction (if known): **1908**

Legal Description: Lots 9-10 Blk 2 Subdivision **BARCLAY PLACE**

(attach separate sheet if necessary)

Landmarked Name and Resolution (if applicable): ________________

**APPLICANT INFORMATION**

Name: ________________

Company: ________________

Address: ________________

Telephone: ________________

Email: ________________

**OWNER INFORMATION (if not applicant)**

Name: **Richard Del Pizzo**

Company: ________________

Address: **2404 Windmill Drive Longmont CO 80504-2777**

Telephone: **303-485-2357 cell**

Email: delpizzod@gmail.com

**CASE NO. ________________**

**TYPE (S) OF APPLICATION**

- Historic Structure Assessment
- Landmark
- Historic Preservation Fund Grant
- Historic Preservation Fund Loan
- Alteration Certificate
- Demolition Review
- Pre-filing Conference with Historic Preservation Commission

**PROJECT INFORMATION**

Summary: ________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

**SIGNATURES & DATE**

Applicant Name (please print): **Richard Del Pizzo**

Applicant Signature: _________________________

Owner Name (please print): **Richard Del Pizzo**

Owner Signature: _________________________
1133 Main St. History

Legal Description: Lots 9 & 10, Block 2, Barclay Place

Year of Construction: 1904

Summary: This home has been consecutively owned by three Italian families: the Tomoro family, the LaSalle family, and (since 1926) the DelPizzo family. The house and this area of Main Street in general are strongly tied to Louisville’s Italian residents. This house still exhibits evidence of traditional Italian cultural practices, and the property includes what is believed to be the last beehive-shaped traditional ash pit in Louisville.

Development of Barclay Place

The Colorado Mortgage and Investment Co., Limited, a corporation organized under the laws of Great Britain and doing business in Colorado, in 1897 platted the Barclay Place subdivision in which this property is located. The subdivision was an early addition to Original Louisville.

Tomoro Family Ownership, 1904-1908; Date of Construction

Filomena Tomoro (sometimes spelled as Tomaro) purchased the parcel from the developer in January 1904. Her husband was Carlo Tomoro, who had come to Louisville in the 1890s.

A document recorded with Boulder County in October 1904 shows that Filomena Tomoro granted a chattel mortgage to Phillip Latronico in exchange for what appears to have been a $375 loan. The chattel mortgage covered the contents of the house at 1133 Main. Significantly, the document referred to the house having had three rooms at that time. This is consistent with the DelPizzo family’s theory that the house originally consisted of the front part of the house.

Newspapers in Lafayette and Denver reported in June 1908 that Carlo Tomoro shot and killed Nick Martello, who was described as being 42 years old and, in two of the accounts, as being Filomena Tomoro’s brother (although this relationship could not be separately confirmed). The
description of the location of the shooting as being just outside the DiFrancia Saloon in Louisville matches with the location of today’s 740 Front restaurant. Martello was said to have dropped dead at the front of the saloon, and Carlo Tomoro took off. Filomena Tomoro denied any knowledge of her husband’s whereabouts. According to newspaper accounts accessible at the websites of Colorado Historic Newspapers Collection and GenealogyBank.com, the two men had a contentious relationship and had been drinking and arguing. Nick Martello was buried in the Columbia Cemetery in Boulder.

The June 26, 1908 issue of the Lafayette Leader stated, “The shooting occasioned little excitement. There is a large foreign element in Louisville, and fights and cutting and shooting scrapes are not uncommon. Very little attention is paid to these disturbances, and arrests are seldom made, it is stated.”

Only two months later, in August 1908, Filomena Tomoro sold the house and property to Nicholas LaSalle. No additional information about either Filomena or Carlo could be located.

With respect to the date of construction of the house at 1133 Main, the 1948 Boulder County Assessor card for this property and the Boulder County Assessor’s Office website both give 1908 as the date of construction of this house. Boulder County has sometimes been found to be in error with respect to the date of construction of Louisville buildings, so it is important to look to other evidence of the construction year.

For Louisville properties, Boulder County typically based the dates it gives on its website on the 1948 Assessor card information, and in looking at the card for this specific property, it can be seen that the handwriting states that the house was “40+” years old in 1948. This indicates a lack of certainty of knowledge about the exact year and suggests that the Assessor thought that the house could have been constructed earlier than 1908.

In this case, Filomena Tomoro purchased the lots in January 1904, and this was the only property in Louisville that she or her husband owned at the time. Also, the 1904 Louisville directory lists a Carlo “Tomaso” and his wife as living in this subdivision of Barclay Place, with the typing of “Tomaso” likely resulting from the misreading of handwriting of the Italian name of Tomaro or Tomoro. But perhaps the most persuasive piece of evidence is the chattel mortgage filed with the County in 1904 that describes the house on the property at what is now 1133 Main as being a three-room house containing personal belongings that provided the security for the loan of money. For these reasons, the date of 1904 is believed to be the accurate date of construction. Evidence of it having been constructed even earlier could not be located.
La Salle Family Ownership, 1908-1926

In August 1908, Nicholas LaSalle (1885-1916) of Louisville purchased this property at 1133 Main from Filomena Tomoro. He had been born in Italy and came to the U.S. as a young boy in about 1889 with his parents and siblings. The family first settled in Marshall before moving to Louisville. The 1910 federal census records show Nicholas LaSalle to be living in this house that he owned on North Main Street, and the other people listed near him in the census are known to have been living in the same block of Main Street. He was 25 at the time and living with his widowed mother, Mary, age 53, and his brother, Joe, age 32. Nicholas was working as a miner, while his brother was working as a bartender in a saloon.

In 1916, Nicholas LaSalle died at the age of about 31. His mother died the same year. According to Boulder County filings, his heirs were his sisters Rose LaSalle Jordinelli and Mary LaSalle Latronico. In another example of family members living near one another in Louisville, his sisters both lived very nearby to 1133 Main. In 1926, the two sisters sold 1133 Main to Rose Scrano DelPizzo.

Del Pizzo Family Ownership, 1926-current

Rose Scrano (sometimes written as “Scarno” and later changed to “Scran”) DelPizzo (1906-1952) purchased this property in 1926 on behalf of herself and her husband, Joseph DelPizzo (1898-1980). They may have also rented the house before buying it.

Rose Scrano was born in Louisville to Italian-born parents. She and her parents and siblings lived up one block from this house on Main Street (believed to be the house at 1237 Main).

Rose DelPizzo purchased the house from Rose Jordinelli, Mary Latronico, and the estate of Nicholas LaSalle. There were many family connections between the Louisville families of DelPizzo, Scrano, Caranci, LaSalle, Latronico, Jordinelli, and Jacoe, and others, all being related by blood or marriage and living near each other.

Rose’s husband, Joseph DelPizzo, came from the small village of Taranta Peligna, Chieti, Abruzzo, in Italy. He served in the Italian Army in World War I, then emigrated to the United States in early 1922. He came directly to Louisville to join his brother, Nicola DelPizzo, whose home for decades was at 1000 Main Street. They were among a group of people who emigrated from Taranta Peligna and came to Louisville in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Some of the surnames of those who came from that village to Louisville, besides DelPizzo, were Demarco, DiDonato, Lippis, Madonna, Merlino, Natale, and Santilli.
In 1922 or 1923, Rose and Joseph married in Louisville. Before purchasing 1133 Main, they had a daughter, Lucile (1923-2015). They later had two sons: Frank (1930-2019) and Richard “Dick” (born 1939). The three children were raised in the house at 1133 Main.

The following photo from the DelPizzo family shows Joseph and Rose DelPizzo:

Joseph DelPizzo made his living putting up timbers to hold up the ceilings in local coal mines and to thereby prevent cave-ins. Also, when a section of the mine was mined out and the miners were moving on to another area of the mine, he was responsible for cutting the timbers so that the timbers would fall and collapse naturally, and he would be the last man out of the area. He worked in coal mines for several decades and retired in 1964. By all accounts, Joseph was a man of many skills that he put to good use on the property at 1133 Main.

The following images show the photo and ground layout from the Boulder County Assessor card that was completed in 1948:
Rose DelPizzo died in 1952. Joseph continued to reside in the house, raising their youngest child with the help of Rose’s sisters who lived nearby. The oldest child, Frank, lived most or all of his life at 1133 Main.

Joseph DelPizzo died in 1980. Frank was given a life estate in the house. Frank died in 2019. Today, members of the DelPizzo family continue to be the owners of the house at 1133 Main.

**Parts of the Property**

The house at 1133 Main is unique in Louisville for being substantially unchanged from when it was a center of activity of Italian cultural practices similar to those carried on in the homes of other Italian families in Louisville. The Museum is grateful to the DelPizzo family for providing most of the following information about the house since its family ownership started in the 1920s and for giving a tour to a member of the Museum staff.

**House Exterior:** The person who stuccoed the house exterior was Vincenzo Ciccarelli (1910-1975) of Frederick. He emigrated from the Italian village of Cansano, not far from the village of Taranta Peligna from which the DelPizzo family came. The stucco was on the house at the time when the 1948 Assessor card photo was taken, but the exact year of its application is not known.

**House Interior:**

It is believed that the kitchen and back bedroom were added to the front after the original construction.

There used to be a built-in archway between the living room and the dining room. Dick DelPizzo recalls that his father removed it in the late 1940s or early 1950s. Carmen Scarpella put in the distinctive kitchen nook and table. Joe Ross, put in the kitchen cabinets with the glass windows.
The family’s washing machine was kept in the back bedroom. Once a week, Rose DelPizzo rolled the heavy machine into the kitchen to do laundry. The family recently donated this Maytag washing machine, which appears to be from 1926, to the Louisville Historical Museum.

The bathroom was likely added in the early 1950s when Louisville voters approved a bond issue to pay for a town sewage system.

Cellar:

The mostly dirt cellar includes an open area and two small rooms that are along the south side of the house. The one further back from the front of the house was for coal. Coal would be delivered through the opening where there is now a window.

Joseph DelPizzo made wine in the cellar using a wooden wine press. The following photo from the small room at the front of the house shows wine barrels that until recently were still located there. (Italian families in Louisville and Frederick would partner to place one large order of grapes from California each year, with each family ordering their preferred variety or varieties of grapes. It was not unusual for one family to make 200 gallons of wine each year for its own use.)

The above photo also shows wire hooks that Joseph DelPizzo used for hanging prosciutto that he made. (Prosciutto is made from fresh hams that are heavily salted for a long period, then hung for at least a period of months.) In the upper left of the photo, one can see brown paper on a horizontal wire where he would hang homemade sausages.

The cellar has timber supports, not unlike what Joseph DelPizzo put in coal mines to provide support for mine ceilings.
Back Yard and Side Yard - Structures:

In the square area to the north of the garage, there was a chicken yard and a chicken coop where the family raised chickens. A coal shed was located near the chicken coop.

From the door on the north side of the garage, going directly north across the yard to the other side, is where the outhouse was located (along the north property line). The following 1940s photo shows Rose DelPizzo with her son, Dick, in the back yard of the house with the outhouse being visible behind them.

The clotheslines, made of heavy wire strung on metal poles, are believed to date back to the earlier years of the DelPizzo family ownership, and were certainly put up by the 1940s. They extend on the two sides of the walkway from the house to the garage, and one goes all the way to the alley.

Back Yard and Side Yard - Gardens:

Like many families in Louisville, the residents of 1133 Main grew much of their own food. This was especially needed in order to carry families through times when coal mining work was not available.

An apple tree stood by the back of the house, and plum trees were on the south side of the house. There were also peach trees in the yard.

The area from the garage to the house, besides having fruit trees, was made up of all vegetable garden that had fava beans, lettuces, endive, escarole, tomatoes, zucchini, string beans, corn, peppers, onions, and garlic. It extended on both sides of the walkway from the garage. Joseph DelPizzo turned the soil by hand.

There were trained grape vines behind the garage, to the south of the garage, and behind the house. The vines are still growing in these locations, but are untrained, as seen in the following
photo. Many are Concord grapes. According the family, there would typically be enough grapes from these vines to make a few gallons of wine, and so the family did this from time to time, but the main winemaking needs were met by the larger amounts of grapes brought from California.

Garage:

The garage used to be a one-car garage. It was on the south side of the property. Joe DelPizzo enlarged it by moving the north wall of the garage farther north and making a new section of wall to fill it in. This photo of the back of the garage shows the seam in the wall and the original part of the wall on the left.

Alley and Ash Pit:

Before Louisville had paved streets, red ash from local coal mine dumps would be spread on the streets. Red ash was a reddish substance, a mining byproduct, that was viewed as a good alternative to having dirt streets. Joseph DelPizzo would regularly arrange for a truckload of red ash to spread on the alley behind 1133 Main. He did this at his own expense because he was the only automobile driver whose house backed up to the alley on this block and who would enter the alley from Caledonia Street to the north.
The ash pit behind the house, right on the alley, is believed to be the last remaining beehive-shaped ash pit in the area. These were once a common site behind houses and were used for dumping coal ashes and for the burning of trash. They were located along the alleys in order to keep stray sparks away from homes and so that they could be emptied easily. (Men or teenage boys could make a little money by cleaning out ash pits with the use of a shovel and a wheelbarrow or truck, and typically the ashes were taken away and dumped down an old coal mine shaft.)

The following is a recent photo of the ash pit, which is essentially a brick dome covered with concrete or cement plaster. Some metal wire is visible on the surface, suggesting that wire mesh might have been used to encase the brick dome before the cement plaster or concrete was added to the exterior.

The date of this ash pit is not known for certain, but identical beehive-shaped ones can be seen next to houses in a Louisville photo from circa 1910.

Louisville’s other beehive-shaped ash pits were replaced over time by incinerators made out of concrete blocks set in a square or rectangle, and both became obsolete when people no longer produced coal ashes from burning coal in stoves (in the 1950s-1960 for the most part) and when people were required to stop burning trash (as of January 1, 1968). The Louisville Historical Museum is working with the DelPizzo family to document the ash pit and to explore options to move and preserve it.

The preceding research is based on a review of relevant and available online County property records, census records, oral history interviews, Louisville directories, and Louisville Historical Museum maps, files, and obituary records.
ITEM: 925 Jefferson Avenue Probable Cause Determination

APPLICANT: James Hopperstad
Longs Peak CAD
1015 Confidence Drive
Longmont, Colorado 80504

OWNER: Christine Dickinson
838 14th Street
Boulder, Colorado 80302

PROJECT INFORMATION:
ADDRESS: 925 Jefferson Avenue
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lots 6-7 Block 11 Jefferson Place
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: circa 1891

REQUEST: A request to find probable cause for a landmark designation to allow for funding of a historic structure assessment for 925 Jefferson Avenue.
SUMMARY:
The applicant requests a finding of probable cause for landmark designation to allow for funding of a historic structure assessment for 925 Jefferson Avenue. Under Resolution No. 17, Series 2019, a property may be eligible for reimbursement for a historic structure assessment (HSA) from the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) if the Historic Preservation Commission finds “probable cause to believe the building may be eligible for landmarking under the criteria in section 15.36.050 of the Louisville Municipal Code.” Further, “a finding of probable cause under this Section is solely for the purposes of action on the pre-landmarking building assessment grant request, and such finding shall not be binding upon the HPC, City Council or other party to a landmarking hearing.”

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND:

This property was originally purchased by Virginia Hamilton in 1891. The exact date of construction for the house is unknown, but it seems likely that the house was constructed around that date. Virginia Hamilton was born in Missouri and moved to Erie, Colorado with her husband Thomas. After he was struck by lightning and killed, Virginia moved to Louisville with her five children. Virginia Hamilton was a school teacher in Louisville, and the 925 Jefferson Avenue home was conveniently located near the school for first and second grade students at 801 Grant (now the Louisville Center for the Arts). Virginia taught in Louisville for 32 years.

In 1898, Virginia Hamilton was one of the four founding members of Louisville’s Saturday Study Club, which was a women’s club that sought to culturally enrich its members and the town. The Saturday Study Club operated the Louisville Public Library for 35 years.

Following Virginia’s death in 1925, her son Frank Hamilton lived in the house with his wife Sadie and her brother Samuel Hilton. Frank was a coal miner and operated a saloon in Superior, and later became a deputy County Clerk and a County road overseer. Following Frank’s death in 1956, his granddaughter sold the property.
Boulder County Assessor records, 1950

925 Jefferson Avenue, east view – Current Photo
ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY:
925 Jefferson is a one-story wood frame structure with a rectangular plan, with its primary facade facing east to Jefferson Avenue. The foundation is brick. The exterior is clad with horizontal wood lap siding painted white. The main roof is hipped with two red brick central chimneys. A wraparound porch stretches across the full width of the front facade and along the south side. The porch has a hip roof with a frieze and dentils. The porch roof is supported on turned wood posts with decorative brackets. A concrete walk leads to four wooden steps at the corner of the porch. The stairs have a newer turned wood posts and railings. The porch floor is wooden boards painted blue, and the soffit is bead board painted white. The front door is clear finished wood with a nearly full-height oval glass light. A crawl space below the porch is enclosed with painted wood latticework. The west end of the house is a 1957 addition. This extends the full width of the house and has similar wood lap siding, a shed roof, three 9-light wood windows and a side door leading to the back yard.

Primary changes over time:
- Rear addition (1957);
- Porch stairs replaced and railing added (unknown)
- Window replacement (2014, approved by HPC)
HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE ANALYSIS AND CRITERIA FOR FINDING PROBABLE CAUSE FOR LISTING AS LOCAL LANDMARK:

Under Resolution No. 17, Series 2019, a property may be eligible for reimbursement for a historic structure assessment (HSA) from the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) if the Historic Preservation Commission finds “probable cause to believe the building may be eligible for landmarking under the criteria in Louisville Municipal Code 15.36.050.” Further, “a finding of probable cause under this Section is solely for the purposes of action on the pre-landmarking building assessment grant request, and such finding shall not be binding upon the HPC, City Council or other party to a landmarking hearing.”

Staff has found probable cause to believe this application complies with the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landmarks must be at least 50 years old</td>
<td>The principal structure at 925 Jefferson Avenue was constructed circa 1891, is 128 years old and meets this criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Landmarks must meet one or more of the criteria for architectural, social or geographic/environmental significance | Architectural Significance - *Exemplifies specific elements of an architectural style or period.*  
  - This house is associated with the historic development of Louisville as one of the early homes in Louisville’s first residential subdivision, Jefferson Place. Although Jefferson Place was platted in 1880, few homes were actually built here before 1900.  
  - The property is significant for architecture as an example of a Hipped-Roof Box form house.  
  
  **Staff finds the style and integrity of the structure has probable cause to meet the criteria for architectural significance.**  

Social Significance - *Exemplifies cultural, political, economic or social heritage of the community.*  
  - Virginia Hamilton was a well-known Louisville teacher and founding member of the Saturday Study Club. Frank Hamilton was a coal miner, saloon operator, deputy County Clerk and a leading citizen in the community.  
  
  **Staff finds that the structure exemplifies the cultural and social heritage of the community and there is probable cause to meet the criterion for social significance.**  

| Landmarks should meet one or more criteria for physical integrity       | The property has integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship and feeling. Integrity of setting is compromised by the construction of adjacent homes that reduce the once  |
substantial size of the property. Integrity of association with the Hamilton family is lost, but association with Jefferson Place subdivision is still intact. There is a 1957 addition, but the addition is small, on the rear, and not readily visible from the street.

The structure retains its overall form and appearance from the street and exhibits a high level of physical integrity.

**Overall staff finds probable cause that the structure meets the criteria for physical integrity.**

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
The finding of probable cause allows for a grant of up to $4,000 for a Historic Structure Assessment from the Historic Preservation Fund.

The current balance of the Historic Preservation Fund as of 07/31/2019 is approximately $2,312,787. Budgeted expenditures from the HPF for 2019 are estimated to be $549,270.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Staff recommends that the HPC finds there is probable cause for landmarking 925 Jefferson Avenue under the criteria in section 15.36.050 of the LMC, making the properties eligible for the cost of a historic structure assessment. The current maximum amount available for an HSA is $4,000. Staff recommends the HPC approve a grant not to exceed $4,000 to reimburse the costs of a historic structure assessment for 925 Jefferson Avenue.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
- 925 Jefferson Avenue Historic Preservation Application
- 925 Jefferson Avenue History Report
### Historic Preservation Application

**Property Information**
- **Address:** 925 Jefferson Ave
- **Date of Construction:** 1905 (est.)
- **Legal Description:**
  - **Lot:** 6-7
  - **Block:** 11
  - **Subdivision:** Jefferson Place
- **Landmark Name and Resolution (if applicable):** N/A

**Type(s) of Application**
- ☣️ Probable Cause/Historic Structure Assessment
- ☐ Landmark
- ☐ Historic Preservation Fund Grant
- ☐ Historic Preservation Fund Loan
- ☐ Alteration Certificate
- ☐ Demolition Review
- ☐ Other: __________

**Applicant Information**
- **Name:** James Hopperstad
- **Company:** Longs Peak CAD
- **Address:** 1015 Confidence Drive, Longmont, CO 80501
- **Telephone:** (303) 885-6176
- **Email:** jrhopper@me.com

**Request Summary**
- Probable cause/HSIA

**Owner Information (if different)**
- **Name:** CHRISTINE DICKINSON
- **Company:**
- **Address:** 838 14th Street, Boulder, CO 80302
- **Telephone:** 303-444-6163, 303-868-6482
- **Email:** Christina.d@earthlink.net

**Signatures and Date**
- **Applicant Name (Print):**
  - **Signature:** [Signature]
  - **Date:** 8/27/19
- **Owner Name (Print):**
  - **Signature:** [Signature]
  - **Date:** 8/27/19
Resource Number: 5BL 923
Temporary Resource Number: 157508406003

OAH1403
Rev. 9/98

COLORADO CULTURAL RESOURCE SURVEY

Architectural Inventory Form

I. IDENTIFICATION

1. Resource number: 5BL 923
2. Temporary resource number: 157508406003
3. County: Boulder
4. City: Louisville
5. Historic building name: Hamilton House
6. Current building name: Schulte House
7. Building address: 925 Jefferson Avenue, Louisville, CO 80027. Alternate address: 424 Jefferson. Louisville addresses were changed in the 1930s.
8. Owner name and address: Schulte, 925 Jefferson Ave Louisville, CO 80027-1815.

II. GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

9. P.M. 6 Township 1S Range 69W
   NW ¼ of NE ¼ of NW ¼ of SE ¼ of section 8
10. UTM reference NAD 83
    Zone 13; 488484 mE 4425457 mN
11. USGS quad name: Louisville, Colorado
    Year: 1965 revised 1994 Map scale: 7.5’ X 15’ Attach photo copy of appropriate map section.
12. Lot(s): 6, 7 Block: 11
    Addition: Jefferson Place Year of Addition: 1880
13. Boundary Description and Justification: The surveyed property is bounded by Jefferson Avenue on the east, an alley on the west, and property lines on the north and south.

III. Architectural Description

14. Building plan (footprint, shape): Rectangular plan
15. Dimensions in feet: Length 44 x Width 26
16. Number of stories: One
17. Primary external wall material(s): Wood horizontal siding
18. Roof configuration: Hip
19. Primary external roof material: Asphalt
20. Special features: Porch, chimney, fence

21. General architectural description: 925 Jefferson is a one-story wood frame structure, rectangular in plan, with its primary façade facing east to Jefferson Avenue. The foundation is brick. The exterior is clad with horizontal wood lap siding painted white. The main roof is hipped, with gray/green asphalt shingles. There are two red brick central chimneys. A prominent wraparound porch graces the full width of the front façade and 24 feet of the south side. The porch has a hip roof with a frieze and dentils. The porch roof is supported on turned wood posts with decorative brackets. Harkening to the days when this house was in the center of a large land parcel, the approach to the house is at an angle, with a concrete walk leading to four wooden steps at the corner of the porch. The stairs have a newer turned wood posts and railings. The porch floor is wooden boards painted blue, and the soffit is bead board painted white. The front door is clear finished wood with a nearly full-height oval glass light. A crawl space below the porch is enclosed with painted wood latticework. Windows on the original part of the house are regularly spaced, historic wood 4/4 divided light double hung sash. The west end of the house is a 1957 addition. This extends the full width of the house and has similar wood lap siding, a shed roof with gray asphalt roll roofing, three 9-light wood windows facing west and a side door leading to the back yard.

22. Architectural style/building type: Hipped-Roof Box

23. Landscaping or special setting features: Jefferson Place Subdivision is a historic residential neighborhood adjacent to downtown Louisville. The subdivision is laid out on a standard urban grid of narrow, deep lots with rear alleys. Houses are built to a fairly consistent setback line along the streets with small front lawns, deep rear yards and mature landscaping. Small, carefully maintained single-family residences predominate. Most of the houses are wood framed, one or one and one-half stories in height, featuring white or light-colored horizontal wood or steel siding, gabled or hipped asphalt shingled roofs and front porches. While many of the houses have been modified over the years, most of the historic character-defining features have been preserved. 925 Jefferson Avenue is consistent with these patterns and blends well with the scale and character of the neighborhood. This small house is set in the center of the block, flanked by neighboring small houses, although it once anchored the center of a six-lot estate. The house is set close to the street with a shallow, unfenced lawn at the front and sides. Somewhat uniquely for Jefferson Place, the front concrete walk approaches the house at an angle, leading to four wooden steps at the southeast corner of the wraparound front porch. There is a very large cottonwood tree in front and large juniper shrubs at the front and sides of the house. The rear yard contains a lawn and planted areas. It is enclosed with a combination of wire fencing and wood picket fencing.

24. Associated buildings, features, or objects: NA

IV. ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

25. Date of Construction: Estimate: ca. 1891 Actual: ___________
   Source of information: Boulder County property records for lot purchase and 1900 Federal census

26. Architect: Unknown
   Source of information: NA

27. Builder/Contractor: Unknown
   Source of information: NA

28. Original owner: Virginia Hamilton
   Source of information: Boulder County property records

29. Construction history (include description and dates of major additions, alterations, or demolitions):
   The house was built at an unknown date between 1891 and 1905, most likely in 1891. For many years, the house had very generous side yards as it occupied the center of a six-lot property, lots 4 through 9. The two southernmost lots were sold in 1936 and the two northern lots were sold in 1952, leaving the property in its current two-lot configuration. A 10x26 rear addition was constructed in 1957. The original wood shingle roof was replaced at an
unknown date with asphalt shingles. Turned wood posts at the front porch stair railing are more recently added. No other exterior modifications were noted.

30. Original location X Moved ___ Date of move(s):

V. HISTORICAL ASSOCIATIONS

31. Original use(s): Domestic, Single Dwelling
32. Intermediate use(s): N/A
33. Current use(s): Domestic, Single Dwelling
34. Site type(s): Urban residence
35. Historical background:

This building is part of Jefferson Place, the first residential subdivision in Louisville.

Virginia Hamilton and her family owned this property for over 65 years, and this was their residence. Virginia Hamilton was a school teacher in Louisville for many years, and this home was conveniently located near her place of work, which was the school for first and second grade students at 801 Grant (5BL7974). Virginia Hamilton was also one of the four charter members of Louisville’s Saturday Study Club, a women’s organization credited with bringing culture to the coal mining town of Louisville. The Hamilton family was also associated with 833 Jefferson (5BL8433) in Jefferson Place. 925 Jefferson has a connected history with 913 Jefferson (5BL8434) and 933 Jefferson.

Marybeth Chambers originally purchased the lots for this property in 1885 from Jefferson Place developer Charles Welch. She was involved in buying and selling a great deal of property in Louisville, as was her husband, John S. Chambers. John and Marybeth Chambers, along with Lyman and Helen Andrews, operated the businesses Andrews & Chambers, located on Front Street, then the Louisville Mercantile Company, located in the brick building that used to stand at 701 Main. All were from New York State, as was Welch. Marybeth and John Chambers were a prominent and influential couple in Louisville until John Chambers died, which appears to have occurred in the 1890s. Marybeth Chambers then moved to Denver to live with a relative, according to census records.

County property records show that Asenath Virginia Hamilton, nicknamed Jennie, purchased the lots for 925 Jefferson by 1891, when the deed was recorded.

Virginia Hamilton was from Missouri (born in 1851, it is believed) and her maiden name was Clemens. (Long after her death, it was believed by some in Louisville that she had been the sister of Samuel Clemens (Mark Twain), but they had only distant cousins.)

Virginia Hamilton and her husband, Thomas, were living in Erie with their five children when he was struck by lightning and killed at the age of 30 in 1878. He was principal of Erie schools and postmaster in Erie.

The widowed Virginia and her children, who at that time ranged in age from 1 to 9, ended up living in Boulder in the early 1880s, then moved to Louisville. In the 1885 Colorado State Census, the family is shown as living on Main Street in Louisville and Virginia was already working as a school teacher to support her family.

The County gives 1905 as an estimated date of construction for this house, but the house is believed to have been constructed earlier. Boulder County has sometimes been found to be in error with respect to the dates of construction of historic buildings in Louisville. The inventory record completed for 925 Jefferson in 1985 estimated that it was constructed in 1880-1890. The 1904 directory for Louisville has the Hamilton family, the owners of 925 Jefferson, as living on Jefferson Avenue north of Walnut, which is an accurate description of this property. Also, although the 1900 federal census does not indicate streets for Louisville, it does list the family as living very close to other families who resided on Jefferson, and states that the Hamiltons owned their house free of a mortgage. It seems likely that the house would have been constructed at around the time that Virginia Hamilton purchased the property in 1891.

The house at 925 Jefferson appears in the correct location on the 1909 Drumm’s Wall Map of Louisville and on the Methodist Church Map of Louisville that was made in circa 1923-25.
The Hamilton property originally included what are now 913 Jefferson (lots 4&5) and 933 Jefferson (lots 8&9). These may have originally been used as side yards for the house. Frank Hamilton sold the property that became 913 Jefferson in 1936 and sold the property that became 933 Jefferson in 1952.

Virginia Hamilton’s children who lived to adulthood and stayed in Louisville were her son Harry (1874-1918), who lived with his family at 833 Jefferson, and her son Frank (1877-1956), who was to live with his family at 925 Jefferson.

It is definitely known that Virginia Hamilton taught young children in Louisville for many years. Exactly which range of years is not known. Her obituary in The Lafayette Leader states that she taught in Louisville for 32 years.

In 1898, Virginia Hamilton was one of the four founding members of Louisville’s Saturday Study Club, which was a women’s club that sought to culturally enrich its members and the town. A primary reason why the Saturday Study Club is remembered today is because of its operation of the Louisville Public Library for a period of about thirty-five years. In fact, Virginia Hamilton’s granddaughter, Asenath Hamilton, was one of the Camp Fire Girls who started the Louisville Library in 1924.

According to a 1904 Denver Post article, Virginia Hamilton became involved in local politics in 1904 by running for office as Superintendent of Schools on the Boulder County Prohibitionists’ ticket. Information about the outcome of the election could not be located, but she apparently did not win.

In the photo at left from circa 1908, Virginia Hamilton has been identified as the teacher. She appears with her class in front of the brick school house at 801 Grant that was used for first and second grade classes and which is now the Louisville Center for the Arts. The photo is from the Louisville Historical Museum.

In this undated photo, Virginia Hamilton is again shown with a class by the same brick school. This photo is also in the Louisville Historical Museum.
In the next photo, which is from the Carnegie Branch Library for Local History in Boulder and is dated 1900, Virginia Hamilton is shown in the center front with the teaching staff and board of the Louisville school:

Virginia Hamilton died in 1925 at the age of 74. According to her obituary, “Hundreds of the residents of [Louisville] and hundreds more who are scattered to the four corners of the earth were pupils of Mrs. Hamilton. ... As a token of respect the schools were closed as were the business houses and the funeral was one of the largest ever held in Louisville.”

Virginia’s son, Frank Hamilton (1877-1956), then owned and lived at 925 Jefferson with his wife, Sarah “Sadie” or “Sadie” Hilton Hamilton (1877-1942). Sadie was herself a member of a pioneer Boulder County family from England. Earlier in his life, Frank was a coal miner and operated a saloon in Superior, and he later became a deputy County Clerk and a County road overseer. His obituary in the Daily Camera stated that he was “one of the community’s leading citizens.” Sarah’s Daily Camera obituary, according to Columbia Cemetery records, stated that “she was one of the most popular residents of Louisville.”

At the time of the 1930 census, Sarah Hamilton’s brother, Samuel Hilton, also resided with them at 925 Jefferson.

Members of the extended Clemens/Hamilton family, including the parents of Virginia Clemens Hamilton who are believed to have brought the family out to Colorado, are buried in the Columbia Cemetery in Boulder.

Following the death of Frank Hamilton in 1956, his granddaughter, Norma Lou Kuempel, sold the property.

The additional owners since the property left the Hamilton family in 1957 have been: Everette Burd; Carl & Allegria Collister; Delbert & Leona Jones and Peggy Frank; James Goudelock & Jo Ann Feigenheimer; Richard Jackson; Philip & Louisa Prescott; and the current owner, Elizabeth Schulte, who has owned the house since 1979.

Another addresses found for 925 Jefferson, under Louisville’s old address system, was 424 Jefferson.

36. Sources of information:


Directories of Louisville residents and businesses on file at the Louisville Historical Museum.
Census records and other records accessed through www.ancestry.com. 


Methodist Church Parish Map of Louisville, Colorado, circa 1923-25.

Sanborn Insurance Maps for Louisville, Colorado, 1893, 1900, and 1908.


Archival materials on file at the Louisville Historical Museum.

VI. SIGNIFICANCE

37. Local landmark designation: Yes ___ No X ___ Date of designation: NA

   Designating authority: NA

37A. Applicable Local Landmark Criteria for Historic Landmarks:

   X A. Architectural.

   (1) Exemplifies specific elements of an architectural style or period.

   (2) Example of the work of an architect or builder who is recognized for expertise nationally, statewide, regionally, or locally.

   (3) Demonstrates superior craftsmanship or high artistic value.

   (4) Represents an innovation in construction, materials or design

   (5) Style particularly associated with the Louisville area.

   (6) Represents a built environment of a group of people in an era of history that is culturally significant to Louisville.

   (7) Pattern or grouping of elements representing at least one of the above criteria.

   (8) Significant historic remodel.

   X B. Social.

   (1) Site of historic event that had an effect upon society.

   (2) Exemplifies cultural, political, economic or social heritage of the community.

   (3) Association with a notable person or the work of a notable person.

   C. Geographic/environmental

   (1) Enhances sense of identity of the community.

   (2) An established and familiar natural setting or visual feature that is culturally significant to the history of Louisville.

   Does not meet any of the above local criteria.

Local Field Eligibility Assessment: The property is worthy of nomination as a Louisville Historic Landmark as a good example of a Hipped-Roof Box form house in Louisville. It is also worth of nomination for its long association with the Hamilton family for over 60 years. Virginia Hamilton was a well-known teacher who taught in Louisville for 32 years and was one of four founding members of Louisville's Saturday Study Club. Frank
Hamilton was a coal miner, saloon operator and deputy County Clerk who was identified as one of the community's leading citizens.

37B. Applicable State Register of Historic Properties Criteria:

___ A. The property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to history.

___ B. The property is connected with persons significant in history.

___ C. The property has distinctive characteristics of a type, period, method of construction or artisan.

___ D. The property has geographic importance.

___ E. The property contains the possibility of important discoveries related to prehistory or history.

___ Does not meet any of the above State Register criteria.

State Register Field Eligibility Assessment: The property is eligible for the State Register under Criterion C for architecture as a good example of a Hipped-Roof Box form house, with the period of significance of 1891, and 1957 for the addition.

38. Applicable National Register Criteria:

___ A. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of our history;

___ B. Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

___ C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

___ D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

___ X Qualifies under Criteria Considerations A through G (see Manual)

___ Does not meet any of the above National Register criteria

39. Area(s) of significance (National Register): Architecture

40. Period of significance: 1891 and 1957 (addition)

41. Level of significance: National ___ State ___ Local _____ X

42. Statement of significance: This house is associated with the historic development of Louisville as one of the early homes in Louisville's first residential subdivision, Jefferson Place. Although Jefferson Place was platted in 1880, few homes were actually built here before 1900. The property is significant for architecture as a good example of a Hipped-Roof Box form house. It is locally significant for its 60+-year association with Louisville's prominent Hamilton family. Virginia Hamilton was a well-known Louisville teacher and founding member of the Saturday Study Club. Frank Hamilton was a coal miner, saloon operator, deputy County Clerk and a leading citizen in the community.

43. Assessment of historic physical integrity related to significance: The property has integrity of location, design, materials, workmanship and feeling. Integrity of setting is compromised by the construction of adjacent homes that reduce the once-substantial size of the property. Integrity of association with the Hamilton family is lost, but association with Jefferson Place subdivision is still intact. There is a 1957 addition, but it is within the period of significance. The addition is small, on the rear, and not readily visible from the street.
VII. NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT

44. National Register eligibility field assessment:
   Eligible____  Not Eligible____ X  Need Data____

45. Is there National Register district potential? Yes   X   No

Discuss: This building is being recorded as part of a 2010-2011 intensive-level historical and architectural survey of Jefferson Place, Louisville's first residential subdivision, platted in 1880. The purpose of the survey is to determine if there is potential for National Register, State Register or local historic districts. Jefferson Place is eligible as a State Register historic district under Criterion A, Ethnic Heritage, European, for its association with European immigrants who first lived here and whose descendants continued to live here for over fifty years. The period of significance for the State Register historic district is 1881 – 1980. Jefferson Place is potentially eligible as a National Register historic district under Criterion A, Ethnic Heritage, European. However it needs data to determine dates of some modifications, and to more definitely establish the significant impacts of various European ethnic groups on the local culture of Louisville. The period of significance of a National Register district is 1881 – 1963. Jefferson Place is eligible as a local Louisville historic district under local Criterion B, Social, as it exemplifies the cultural and social heritage of the community.

European immigrant families flocked to Colorado coal mining communities, including Louisville, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in search of economic opportunities they could not find in their own countries. Louisville's Welch Coal Mine, along with other mines in the area, recruited skilled workers from western Europe. In the early years before 1900, most of the miners who lived in Jefferson Place came from English-speaking countries.

Immigrants from England brought a strong tradition and expertise in coal mining. The English are widely credited with developing the techniques of coal mining that were used locally, and they taught these techniques to other miners. The British mining culture was instilled in the early Colorado coal mines. English immigrants also brought expertise in other necessary skills such as blacksmithing and chain forging.

Later Jefferson Place residents arrived from Italy, France, Austria, Germany, Hungary, Slovakia, and Slovenia, among other places. The Italians eventually became the largest single ethnic group in Jefferson Place and in Louisville as a whole. About one-third of the houses in Jefferson Place were owned and occupied by Italian immigrants. Italian immigrants left their mark on Louisville in the food and beverage industries. To the present day, downtown Louisville is known throughout the Front Range for its tradition of Italian restaurants. The impacts of the heritage and customs of the other European ethnic groups could be significant, but are not well documented and need further investigation.

If there is National Register district potential, is this building: Contributing____ X  Noncontributing____

46. If the building is in existing National Register district, is it: Contributing____  Noncontributing____

The property is not within an existing National Register district.

VIII. RECORDING INFORMATION

47. Photograph numbers: 5BL923_Jefferson_01 through 5BL923_Jefferson_04.

   Digital images filed at: City of Louisville, Planning Department


49. Date(s): 2013

50. Recorder(s): Kathy and Leonard Lingo, Avenue L Architects, and Bridget Bacon, City of Louisville

51. Organization: Avenue L Architects

52. Address: 3457 Ringsby Court Suite 317, Denver, CO 80216

53. Phone number(s): (303) 290-9930
NOTE: Please include a sketch map, a photocopy of the USGS quad map indicating resource location, and photographs.

Colorado Historical Society - Office of Archaeology & Historic Preservation
1200 Broadway, Denver, CO 80203 (303) 866-3395
925 Jefferson Avenue, Louisville, Colorado

SOURCE: Extract of Louisville, Colorado
925 Jefferson Avenue, Louisville, Colorado

SOURCE: City of Louisville, Colorado GIS Files.
To: Historic Preservation Commission Members  
From: Department of Planning and Building Safety  
Subject: Miner’s Cabin Relocation and Rehabilitation RFP  
Date: September 16, 2019

Staff drafted the attached Request For Proposals (RFP) for engineering, design, relocation and construction services to relocate and rehabilitate the historic Miners Cabins. The Cabins were previously moved in 2018 from the Miner’s Field neighborhood to City Shops while the City determined a permanent home for the structures.

The proposed project has been structured in two phases:

1. Phase One: Cabin relocation to Miner’s Field, including site preparation, Cabin structural stabilization and transportation, and Cabin placement on a foundation. This includes development of civil and building plans meeting City building codes and requirements and submittal and approval of the plans from the City’s Engineering and Building Divisions.

2. Phase Two: Cabin rehabilitation. This includes preparation of design drawings for review and approval by the Historic Preservation Commission and Alteration Certificate for Historic Landmarks, development of civil and building plans meeting City building codes and requirements and submittal and approval of the plans from the City’s Engineering and Building Divisions.

Staff is requesting comments on the draft RFP.
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR
HISTORIC STRUCTURE RELOCATION AND REHABILITATION

The City of Louisville is accepting proposals from qualified contractors (“Contractor”) to relocated two historic structures currently located at the City Services Building, 739 S 104th St., Louisville, CO 80027, to Miners Field Park, 1212 South Street, as well as develop plans for and perform rehabilitation of the structures. Please review the following pages for complete information on the request for proposal process and details.

**Timeline of Activities and Proposal Format**

- Digital copies of each proposal shall be submitted in PDF to the City Contact Person listed below. Proposals shall be submitted on a flash drive, via email or file transfer.

- The City of Louisville will receive proposals in response to this RFP until 4:00 pm MST on Friday, November XX, 2019. Proposals received after that time will not be reviewed. Proposals submitted on a flash drive must be in a sealed envelope plainly marked with the project name “Miner’s Cabins Relocation Services”, and shall be addressed as follows:

  Felicity Selvoski  
  City of Louisville  
  749 Main Street  
  Louisville CO 80027

  Or emailed to fselvoski@louisvilleco.gov with “Miner’s Cabins Relocation Services” in the Subject line.

- Interviews of applicants selected by City for interview (if necessary) – beginning the week of December XX, 2019.

- Anticipate final selection by the week of December XX, 2019.

- Contract executed by the City approximately December XX, 2019.
**SECTION 1. SUMMARY OF REQUEST**

**PURPOSE:** The City of Louisville is seeking proposals for engineering, design, relocation and construction services to relocate and rehabilitate the historic Miners Cabins currently located at 739 S 104th St., Louisville, Colorado. The Cabins were previously moved in 2018 from the Miner’s Field neighborhood to City Shops while the City determined a permanent home for the structures. The Contractor shall accomplish the following: Provide all necessary expertise, equipment, materials, supervision, labor and incidentals required to prepare and relocate the structures from City Services, Louisville, Colorado and place it on a new foundation to be located at Miner’s Field, 1212 South St., Louisville, Colorado and perform rehabilitation of the structures. There is also a strong desire in the community for volunteer participation in the rehabilitation of the Cabins. All proposals should include a plan for use of volunteers in the rehabilitation efforts.

The proposed project has been structured in two phases:

1. **Phase One:** Cabin relocation to Miner’s Field, including site preparation, Cabin structural stabilization and transportation, and Cabin placement on a foundation. This includes development of civil and building plans meeting City building codes and requirements and submittal and approval of the plans from the City’s Engineering and Building Divisions.
2. **Phase Two:** Cabin rehabilitation. This includes preparation of design drawings for review and approval by the Historic Preservation Commission and Alteration Certificate for Historic Landmarks, development of civil and building plans meeting City building codes and requirements and submittal and approval of the plans from the City’s Engineering and Building Divisions.

F&D International conducted an assessment of the structures dated May 4, 2017, which is attached to this RFP.

Questions regarding the proposal can be directed to:

Felicity Selvoski  
City of Louisville  
749 Main Street  
Louisville, CO 80027  
303.335.4594  
FSelvoski@LouisvilleCO.gov

**SECTION 2. SCOPE OF WORK**

The Scope of Work shall include but is not limited to the following:

- Submit a safety plan prior to the commencement of the Job. The safety plan should detail procedures for accident prevention and show an understanding of all local, state, and federal regulations governing the relocation of the structure.
  - The relocation operations shall be conducted in a manner which will ensure the safety of persons and property and will prevent damage by falling debris or other cause to adjacent buildings, structures or other facilities. The Contractor will take the necessary steps to protect the structure from inclement weather, water, vandalism, and theft. Any
damage caused by the relocation to the structure, to adjacent facilities, to utilities, to streets and roadways, including curbs and gutters, shall be the responsibility of the Contractor.

- Evaluate site conditions at the receiving site (Miner’s Field) and provide a site plan for grading, drainage, foundation and any other needed site work to accommodate the cabins. Site planning for the cabins will need to be coordinated with the City’s Parks, Public Works, and Planning Departments. A site and topographic survey may be required.
- Transport the Cabins to the new site. Transportation shall be in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local ordinances and regulations.
  - The Contractor will be responsible for developing construction documents and obtaining the necessary permits and making the necessary arrangements with local authorities to transport the Cabins, including escorts and traffic control (as required).
  - Coordinate with utility companies to make necessary arrangements and payment for checking and clearing utility lines and traffic lights as required to move the cabins.
- The Contractor will be responsible for providing shoring and bracing or other support necessary to prevent movement, settlement, or collapse of the Cabins during the move.
  - The Contractor will be responsible for the safety and adequacy of the precautions against movement.
  - The Contractor will be responsible for protecting all surfaces, windows, and doors and other features of the structure from potential damage.
  - The Contractor will repair any damage incurred or alterations made to the building during the relocation/move as required to preserve the integrity of the structure.
- Prepare the Miner’s Field site to receive the Cabins (to include but not limited to site grading, removal of landscaping, installation of foundations). Anchor/attach the Cabins to the new foundations.
- Coordinate, oversee and conduct rehabilitation construction work on the Cabins as defined by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.
  - This will include developing design plans for the rehabilitation work to be presented to the City’s Historic Preservation Commission for approval through the Alteration Certificate process for historic Landmarks.
  - The Contractor will be responsible for developing construction documents and obtaining the necessary permits for the rehabilitation work.
- The City requests the Contractor provide meaningful opportunities for community volunteers to assist in the relocation and rehabilitation work. The Contractor will need to provide a plan for volunteer participation, including how volunteers will be supervised and what elements of the project to which volunteers will be able to contribute.

SECTION 3. STANDARD TERMS AND CONDITIONS

When preparing a proposal for submission in response to this RFP, Contractors should be aware of the following terms and conditions which have been established by the City of Louisville:

This request for proposals is not an offer to contract. The provisions in this RFP and any purchasing policies or procedures of the City are solely for the fiscal responsibility of the City, and confer no rights, duties or entitlements to any party submitting proposals. The City of Louisville reserves the right to reject
any and all proposals, to consider alternatives, to waive any informalities and irregularities, to abandon
the project and this RFP at any time, and to re-solicit proposals.

The City of Louisville reserves the right to conduct such investigations of and discussions with those who
have submitted proposals or other entities as they deem necessary or appropriate to assist in the
evaluation of any proposal or to secure maximum clarification and completeness of any proposal.

The successful proposer shall be required to sign a contract with the City in a form provided by and
acceptable to the City. The contractor shall be an independent contractor of the City.

The City of Louisville assumes no responsibility for payment of any expenses incurred by any proponent
as part of the RFP process.

The following criteria will be used to evaluate all proposals:

- RFP, as well as their understanding of the scope of such services and the specific requirements of
  the City of Louisville.
- The reputation, experience, and efficiency of the contractor.
- The ability of the contractor to provide quality services within time and funding constraints.
- The general organization of the proposal: Special consideration will be given to submittals which
  are appropriate, address the goals; and provide in a clear and concise format the requested
  information.
- Other selection factors within this RFP or that City determines are relevant to consideration of
  the best interests of the City.

All responses to this RFP become the property of the City upon receipt and regardless of selection or
rejection, and will not be returned, except that the City may return late responses submitted after the
response deadline. Any trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information submitted with
any response is subject to potential disclosure and submitting it against the City in respect to agreement
to indemnify the City for any costs, legal fees or expenses incurred in relation to any proceeding
concerning disclosure of such information. Any trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial
information submitted with a response shall be clearly segregated and marked; provided; however, that
neither cost information nor the total RFP will be considered proprietary. The City will notify the vendor
of any request for disclosure of information so segregated and marked that may be subject to
nondisclosure, and it will be the responsibility of the vendor to object and to pursue any legal actions
pursuant to Colorado law. A vendor shall notify the City within 24 hours of notification by City of request
for disclosure of the protection under Colorado law.

SECTION 4. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

The following information is required for a proposal to be considered complete and to be eligible for the
award process. Please respond to all of the following outlined points specifically and clearly.

A. GENERAL INTRODUCTION: Provide the name, address, and email address of Contractor. If an
   entity, provide the legal name of the entity and the names of the entity’s principal(s) who is
proposed to provide the services. Provide a concise description and experience of yourself, or your firm, and the experience of the Contractor.

B. PRIOR EXPERIENCE: Provide a review of qualifications and relevant experience for all team members involved. Relevant experience should include details on removing and relocating houses from one site to another site and must provide convincing evidence that the team has sufficient understanding and experience with similar projects to be able to remove and relocate the Improvements. Qualified engineering and architecture professionals with demonstrated historic preservation, restoration, and building relocation and stabilization experience must be demonstrated.

C. REFERENCES: Provide a list of at least 3 references from clients with similar projects completed by the person/firm(s), giving names, addresses, and phone numbers of clients.

D. MOVING AND REHABILITATION PLAN: Provide a concise proposed scope of work for moving and rehabilitating the cabins including permitting, mitigation of hazardous materials, staging for move, transportation from City Services Building to Miner’s Field, new foundation, site restoration, anticipated timeline.

E. COST PROPOSAL: Provide a detailed and itemized cost proposal for each phase of the project. Also include hourly rates of each of the consultants that are anticipated to work on the project.

F. Review the City’s standard contract and highlight any concerns.

G. Provide the completed pre-contract certification and return with your proposal.
AN AGREEMENT BY AND BETWEEN THE CITY OF LOUISVILLE
AND ______________________________
FOR CONSULTING SERVICES

1).0 PARTIES

This AGREEMENT FOR CONSULTING SERVICES (this “Agreement”) is made and entered into this ____ day of ________, 20___ (the “Effective Date”), by and between the City of Louisville, a Colorado home rule municipal corporation, hereinafter referred to as the “City”, and ____________________ [Name of Contractor], a ________________________ [State of Formation and Type of Entity] hereinafter referred to as the “Consultant”.

2).0 RECITALS AND PURPOSE

2.1 The City desires to engage the Consultant for the purpose of providing building relocation, construction, and rehabilitation services as further set forth in the Consultant’s Scope of Services (which services are hereinafter referred to as the “Services”).

2.2 The Consultant represents that it has the special expertise, qualifications and background necessary to complete the Services.

3).0 SCOPE OF SERVICES

The Consultant agrees to provide the City with the specific Services and to perform the specific tasks, duties and responsibilities set forth in Scope of Services attached hereto as Exhibit “B” and incorporated herein by reference.

4).0 COMPENSATION

4.1 The City shall pay the Consultant for services under this agreement a total not to exceed the amounts set forth in Exhibit “C” attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference. [Further revise as needed to reflect whether contract is hourly or flat amount]. The City shall not pay mileage and other reimbursable expenses (such as meals, parking, travel expenses, necessary memberships, etc.), unless such expenses are (1) clearly set forth in the Scope of Services, and (2) necessary for performance of the Services (“Pre-Approved Expenses”). The foregoing amounts of compensation shall be inclusive of all costs of whatsoever nature associated with the Consultant’s efforts, including but not limited to salaries, benefits, overhead, administration, profits, expenses, and outside consultant fees. The Scope of Services and payment therefor shall only be changed by a properly authorized amendment to this Agreement. No City employee has the authority to bind the City with regard to any payment for any services which exceeds the amount payable under the terms of this Agreement.

4.2 The Consultant shall submit monthly an invoice to the City for Services rendered and a detailed expense report for Pre-Approved Expenses incurred during the previous month. The invoice shall document the Services provided during the preceding month, identifying
by work category and subcategory the work and tasks performed and such other information as may be required by the City. The Consultant shall provide such additional backup documentation as may be required by the City. The City shall pay the invoice within thirty (30) days of receipt unless the Services or the documentation therefor are unsatisfactory. Payments made after thirty (30) days may be assessed an interest charge of one percent (1%) per month unless the delay in payment resulted from unsatisfactory work or documentation therefor.

5.0 PROJECT REPRESENTATION

5.1 The City designates ________________ as the responsible City staff to provide direction to the Consultant during the conduct of the Services. The Consultant shall comply with the directions given by ________________ and such person’s designees.

5.2 The Consultant designates _____________ as its project manager and as the principal in charge who shall be providing the Services under this Agreement. [The Services shall not be provided by persons other than _______________.] [or] [Should any of the representatives be replaced, particularly ________________, and such replacement require the City or the Consultant to undertake additional reevaluations, coordination, orientations, etc., the Consultant shall be fully responsible for all such additional costs and services.]

6.0 TERM

6.1 The term of this Agreement shall be from the Effective Date to ________________, 20__, unless sooner terminated pursuant to Section 13, below. The Consultant’s Services under this Agreement shall commence on [(the Effective Date) or (on another date desired by the City, after the Effective Date)] and Consultant shall proceed with diligence and promptness so that the Services are completed in a timely fashion consistent with the City’s requirements.

6.2 Nothing in this Agreement is intended or shall be deemed or construed as creating any multiple-fiscal year direct or indirect debt or financial obligation on the part of the City within the meaning of Colorado Constitution Article X, Section 20 or any other constitutional or statutory provision. All financial obligations of the City under this Agreement are subject to annual budgeting and appropriation by the Louisville City Council, in its sole discretion. Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, in the event of non-appropriation, this Agreement shall terminate effective December 31 of the then-current fiscal year.

7.0 INSURANCE

7.1 The Consultant agrees to procure and maintain, at its own cost, the policies of insurance set forth in Subsections 7.1.1 through 7.1.4. The Consultant shall not be relieved of any liability, claims, demands, or other obligations assumed pursuant to this Agreement by reason of its failure to procure or maintain insurance, or by reason of its failure to procure
or maintain insurance in sufficient amounts, durations, or types. The coverages required below shall be procured and maintained with forms and insurers acceptable to the City. All coverages shall be continuously maintained from the date of commencement of services hereunder. The required coverages are:

7.1.1 Workers’ Compensation insurance as required by the Labor Code of the State of Colorado and Employers Liability Insurance. Evidence of qualified self-insured status may be substituted.

7.1.2 General Liability insurance with minimum combined single limits of ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) each occurrence and TWO MILLION DOLLARS ($2,000,000) aggregate. The policy shall include the City of Louisville, its officers and its employees, as additional insureds, with primary coverage as respects the City of Louisville, its officers and its employees, and shall contain a severability of interests provision.

7.1.3 Comprehensive Automobile Liability insurance with minimum combined single limits for bodily injury and property damage of not less than FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ($400,000) per person in any one occurrence and ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) for two or more persons in any one occurrence, and auto property damage insurance of at least FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ($50,000) per occurrence, with respect to each of Consultant’s owned, hired or non-owned vehicles assigned to or used in performance of the services. The policy shall contain a severability of interests provision. If the Consultant has no owned automobiles, the requirements of this paragraph shall be met by each employee of the Consultant providing services to the City of Louisville under this Agreement.

7.1.4 Professional Liability coverage with minimum combined single limits of ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) each occurrence and ONE MILLION DOLLARS ($1,000,000) aggregate.

7.2 The Consultant’s general liability insurance, automobile liability and physical damage insurance, and professional liability insurance shall be endorsed to include the City, and its elected and appointed officers and employees, as additional insureds, unless the City in its sole discretion waives such requirement. Every policy required above shall be primary insurance, and any insurance carried by the City, its officers, or its employees, shall be excess and not contributory insurance to that provided by the Consultant. Such policies shall contain a severability of interests provision. The Consultant shall be solely responsible for any deductible losses under each of the policies required above.

7.3 Certificates of insurance shall be provided by the Consultant as evidence that policies providing the required coverages, conditions, and minimum limits are in full force and effect, and shall be subject to review and approval by the City. No required coverage shall be cancelled, terminated or materially changed until at least 30 days’ prior written notice has been given to the City. The City reserves the right to request and receive a certified copy of any policy and any endorsement thereto.
7.4 Failure on the part of the Consultant to procure or maintain policies providing the required coverages, conditions, and minimum limits shall constitute a material breach of contract upon which the City may immediately terminate this Agreement, or at its discretion may procure or renew any such policy or any extended reporting period thereto and may pay any and all premiums in connection therewith, and all monies so paid by the City shall be repaid by Consultant to the City upon demand, or the City may offset the cost of the premiums against any monies due to Consultant from the City.

7.5 The parties understand and agree that the City is relying on, and does not waive or intend to waive by any provision of this Agreement, the monetary limitations or any other rights, immunities, and protections provided by the Colorado Governmental Immunity Act, § 24-10-101 et seq., C.R.S., as from time to time amended, or otherwise available to the City, its officers, or its employees.

8.0 INDEMNIFICATION

To the fullest extent permitted by law, the Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City, and its elected and appointed officers and its employees, from and against all liability, claims, and demands, on account of any injury, loss, or damage, which arise out of or are connected with the services hereunder, if and to the extent such injury, loss, or damage is caused by the negligent act, omission, or other fault of the Consultant or any subcontractor of the Consultant, or any officer, employee, or agent of the Consultant or any subcontractor, or any other person for whom Consultant is responsible. The Consultant shall investigate, handle, respond to, and provide defense for and defend against any such liability, claims, and demands. The Consultant shall further bear all other costs and expenses incurred by the City or Consultant and related to any such liability, claims and demands, including but not limited to court costs, expert witness fees and attorneys’ fees if the court determines that these incurred costs and expenses are related to such negligent acts, errors, and omissions or other fault of the Consultant. [Notwithstanding the foregoing, Consultant’s duty to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City, and its elected and appointed officials and employees as set forth in this section shall only arise upon determination, by adjudication, alternative dispute resolution, or mutual agreement between Consultant and the City, of the Consultant’s liability or fault.] The City shall be entitled to its costs and attorneys’ fees incurred in any action to enforce the provisions of this Section 8.0. The Consultant’s indemnification obligation shall not be construed to extend to any injury, loss, or damage which is caused by the act, omission, or other fault of the City.

9.0 QUALITY OF WORK

Consultant’s professional services shall be in accordance with the prevailing standard of practice normally exercised in the performance of services of a similar nature in the Denver metropolitan area.

10.0 INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR
It is the expressed intent of the parties that the Consultant is an independent contractor and not the agent, employee or servant of the City, and that:

10.1. Consultant shall satisfy all tax and other governmentally imposed responsibilities including but not limited to, payment of state, federal, and social security taxes, unemployment taxes, worker’s compensation and self-employment taxes. No state, federal or local taxes of any kind shall be withheld or paid by the City.

10.2. Consultant is not entitled to worker’s compensation benefits except as may be provided by the Consultant nor to unemployment insurance benefits unless unemployment compensation coverage is provided by the Consultant or some entity other than the City.

10.3. Consultant does not have the authority to act for the City, or to bind the City in any respect whatsoever, or to incur any debts or liabilities in the name of or on behalf of the City.

10.4. Consultant has and retains control of and supervision over the performance of Consultant’s obligations hereunder and control over any persons employed by Consultant for performing the Services hereunder.

10.5. The City will not provide training or instruction to Consultant or any of its employees regarding the performance of the Services hereunder.

10.6. Neither the Consultant nor any of its officers or employees will receive benefits of any type from the City.

10.7. Consultant represents that it is engaged in providing similar services to other clients and/or the general public and is not required to work exclusively for the City.

10.8. All Services are to be performed solely at the risk of Consultant and Consultant shall take all precautions necessary for the proper and sole performance thereof.

10.9. Consultant will not combine its business operations in any way with the City’s business operations and each party shall maintain their operations as separate and distinct.

11) ASSIGNMENT

Except as provided in section 22.0 hereof, Consultant shall not assign or delegate this Agreement or any portion thereof, or any monies due or to become due hereunder without the City’s prior written consent.

12) DEFAULT
Each and every term and condition hereof shall be deemed to be a material element of this Agreement. In the event either party should fail or refuse to perform according to the terms of this Agreement, such party may be declared in default.

13.0 TERMINATION

13.1 This Agreement may be terminated by either party for material breach or default of this Agreement by the other party not caused by any action or omission of the other party by giving the other party written notice at least thirty (30) days in advance of the termination date. Termination pursuant to this subsection shall not prevent either party from exercising any other legal remedies which may be available to it.

13.2 In addition to the foregoing, this Agreement may be terminated by the City for its convenience and without cause of any nature by giving written notice at least fifteen (15) days in advance of the termination date. In the event of such termination, the Consultant will be paid for the reasonable value of the services rendered to the date of termination, not to exceed a pro-rated daily rate, for the services rendered to the date of termination, and upon such payment, all obligations of the City to the Consultant under this Agreement will cease. Termination pursuant to this subsection shall not prevent either party from exercising any other legal remedies which may be available to it.

14.0 INSPECTION AND AUDIT

The City and its duly authorized representatives shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the Consultant that are related to this Agreement for the purpose of making audits, examinations, excerpts, and transcriptions.

15.0 DOCUMENTS

All computer input and output, analyses, plans, documents photographic images, tests, maps, surveys, electronic files and written material of any kind generated in the performance of this Agreement or developed for the City in performance of the Services are and shall remain the sole and exclusive property of the City. All such materials shall be promptly provided to the City upon request therefor and at the time of termination of this Agreement, without further charge or expense to the City. Consultant shall not provide copies of any such material to any other party without the prior written consent of the City.

16.0 ENFORCEMENT

16.1 In the event that suit is brought upon this Agreement to enforce its terms, the prevailing party shall be entitled to its reasonable attorneys’ fees and related court costs.

16.2 This Agreement shall be deemed entered into in Boulder County, Colorado, and shall be governed by and interpreted under the laws of the State of Colorado. Any action arising out of, in connection with, or relating to this Agreement shall be filed in the District Court of Boulder County of the State of Colorado, and in no other court. Consultant hereby
waives its right to challenge the personal jurisdiction of the District Court of Boulder County of the State of Colorado over it.

17).0 COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS; WORK BY ILLEGAL ALIENS PROHIBITED

17.1 Consultant shall be solely responsible for compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, including the ordinances, resolutions, rules, and regulations of the City; for payment of all applicable taxes; and obtaining and keeping in force all applicable permits and approvals.

17.2 Exhibit A, the “City of Louisville Public Services Contract Addendum-Prohibition Against Employing Illegal Aliens”, is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference. There is also attached hereto a copy of Consultant’s Pre-Contract Certification which Consultant has executed and delivered to the City prior to Consultant’s execution of this Agreement.

17.3 Consultant acknowledges that the City of Louisville Code of Ethics provides that independent contractors who perform official actions on behalf of the City which involve the use of discretionary authority shall not receive any gifts seeking to influence their official actions on behalf of the City, and that City officers and employees similarly shall not receive such gifts. Consultant agrees to abide by the gift restrictions of the City’s Code of Ethics.

18).0 INTEGRATION AND AMENDMENT

This Agreement represents the entire Agreement between the parties and there are no oral or collateral agreements or understandings. This Agreement may be amended only by an instrument in writing signed by the parties.

19).0 NOTICES

All notices required or permitted under this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be given by hand delivery, by United States first class mail, postage prepaid, registered or certified, return receipt requested, by national overnight carrier, or by facsimile transmission, addressed to the party for whom it is intended at the following address:

If to the City:

City of Louisville
Attn: City Manager
749 Main Street
Louisville, Colorado 80027
Telephone: (303) 335-4533
Fax: (303) 335-4550

If to the Consultant:
Any such notice or other communication shall be effective when received as indicated on the delivery receipt, if by hand delivery or overnight carrier; on the United States mail return receipt, if by United States mail; or on facsimile transmission receipt. Either party may by similar notice given, change the address to which future notices or other communications shall be sent.

20.0  EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

20.1  Consultant will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, age, sex, disability or national origin. Consultant will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed and that employees are treated during employment without regard to their race, color, religion, age, sex, disability, or national origin. Such action shall include but not be limited to the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. Consultant agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notice to be provided by an agency of the federal government, setting forth the provisions of the Equal Opportunity Laws.

20.2  Consultant shall be in compliance with the applicable provisions of the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 as enacted and from time to time amended and any other applicable federal, state, or local laws and regulations. A signed, written certificate stating compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act may be requested at any time during the life of this Agreement or any renewal thereof.

21.0  NO THIRD PARTY BENEFICIARIES

It is expressly understood and agreed that enforcement of the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and all rights of action relating to such enforcement, shall be strictly reserved to City and Consultant, and nothing contained in this Agreement shall give or allow any such claim or right of action by any other third party on such Agreement. It is the express intention of the parties that any person other than City or Consultant receiving services or benefits under this Agreement shall be deemed to be an incidental beneficiary only.

22.0  SUBCONTRACTORS

Consultant may utilize subcontractors identified in its qualifications submittal to assist with non-specialized works as necessary to complete projects. Consultant will submit any proposed subcontractor and the description of its services to the City for approval. The City will not work directly with subcontractors.
23.0 AUTHORITY TO BIND

Each of the persons signing below on behalf of any party hereby represents and warrants that such person is signing with full and complete authority to bind the party on whose behalf of whom such person is signing, to each and every term of this Agreement.

In witness whereof, the parties have executed this Agreement to be effective on the date first above written.

CITY OF LOUISVILLE,
a Colorado Municipal Corporation

By: _____________________________
   Robert P. Muckle, Mayor

Attest: __________________________
      Meredyth Muth, City Clerk

CONSULTANT:

________________________________

By: _____________________________
   Title: ___________________________
Exhibit A

City of Louisville Public Services Contract Addendum
Prohibition Against Employing Illegal Aliens

Prohibition Against Employing Illegal Aliens. Contractor shall not knowingly employ or contract with an illegal alien to perform work under this Agreement. Contractor shall not enter into a contract with a subcontractor that fails to certify to the Contractor that the subcontractor shall not knowingly employ or contract with an illegal alien to perform work under this Agreement.

Contractor will participate in either the E-verify program or the Department program, as defined in C.R.S. §§ 8-17.5-101(3.3) and 8-17.5-101(3.7), respectively, in order to confirm the employment eligibility of all employees who are newly hired for employment to perform work under the public contract for services. Contractor is prohibited from using the E-verify program or the Department program procedures to undertake pre-employment screening of job applicants while this Agreement is being performed.

If Contractor obtains actual knowledge that a subcontractor performing work under this Agreement for services knowingly employs or contracts with an illegal alien, Contractor shall:

   a. Notify the subcontractor and the City within three days that the Contractor has actual knowledge that the subcontractor is employing or contracting with an illegal alien; and

   b. Terminate the subcontract with the subcontractor if within three days of receiving the notice required pursuant to this paragraph the subcontractor does not stop employing or contracting with the illegal alien; except that the Contractor shall not terminate the contract with the subcontractor if during such three days the subcontractor provides information to establish that the subcontractor has not knowingly employed or contracted with an illegal alien.

Contractor shall comply with any reasonable request by the Department of Labor and Employment made in the course of an investigation that the Department is undertaking pursuant to the authority established in C.R.S. § 8-17.5-102(5).

If Contractor violates a provision of this Agreement required pursuant to C.R.S. § 8-17.5-102, City may terminate the Agreement for breach of contract. If the Agreement is so terminated, the Contractor shall be liable for actual and consequential damages to the City.
Pre-Contract Certification in Compliance with C.R.S. Section 8-17.5-102(1)

The undersigned hereby certifies as follows:

That at the time of providing this certification, the undersigned does not knowingly employ or contract with an illegal alien; and that the undersigned will participate in the E-Verify program or the Department program, as defined in C.R.S. §§ 8-17.5-101(3.3) and 8-17.5-101(3.7), respectively, in order to confirm the employment eligibility of all employees who are newly hired for employment to perform under the public contract for services.

Proposer:
________________________

By________________________

Title:_______________________

________________________

Date
Exhibit B – Scope of Services

[Insert Scope of Service(s)]
MEMORANDUM

To: Historic Preservation Commission Members
From: Department of Planning and Building Safety
Subject: Staff Updates
Date: September 15th, 2019

Alteration Certificate Updates

1021 Main Street (8/27/2019)
• Rationale: The windows will be replaced with high-quality wood windows. There will be no changes to the size and design of the windows, making the windows appear the same as the historic windows. The new windows will not detract from its landmark status.

Demolition Updates
None

Upcoming Schedule

October
  10-12th – PastForward: National Preservation Conference, Denver
  21st – Historic Preservation Commission, Council Chambers, 6:30 pm
November
  18th – Historic Preservation Commission, Council Chambers, 6:30 pm
December
  16th – Historic Preservation Commission, Council Chambers, 6:30 pm