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Executive Summary

This report is a response to Gunnison County Library District’s effort to address the need for library facility improvements. Specifically, it seeks to offer a data driven decision-making framework for two key items; Location & Scope. The report outlines potential public library sites identified for investigation through community and stakeholder feedback. The report provides an ‘apples-to-apples’ comparison allowing the Gunnison County Library District Board of Trustees to consider quantitative development information in tandem with qualitative information related to various sites and library programs gathered from a community outreach process.

After a preliminary evaluation, it was determined that the Design Team would work to provide a detailed assessment of three potential locations. These three locations were selected because they presented the highest level of publicly supported features, greatest feasibility for development, and allowed the library to meet a scope identified through community input. A more detailed narrative describing this process can be found in the Gunnison County Site Analysis section found later in this document. The three sites identified for in-depth study include:

1. Current Gunnison Public Library
2. A Non-specific site in Gunnison’s downtown core
3. The Library-owned Van Tuyl site

The sites were evaluated in three components; Infrastructure, Development, and Other Costs. The costs presented in this report are conservative in nature and reflect the remote location of Gunnison, a tight labor market, and high commodity prices. A summary of this effort is included below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Library</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>Van Tuyl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>$31,000</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$153,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$4,978,000</td>
<td>$4,592,550</td>
<td>$5,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>$1,502,700</td>
<td>$1,389,165</td>
<td>$1,726,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,511,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,019,715</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,479,550</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The costs included in this matrix are intended to provide an apples-to-apples comparison between the sites under consideration. Once a single site is selected a site-specific design and cost estimate should be conducted to determine an estimated total project cost prior to determining any prospective bond issue amounts. In addition to the quantitative cost there are qualitative elements related to the process required to develop each site.

In general, a “use-by-right” is the ideal development process as it focuses primarily on specific, and more predictable development standards and is reviewed administratively. A “conditional review” is a public hearing in front of the Planning Commission who are granted broader authority to approve, deny, or approved with conditions, any project brought before them. A summary of these processes is included in the following matrix:

---

1 See Process Cost section – Page 22
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Library</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>Van Tuyl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>Use-by-Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Use-by-Right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond process, each site brings with it a series of possible liabilities that have the potential to increase cost, delay the project, or prohibit it from occurring, these can be generally summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Library</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>Van Tuyl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Scenario would require demolition of existing Library for parking</td>
<td>Few properties of adequate size will either require several adjacent purchases or a cost premium for a single lot</td>
<td>CR 15 improvements may be required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library district doesn’t own current Library.</td>
<td>Purchase of multiple, adjacent sites would require additional process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment was intended to develop a Library at Van Tuyl site.</td>
<td>Endowment was intended to develop a Library at Van Tuyl site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require conditional review.</td>
<td>Use is prohibited in CBD zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of multiple, adjacent sites would require additional process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties in North Scenario are not listed for sale, purchase would likely come at a premium if at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these site options are possible and achievable for Gunnison County Library District. The primary considerations in making a decision can be summarized in terms of project complexity, time to completion, and cost. The most cost-effective location is also the location with the fewest liabilities, the District owned Van Tuyl site. The more than 5-acre site also offers a clear path to delivering key items identified through the public input including walkability for children, bike access, bus access, outdoor spaces, and ample parking.

The desire for the library to remain nearer the downtown core is also real and has been expressed through public feedback. In fact, questionnaire responses indicate an equal affinity for a facility that is proximate to downtown and one that is in proximity to local schools. As practical site considerations have been discussed in public meetings, responses to the financial realities associated with downtown development have been met by a general understanding that those added costs may be prohibitive. In an effort to deliver on the public’s desire for library services to be available downtown conversations have taken place about the future of the current library. If the facility’s primary use is no longer a public library, project stakeholders with Gunnison County have indicated that the library may be able to maintain a footprint at 307 N Wisconsin dedicated to library services. This report shows that while there is no bad option for Gunnison County Libraries, there is a clear choice in terms of cost and buildability.
Site Selection Report Overview

Purpose

This report is a response to Gunnison County Library District’s effort to address the need for library facility improvements. Specifically, it seeks to offer a data driven decision-making framework for two key items; Location & Scope. The report outlines potential public library sites identified for investigation through community and stakeholder feedback. The report provides an 'apples-to-apples' comparison allowing the Gunnison County Library District Board of Trustees to consider quantitative development information in tandem with qualitative information related to various sites and library programs gathered from a community outreach process.

The initial site list included:

1. Current Library
2. Non-specific site in Gunnison’s downtown core
3. The Library-owned Van Tuyl Site
4. Legion Park
5. Catholic Church-owned former Safeway lot
6. Recreation Center
7. Lazy K Ranch

After a preliminary evaluation it was determined that the Design Team would go into a more detailed assessment of three selected locations that offered the most significant advantages to the Library and its stakeholders. A more detailed narrative describing this process can be found in the Gunnison County Site Analysis section found later in this document. These three sites include:

1. Current Library
2. Non-specific site in Gunnison’s downtown core
3. Library Owned Van Tuyl Site

Process

The site selection approach represented in this report generally followed four steps.

1. Preliminary Information Gathering
2. Selected Staff Interviews
3. Report Compilation
4. Order of Magnitude Cost Evaluation

Information gathered during the preliminary evaluation phase was generally obtained from public records of both the City of Gunnison and Gunnison County, coupled with a review of property information records retained by either the owner, (Van Tuyl Site) or leaseholder, (Current Library Site) of two of the sites.
With this information gathered the Design Team compiled a list of questions for dedicated follow-up interviews with City Staff. These took place either in person or over the phone over the course of three months. These interviews included Gunnison Community Development staff, City Manager staff, Public Works staff, Atmos Energy employees, and Gunnison County staff. The intent of these interviews was to clarify the extent of required improvements from either a code or infrastructure perspective.

The extent of required improvements was evaluated on a site-by-site basis for those properties with known, specific, locations (Current Library and Van Tuyl sites) along with the creation of assumed values for a prospective Downtown location. These elements were then evaluated for order of magnitude cost to produce as close to a direct or ‘apples-to-apples’ cost comparison for the three sites as possible.

**Initial Selection Criteria**

When evaluating a site, we first look at three things:

1. Can we build there?– What is it zoned? Who owns it?
2. Is there infrastructure? – Access, Water, Sewer, etc.
3. Will it be used? – Proximity and accessibility to stakeholders

Then we look at what distinguishes sites

1. Proximity to synergistic uses
2. Partnership opportunities
3. Visibility (or not)
4. Traffic (or not)
Site Selection

The Library and Design Team have been evaluating several sites within Gunnison for the possibility of constructing a new or expanded Library. Given the wide-ranging nature of these sites a preliminary effort was undertaken to reduce the total number of sites for a more detailed assessment.

This selection was conducted by evaluating the development potential, stakeholders, potential partnerships, site sensitivity, and development status. Sites that were selected for a more detailed review are summarized later in this document. Sites that were not selected have a brief narrative describing why each site was not subjected to further evaluation.

**Selected Sites**
- Current Library
- Downtown
- Van Tuyl

**Other Sites**
- Legion Park
- Lazy K
- Recreation Center
- Catholic Church

**Selected Sites - Current Library**
The current Library site refers to the land currently owned by Gunnison County and occupied by the Gunnison Library. There are two opportunities for expansion on this block which are outlined later in this report. They are generally referred to as the “North Scenario” and “South Scenario”.

![Map of libraries and scenarios](image-url)
**Selected Sites - Downtown**
The Downtown site refers to a yet-to-be-determined site within the downtown area of Gunnison. There are no defined boundaries of this area however the general boundaries of the area evaluated is shown below.

![Downtown Site Map](image)

**Selected Sites - Van Tuyl**
The Van Tuyl site refers to the property currently owned by the Library District on the corner of Spencer Ave and 11th St.

![Van Tuyl Site Map](image)
Other Sites - Legion Park
Legion Park was considered as a potential site for new construction. To effectively develop this site the Library would need to partner with the City and the Chamber of Commerce to develop a portion of the western side of the property. Developing this site would require reconfiguration of the existing park and would likely involve the removal of either the Chamber of Commerce building and/or park restroom facility. These elements would then need to be included in any new construction which would increase the total project cost while not providing any additional funding. Beyond these items the transfer of this property would require significant administrative actions in addition to a possible public vote. These items led the team to remove Legion Park from the list of sites for more detailed analysis.

Other Sites - Lazy K Ranch
The Lazy K Ranch, currently owned by the City was considered as a potential site for new construction. To effectively develop this site the Library would need to purchase the property and remove the existing structure on the site. The location of this property within the floodplain of the Gunnison River coupled with the relative distance from other community facilities, property purchase, and demolition requirement led the team to remove Legion Park from the list of sites for more detailed analysis.

Other Sites - Recreation Center
The Recreation Center located off Colorado and Spencer has two possible locations that the team considered for a new Library. The first, located at the southeast corner of the site is inadequate in size to allow for the construction of a single-story Library and provide the code-required parking. The second location to the north of the Recreation Center would prohibit the Recreation Center from being able to effectively expand to the north in the future. These items, coupled with the sites distance from community schools and residential neighborhoods prompted the team to remove the Recreation Center from the list of sites for a more detailed analysis.

Other Sites - Catholic Church
The vacant lot at the northwest corner of Virgina Ave and Spruce St was provided to the team as a possible location for the new construction of the Library. The lot in question is currently owned by the Bishop of Pueblo which has other plans for the future development of the lot. This prompted the team to remove the site from the list of sites for more detailed analysis.
Selected Sites - **Current Library**

**Zoning**
R-2 – Duplex Residential (Conditional Use)

**Size**
Current Lot ~14,500 sf
North Scenario – purchase of two residential lots ~ 32,200 sf
South Scenario – purchase of one residential lot ~ 21,000 sf

**Infrastructure**
- Street Access: Wisconsin (two-lane, bike lane)
- Alley Access
- On street parking, alley loaded parking
- Access to non-potable irrigation

**Advantages**
- Benefits from proximity to downtown
- Proximity to downtown helps to support Library as social gathering space
- Historic location is widely known in the area

**Sensitivities (Entitlement\(^2\) Challenges)**
- Hemmed in by existing residential structures
- Challenges with building both up and out
- To expand the site by purchasing adjacent properties could cost upwards of $732,550 going to the north or $523,000 going to the south. While the property to the South is for sale, the properties to the north are currently not listed, and it is likely that the Library would need to pay a premium to encourage the sale of the properties
- Even with the purchase of additional property, the existing structures would need to be moved or demolished
- The expansion to the south would not provide enough additional land to construct a new Library and enough parking to meet contemporary standards; the Current Library building would need to be demolished
- Even with expansion, exterior space may be limited

---

1 See Process Cost section – Page 22
2 See Soft Cost section – Page 22
Selected Sites - **Downtown**

**Zoning**
CBD – Central Business District (Prohibited)
C – Commercial (Use by Right)
B1 – Professional Business (Use by Right)

**Size**
30,000 sf preferred - 20,000 sf minimum

**Infrastructure**
- Street Access (Generally)
- Alley Access (Generally)
- Access to non-potable irrigation (Generally)

**Advantages**
- The density of downtown properties gives the Library an advantage as a social gathering location
- Can be a catalyst to redevelop underutilized properties downtown
- If on a highly visible corridor such as Tomichi it can serve as a landmark/visual icon
- Can incorporate or share elements with commercial space (Such as Harris Community Center/Library in Breckenridge, Council Tree Library in Fort Collins)

**Example Sites**
- Safeway Site: 110k, 0.3 Acres, existing infrastructure, possible parking sharing with Safeway
- Gunnison County Fire Protection District: Land swap opportunity of 0.33 space acres, no sidewalks

**Sensitivities (Variable)**
- Providing off-street parking will be a challenge for any downtown site
- Available exterior space may be limited
- While there are other sites which present opportunities, the selection process would need to be carefully designed and considered to not artificially drive up price or cause concern

---

1 See Process Cost section – Page 22
Selected Sites - Van Tuyl

Zoning
PUD LIB – Planned Unit Development, Library (Use by right)

Size
Current ~231,900 sf

Infrastructure
- Street Access: Spencer Ave/CR15 (two lane, bike lane/two lane
  Water & Sewer Access from Quartz

Advantages
- Benefits from adjacent irrigation lateral and associated habitat
- Proximity to Van Tuyl trails
- Adjacency to Community school for synergy with after-school programs
- Adjacency to Charmar Park
- Proximity to Lake School for children’s programs
- Large parcel size allows for exterior areas to support/supplement Library programs

Sensitivities (Entitlement/Infrastructure Challenges)
- May need to improve CR15 for edge of property (sidewalk upgrades, width increase)

---

1 See Process Cost section – Page 22
2 See Soft Cost section – Page 22
Selected Site Analysis

This section is broken down into three portions; Infrastructure, Development, and Other Costs. A summary is provided in each portion that describes the individual elements considered for each site. A matrix is provided that summarizes the assumed improvements required and provides an estimated cost.

These costs are conservative in nature and reflect the remote location of Gunnison, tight labor market, and high commodity prices. Estimated amounts are in 3rd Quarter 2018 dollars. Future use of this estimate should utilize an escalation factor\(^1\) of 8% per year to reflect the high cost of construction currently being seen throughout the state.

Hard Costs vs Soft Costs

The narratives below use the terms "Hard Costs" and "Soft Costs". These are terms used in estimating to describe the character of different expenses that are required to construct a new structure. In general, Hard Costs refer to direct construction costs, i.e. the labor and materials required to complete a specific scope of work. Soft Costs refer to all other costs associated with a project. These can include design fees, legal fees, permits, taxes, insurance, furniture, fixtures, equipment, along with the overhead and profit of a contractor hired to execute the work.

Infrastructure Costs

Summary

Infrastructure costs shown here are limited to utility connections and infrastructure work required to serve a new or expanded Library. These costs represent both labor and materials to execute the work but do not include soft costs\(^2\). In general, the Downtown and Current Library sites have older but more extensive infrastructure elements while the Van Tuyl site has newer but less extensive infrastructure. All sites that were evaluated have adequate infrastructure to support the construction of an expanded or new Library facility. The principal limitation for any site will be available land for construction.

Streets

It is expected that both the Current Library and Downtown sites will not have any additional street requirements and that improvements would be limited to provided two curb cuts to allow access to new parking facilities.

The potential for required street improvements is one of the larger potential liabilities for the Van Tuyl site. CR 15 (Spencer Ave) currently is a two-lane paved road without any additional infrastructure. As a component of developing the site it may be required to provide street widening and associated public improvements for CR 15. It is important to note that the

---

\(^1\) The costs of construction can vary depending on many factors including commodity prices, labor prices, remoteness, inflation, etc. An escalation factor is the rate that an estimated price is expected to increase each year if projected trends continue.

\(^2\) See Hard Costs vs Soft Costs
considerably larger Community School was developed just south of CR 15 without being required to make associated improvements to CR 15.

The improvements required to this road would be dictated by the agency having jurisdiction over the right-of-way which according to current GIS mapping would be the City of Gunnison. During staff interviews it was pointed out that City staff believes CR 15 was excluded from the annexation and would be under County Jurisdiction. County mapping records currently indicate this road is annexed into the City however City staff have indicated it remains under County jurisdiction.

Sidewalks

It is expected than all of the selected sites will have some level of sidewalk improvements necessary for development to ensure safe and accessible, pedestrian access to the Library. The Current Library and Downtown sites generally have well developed sidewalk infrastructure however there are portions of blocks throughout the downtown area that are missing sidewalks.

The Van Tuyl site is bordered on one side with Quartz street which includes new sidewalk infrastructure. It is expected that the Library development would provide a concrete pedestrian sidewalk along the east-west length of Spencer Ave/CR 15.

Water

The Current Library and the Downtown sites currently have access to water taps. Similar to sewer service, it is expected that this service will need to be expanded for a new or enlarged facility. The value of these existing taps are applied against the expanded service which would reduce the cost of the new, larger tap.

The Van Tuyl site does not have access to a current water tap and would be expected to pay full price for the new infrastructure.

Sewer

The Current Library currently has a 4” sewer tap which is the expected size of the expanded Library. It is assumed that a Downtown site would have a smaller tap and need to upsize to provide adequate service. Similar to water service, it is expected that this service will need to be expanded for a new or enlarged facility. The value of these existing taps are applied against the expanded service which would reduce the cost of the new, larger tap.

The Van Tuyl site does not have access to a current sewer tap and would be expected to pay full price for the new infrastructure.

Natural Gas

Natural Gas infrastructure is present throughout much of Gunnison and most of the downtown area has developed lines that can be connected to. The Current Library has a 2” steel main that could be connected to and it is expected that most other Downtown sites will be similar.

The Van Tuyl site has a newer 2” PE gas line running on the north side of CR 15. It is expected that the Library would be able to connect to this line to obtain Natural Gas service.
Electric (Three Phase)

While electrical service is available throughout Gunnison it is important to have access to three-phase electrical service in order to run the larger and more efficient HVAC equipment. Three Phase power is proximate to both the Current Library and the Van Tuyl site but may need to be routed underground from their current location as City Staff was not certain the smaller existing utility poles would be capable of being used to run overhead three-phase lines.
It is currently unclear if the right-of-way for County Road 15 was annexed at the time of the Van Tuyl Annexation. The City of Gunnison has stated that the right-of-way remains in the County and the Design Team has not received work back from Gunnison County to corroborate this account. Additional property research is necessary to understand the agency having jurisdiction for CR 15.1

The potential exposure for extensive street improvements is moderate at this location. Due to the potential for significant capital costs to widen this road resolving this question is a high priority.2

Current tap credit will diminish total cost of this tap, TC = Tap Credit3

---

**Infrastructure Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/Acassumption</th>
<th>Current Library</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>Van Tuyl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streets</strong></td>
<td>Existing/Improved All Sides</td>
<td>Generally Improved</td>
<td>Existing/Improved along East (Quartz). May need to provide street improvements to CR 15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>60’ Curb Cut/Gutter</td>
<td>60’ Curb Cut/Gutter</td>
<td>190’ Curb/Gutter 60’ Curb Cut/Gutter2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sidewalks</strong></td>
<td>Existing/improved at current lot or if expanded south. If expanded north a new sidewalk will be required along Gothic.</td>
<td>Generally Improved, some missing sidewalks.</td>
<td>Existing/West Sidewalk along the South Side required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>150’ – 5’ Sidewalk</td>
<td>50’ – 5’ Sidewalk</td>
<td>190’ – 5’ Sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>Tap/Meter</td>
<td>Tap/Meter</td>
<td>Tap/Meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>$10,000 – TC3</td>
<td>$10,000 – TC3</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer</strong></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>Tap/Meter</td>
<td>Tap/Meter</td>
<td>Tap/Meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Gas</strong></td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>50’ Line/Meter</td>
<td>50’ Line/Meter</td>
<td>200’ Line/Meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>$3500</td>
<td>$3500</td>
<td>$5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electric (Three Phase)</strong></td>
<td>Available – Assume 200 Ft, likely underground trench</td>
<td>Available – Assume 200 Ft, likely underground trench</td>
<td>Available – 200 Ft to south, underground trench</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>200’ Line/Transformer</td>
<td>200’ Line/Transformer</td>
<td>300’ Line/Transformer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 It is currently unclear if the right-of-way for County Road 15 was annexed at the time of the Van Tuyl Annexation. The City of Gunnison has stated that the right-of-way remains in the County and the Design Team has not received work back from Gunnison County to corroborate this account. Additional property research is necessary to understand the agency having jurisdiction for CR 15.

2 The potential exposure for extensive street improvements is moderate at this location. Due to the potential for significant capital costs to widen this road resolving this question is a high priority.

3 Current tap credit will diminish total cost of this tap, TC = Tap Credit
Development Costs

Summary

Development Costs represent the cost of constructing a new or expanded Library on each site. These include both hard and soft costs along with other costs that are necessary to complete the project such as structure demolition, land acquisition, and structure relocation.

New Structure

When discussing the construction of a new or enlarged Library in Gunnison it is important to use a consistent size for the final product. For estimating the cost of a proposed new structure an assumed size of 10,000 sf was selected.

Rapidly changing construction costs in the current construction environment make it difficult to pin down an estimated cost for a new structure. The size, systems, materials, and remoteness of a project all influence the final price of a project.

For the purposes of estimating the cost of a new structure this report uses $340/sf in direct costs (does not include design, contingency, furniture, fixtures, equipment, etc.). This number was derived by considering current construction projects taking place in more rural areas on the western slope.

Site Improvements

A flat allowance was assumed across the board for every site. This allowance would provide all excavation, earthwork, parking lots, sidewalks, and other miscellaneous site improvements. This allowance is assumed at $480,000 ($48/building SF). Site work at the Van Tuyl site would be easier as it does not currently have a significant amount of existing improvements to conflict with the use of heavy equipment. While some of the smaller sites would require smaller totals of certain improvements they have increased complexity.

Two Stories

In order to make more efficient use of a smaller lot it will likely be necessary at the Current Library and Downtown sites to construct a two-story Library. Accessibility standards and the efficient movement of Library books/equipment will require that an elevator be provided. While there are limited-use, limited-access lifts available a more traditional elevator will be necessary in order satisfy both the requirements listed above and is adequate for routine use. The cost associated with the elevator includes the equipment, structure and hoistway.

The Van Tuyl site is large enough that a single-story Library is possible, removing the need to provide an elevator.

Demo/Relocation

All sites other than the Van Tuyl site either have or are expected to have existing structures that need to be relocated or removed.

---

1 See Hard Costs vs Soft Costs – Page 15
Relocation costs include the cost to move the structure, an allowance to drop utility lines that would conflict with the relocation, an allowance to prepare the site and associated foundation, and an allowance to assist with a partner agency to purchase land.

The Current Library is bordered on both the North and South sides by residential structures. If the Library were to purchase either both lots to the north or the single lot to the south the relocation of the single-family dwellings to another property is being proposed.

If the Library were to purchase the property to the South and construct a new Library, the remaining land is inadequate to provide enough parking to satisfy City requirements. This would require the demolition of the existing Library to provide enough space for parking.

The downtown area is generally developed and it is expected that either through the purchase of one or multiple adjacent lots, the removal of existing structures will be necessary to allow for the construction of the new Library and support infrastructure.

Parking Lot

Each site will need to provide off-street parking for the use of Library patrons.

The required parking for a 10,000 sf Library under the City code is 34 spaces. The basic cost to provide those spaces will remain the same however the confined geometry of the current library and downtown will make laying out an efficient parking lot difficult. Land located within the CBD is exempt from parking requirements and the City has indicated they would be able to review some parking reduction requests to reduce to total amount of parking. The total amount of reduction will vary as administrative reductions are limited and anything above would require an additional public hearing to consider a variance from the standards.

Land Acquisition

For the Current Library the listed price of the property to the south was used for the "South Scenario". Land acquisition to the north was estimated by assuming 15% over estimated value for the two properties to the north. Legal fees, closing costs, and the associated cost to survey and combine the individual lots into a single lot for development are included in the "soft cost" line-item in the Other Costs section later in this document.

It is difficult to obtain a specific number for the potential cost of a property in downtown Gunnison. An evaluation of commercial real estate prices in Gunnison has given an average listing price of $100/sf of building in the downtown core. Since there are not any specific sites under consideration the team reduced the assumed cost per square foot to $60/sf under the assumption that some vacant land would be included in the sale.
## Development Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Library</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>Van Tuyl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Structure</strong></td>
<td>10,000 sf North; or 7,000 sf South</td>
<td>$2,380,000 North(^1)</td>
<td>$3,400,000 (^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,400,000 South(^2)</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renovation</strong></td>
<td>3,000 sf South</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two Stories</strong></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demo/Relocation</strong></td>
<td>North Scenario – Relocation of two single-story single-family homes.</td>
<td>Demolition/removal of 6,000 sf building</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Scenario – Relocation of existing two-story, single-family home, demolition of existing 3,000 sf library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$375,000/$10,000 North</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$340,000/$50,000 South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking Lot</strong></td>
<td>Parking Reduction Possible</td>
<td>Parking Reduction Possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Acquisition</strong></td>
<td>Two lots North; or One lot South</td>
<td>20k–30k sf</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$757,550 North</td>
<td>$2M–$3M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$538,000 South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) The Current Library – North Scenario would include the purchase of an additional 20,000 sf of property to the north of the Library. This would allow for both the construction of a 7,000 sf addition to the Library and a new parking lot of adequate site to meet contemporary parking requirements.

\(^2\) The Current Library – South Scenario would include the purchase of an additional 10,000 sf of property to the south of the Library. This amount of land is not adequate to provide enough parking to meet contemporary parking standards. To meet the program needs of the Library and City standards for parking the existing Library would need to be demolished to allow for the construction of a new parking lot.

\(^3\) Since there is not a specific site in mind for the prospective downtown site it is assumed that the removal of a structure would be required to facilitate the construction of a new library. The downtown new structure estimate would assume the removal of a 6,000 sf building and the construction of a new Library.
Other Costs

Soft Costs\(^1\)

While "Hard Costs" are generally easier to describe and estimate a significant amount of development requires "Soft Costs" which include a broad range of items. These include the overhead/profit for any contractor, architectural/engineering design fees, legal fees, permit fees, taxes, insurance, furniture, equipment, security, etc. This can also include the work required to gain the legal right to construct a building on a property. These practices are often referred to as "Entitlements". Entitling a property generally refers to the work necessary to complete the administrative actions to ready a property for development and as such varies depending on the selected sites. These actions can include moving property lines, providing easements, changing zoning, or going through different forms of zoning review such as conditional reviews\(^2\).

As these costs are less able to be clearly articulated and itemized when compared to new construction estimating them at this preliminary stage of a project is often completed by taking a proportion of the total construction cost so that the soft costs generally reflect the magnitude of the project. For the purposes of estimating soft costs this report is assuming that soft costs will be approximately 30% of total construction costs.

Process

The ‘process cost’ of a Project often goes further than just the price of application fees or design assistance. In many ways the timing and extent of required reviews can dramatically increase the complexity of a project.

The Library could face a number of entitlement\(^3\) challenges. The first of which is that the use of a "Library" is not called out within the Zoning Code as a use. In such a case the project is subject to a determination by the Community Development Director. During staff interviews it was determined that the Library would be considered a Neighborhood/Community Center which is generally a conditional use in most zones except within the CBD where it is prohibited.

In all cases as a conditional use it requires a public hearing in front of the Planning Commission. This means public notice, public testimony.

A Library is considered a 'use by right'\(^3\) on the Van Tuyl site, which is the most permissive type of land use approval. In general terms, so long as you meet the development criteria the agency having jurisdiction is required to approve the application. Although broad latitude remains in interpreting requirements (such as the requirement for street improvements) that can make it difficult for a new development to be able to pay for the required improvements.

A new or expanded Library at the current Library site is considered a 'conditional use'. This introduces an additional level of public review and approval that may add additional time and cost.

The Downtown contains several different Zoning Districts with varying review requirements for a new Library. This review ranges from use-by-right to conditional review in the majority of

\(^1\) See Hard Costs vs Soft Costs – Page 15
\(^2\) See Use-by-Right vs Conditional Use – Page 23
\(^3\) See "Soft Costs" section – Page 22
The City of Gunnison does not have a dedicated use category for “Library”. When a use is not specifically listed in the table of principal land uses it falls to the Community Development Director to make a determination on what listed use most closely aligns with the proposed use. In the case of the Library it was determined that it would fall into the Neighborhood/Community Center category which is prohibited in the CBD zone.

**Use-by-Right vs Conditional Use**

A use-by-right is a use that is allowed within its respective zoning district so long as it complies with the development standards of that district. These types of review are not as discretionary as a conditional use where zoning administrators are granted more latitude in the decisions they make. A conditional use requires an additional staff review, public notice, and a public hearing. During this hearing the Planning Commission has broader discretion when compared to a use-by-right to approve, deny, or approve with conditions any development proposal.

**Endowment**

A consideration that needs to be outlined is that coupled with the dedication of land for a new library the Van Tuyl estate dedicated an endowment to support the construction of a new Library. As the dedication implied the construction of a new library on the Van Tuyl site, it is likely that there will be an associated cost in both time and money to ensure the funds are available to the Library on other sites.

---

1 The City of Gunnison does not have a dedicated use category for “Library”. When a use is not specifically listed in the table of principal land uses it falls to the Community Development Director to make a determination on what listed use most closely aligns with the proposed use. In the case of the Library it was determined that it would fall into the Neighborhood/Community Center category which is prohibited in the CBD zone.
### Other Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Library</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>Van Tuyl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soft Costs(^1)</strong></td>
<td>$1,389,165 North</td>
<td>$1,726,050</td>
<td>$1,217,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,502,700 South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process Cost</strong></td>
<td>Conditional Use</td>
<td>Prohibited</td>
<td>Use-by-Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use-by-Right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment</strong></td>
<td>Re-allocated</td>
<td>Re-allocated</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) This value can range widely, for the purposes of this report it is assumed to be 30% of total project cost.
## Site Analysis Summary

### Estimated Cost Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Library</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Van Tuyl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>$2,380,000</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Work</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>$523,000</td>
<td>$732,550</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$5,009,000</td>
<td>$4,630,550</td>
<td>$5,753,500</td>
<td>$4,059,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>$1,502,700</td>
<td>$1,389,165</td>
<td>$1,726,050</td>
<td>$1,217,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Prohibited Conditional Use-by-Right</td>
<td>Use-by-Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total Cost</strong></td>
<td>$6,511,700</td>
<td>$6,019,715</td>
<td>$7,479,550</td>
<td>$5,276,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The costs included in this matrix are intended to provide an apples-to-apples comparison between the sites under consideration. Once a single site is selected a site-specific design and cost estimate should be conducted to determine an estimated total project cost prior to determining any prospective bond issue amounts.
Site Liabilities

Current Library

1. The South Scenario does not have adequate land for both the expanded library and required parking. The current Library would need to be demolished in the South Scenario.
2. The Library District does not own the current library. It may be required to purchase the Library building prior to doing any major renovations or demolition (South Scenario).
3. The properties to the north are not currently listed as for sale, there is no guarantee that the Library would be able to purchase these properties and if the Library is able to purchase these properties it would likely be at a cost premium.
4. Any land acquisition would need to be coupled with a subdivision action to combine the properties into a single lot. This is an additional process beyond that of a building permit and administrative zoning review.
5. The Library is located in a district that requires a conditional review. This is a public hearing and additional review beyond that of a building permit and administrative zoning review. This review will extend the total duration of review and may bring with it additional requirements (and associated costs).
6. The endowment provided as a component of the Van Tuyl land dedication was made with the implied purpose of constructing a new Library on the Van Tuyl site. Locating the Library elsewhere may require additional process and legal action to maintain free use of the funds for the Library.

Downtown

1. There are few properties throughout the downtown area of sufficient size for the Library and required parking. None of those are currently listed are of adequate size. There is no guarantee that the Library would be able to purchase a single property of adequate size and if the Library is able to purchase these properties it would likely be at a cost premium.
2. Any land acquisition of multiple adjacent properties would need to be coupled with a subdivision action to combine the properties into a single lot. This is an additional process beyond that of a building permit and administrative zoning review.
3. Many of the downtown sites are zoned CBD (Central Business District). Within this zone construction of the Library is prohibited. While the City has verbally indicated they are open to pursuing a code amendment to allow the construction of the Library this will take additional time and will require a code amendment process.
4. Much of the other areas in downtown are located in a district that requires a conditional review. This is a public hearing and additional review beyond that of a building permit and administrative zoning review. This review will extend the total duration of review and may bring with it additional requirements (and associated costs).
5. The endowment provided as a component of the Van Tuyl land dedication was made with the implied purpose of constructing a new Library on the Van Tuyl site. Locating the Library elsewhere may require additional process and legal action to maintain free use of the funds for the Library.
Van Tuyl

1. CR 15 is shown as a “major collector” in the Gunnison master plan. The City may require the dedication of ½ of the required ROW (100’ total, 50’ from each side of the street along with ½ of the improvements to CR 15 as a component of the development. This would include one travel lane, one bike lane, a parking lane, a tree lawn, and 5’ detached sidewalk.
Next Steps

The purpose of this report is to outline the differences of potential sites and present an 'apples-to-apples' comparison of cost drivers and critical site features. This work is reflective of feedback related to the location of a public library in Gunnison as well as the scope of facility improvements presented to Gunnison County voters in 2011. The quantitative information in this report is intended to work in concert with public feedback regarding program scope, location, amenities, and accessibility. Throughout the process there has been little disagreement that expanded and improved library facilities are overdue in Gunnison County. The vast majority of feedback has indicated that a new library is viewed as a necessary, significant community improvement. The data in this report is designed to allow the Board to make a data driven decision on how to best achieve those improvements.

Each of these site options are possible and achievable for Gunnison County Library District. The primary considerations in making a decision can be summarized in terms of project complexity, time to completion, and cost. The most cost-effective location is also the location with the fewest liabilities, the District owned Van Tuyl site. The more than 5-acre site also offers a clear path to delivering key items identified through the public input including walkability for children, bike access, bus access, outdoor spaces, and ample parking.

The desire for the library to remain nearer the downtown core is also real and has been expressed through public feedback. In fact, questionnaire responses indicate an equal affinity for a facility that is proximate to downtown and one that is in proximity to local schools. As practical site considerations have been discussed in public meetings, responses to the financial realities associated with downtown development have been met by a general understanding that those added costs may be prohibitive. In an effort to deliver on the public’s desire for library services to be available downtown conversations have taken place about the future of the current library. If the facility’s primary use is no longer a public library, project stakeholders with Gunnison County have indicated that the library may be able to maintain a footprint at 307 N Wisconsin dedicated to library services. This report shows that while there is no bad option for Gunnison County Libraries, there is a clear choice in terms of cost and buildability.

There is perhaps no more important decision for a public facility than location. A well informed, justified, and data driven decision regarding site will allow the Gunnison County Library District to take the next step toward improved facilities; a public input driven design process that delivers a library capable of adequately serving the Gunnison Valley.
Appendix A – Infrastructure/Process Research
Land Use Permit – City of Gunnison Zoning

What use would a Library be considered under Table 2-3 Principal Use Table? Similar to a School, public or private or a Neighborhood/Community Center?

**Answer:** Probably a neighborhood community center but the Town is interested in updating its standards to allow for such a facility to be located in the CBD, per Andie Ruggera phone call 7/31/2018

**Note:** A Neighborhood/Community Center is considered a permitted use in the B-1 and C districts but is prohibited in the CBD (Central Business District). Everywhere else it is a conditional use. A School would be considered a conditional use everywhere.

What parking demand standard under Table 4-7 Off-Street Parking Requirements would be required of the site? Would it be a standard within the table or require a study per §4.4.D.3.b?

**Answer:** Parking will be required at a 1:300 SF rate for any Library location.

The existing Library will be required to meet current parking requirements if expanded and parking provided for the entire facility. Parking at the current site would be eligible for a parking requirement reduction either administratively through City staff or through a variance request which would require a public hearing.

Development within the CBD does not have a parking requirement.

**Note:** The Van-Tuyl site may have some opportunities for shared parking partially funded from other sources that would primarily fund outdoor elements i.e. GOCO.

Could we have the adopted PUD-LIB development standards as adopted?

**Answer:** Standards were submitted in 8/3/2018 email from Andie Ruggera.

The standards have been included as an Appendix to this report.

Within the PUD-LIB zone is a library considered a permitted use (use-by-right)? What is the administrative process to review a permitted use?

**Answer:** Yes, use by right, per Andie Ruggera phone call 7/31/2018

**Follow-up:** Confirmed, email sent with associated text 7/31/2018

**Note:** A use-by-right is a use that is allowed within its respective zoning district so long as it complies with the development standards of that district. These types of review are not as discretionary as a conditional use where zoning administrators are granted more latitude in the decisions they make.

What type of street improvements would be required adjacent to the site? Would street widening be required (i.e. CR 15 at the Community School Site)? Would sidewalks be required along the streets?

**Answer:** This depends on what jurisdiction CR 15 is within, the City believes the ROW was not annexed as a component of the Van Tuyl annexation.
CR 15 is under the County's jurisdiction. David Gardner email 10/18/2018

Note: Depending on the type of use a City can often require a developing property to improve their side of the street to contemporary standards. This can range wildly from minor improvement to sidewalks to wholesale construction of traffic lanes, along with curb/gutter/sidewalk.

There was language within some of the proceedings of the Van Tuyl annexation that referenced the strip of property between the Van Tuyl – Library site and Quartz street. It referenced that this may be quit claimed to the City however County records seem to indicate that this has not occurred. Are you aware of the status of this property?

Answer: Andie Ruggera, Interim Community Development Director is following up on the research. She speculates that it is possible the quitclaim deeds were drafted but the owner wanted money which sank the initial deal. She is reaching out to the Parks Director who may have more information.

Follow-up: Andie Ruggera confirmed the quit-claim deed for the property has been filed however there was a clerical error identified that has yet to be resolved.

Note: This property has implications on sanitary sewer and vehicular access and could add a fair amount of cost to the project.

Does the City have any permitting handout already generated with a list of adopted codes along with contacts for various agencies (i.e. Fire Marshal, Electrical Utility, etc?)

Per Ord: 2015 IBC, IEBC, IRC, IECC, IMC, IPC, IFGC, IFC, IPMC, 2017 NEC

Answer: Building permit packet submitted in 8/3/2018 email from Andie Ruggera. Packet has been included as an Appendix to this report.
What is the typical processing time for the staff review of a Conditional Use?
Answer: 4-6 Weeks
Note: This 4-6 week review is required prior to issuance of a building permit.

Do you have an expected list of external consultants/agencies/etc.?
Packet has been included as an Appendix to this report.

Who provides public notice per §6.7? Mailing? Site Posting? Newspaper? (CDD or “assignee”)
Answer: Site posting is the responsibility of the landowner.
Community Development Department provides all other notices.

How far in advance do you prepare PZ packets for review by commission?
Answer: Friday before each meeting. Planning Commission meets every second and fourth Wednesday.

What is the typical processing time for the staff review of a Site Development Permit?
Answer: Two weeks typically however the complexity of this project will likely extend the review time to four weeks.
Infrastructure Questions – City of Gunnison Public Works

Are Water and Sewer tap fees uniform in cost across the City?

Answer: Tap Fees are based on water meter size. David Gardner 7/26/2018 email

Follow-up: How does Gunnison evaluate fire suppression taps? Are they individual dedicated taps or is it preferred that they are consolidated?

Discussed in 10/17/2018 call and 10/17/2018 e-mail.

Fire suppression taps only require time and materials to property line. David Gardner 10/18/2018 email.

Are credits offered for existing taps that may either be consolidated or need to be enlarged?

Answer: We do not double bill on taps. If you use an existing tap, no fee. If you opt to upsize, then additional costs would be incurred for the upsize. Please contact Joe Doherty at jdoherty@gunnisonco.gov for additional information. And his number is 970-641-8330, David Gardner 7/26/2018 email

Follow-up: Does the Van Tuyl property have any existing taps?

Van Tuyl does not have any existing taps.

What size tap does the current Library have?

The Library currently has a ¾” water tap

Discussed in 10/17/2018 call and 10/17/2018 e-mail. Specific information in 10/18/2018 email from David Gardner.

Note: Sometimes value in a property can be found in existing infrastructure connections, likewise new taps may be an additional cost liability.

Is non-potable irrigation included in these tap fees or is it a separate utility?

Answer: Separate. There is no fee for this free service, provided it is available at your site, David Gardner 7/26/2018 email

Has all raw water/water right dedication been completed as a part of the Van Tuyl Annexation?

Answer: Yes, David Gardner 7/26/2018 email

Note: Depending on if the raw water/water right dedication has been settled for the annexation it may be an outstanding liability that would need to be resolved prior to the property being developed.

Does the City maintain Water infrastructure size and test information (i.e. hydrant tests)?

Answer: Yes, David Gardner 7/26/2018 email

Follow-up: Service is adequate for anticipated 1-1/2” water line at all locations. David Gardner 10/18/2018 email.
Discussed in 10/17/2018 call and 10/17/2018 e-mail. City to respond with clarification.

Note: Knowing if existing infrastructure is sized with sufficient capacity for fire suppression in a building allows the library to know if additional utility oversizing costs would be required to construct the building.

**Does the City maintain Sewer infrastructure size, type and depth information?**

**Answer:** Yes, David Gardner 7/26/2018 email

**Follow-up:** Service is adequate for anticipated 4” sewer tap at all locations. David Gardner 10/18/2018 email.

Discussed in 10/17/2018 call and 10/17/2018 e-mail. City to respond with clarification.

Note: Knowing that a sewer line exists often won’t tell you the whole story. The sewer line needs to be downhill to the proposed building (unless a sewer injector pump is used) and needs to have sufficient capacity. Knowing the type also gives information on the probable condition of the line.

**Does the City have information related to where three-phase power may be available?**

**Answer:** Three-phase power is available to the current library site but is not currently connected.

Three phase service is not currently on the Van Tuyl site. Closest service is 300 feet away due south.

Utility poles throughout much of Gunnison are undersized for the running of three-phase power along with pole-mounted utility transformers. Undergrounding of three-phase will likely be necessary.

**Note:** Three-phase power is important to run the HVAC equipment often required for larger commercial/community buildings. This equipment also runs more efficiently than a single-phase counterpart.
Infrastructure Questions – Atmos Energy (Gas Provider)

Does the Van Tuyl, Current Library, and Downtown sites have access to Natural Gas infrastructure?

Answer: A 2" PE main is currently installed on the north side of CR 15 (extension of Spencer Ave) and continues along the south side of the property.

The current library site has access to a 2" Steel main in the alley to the west of the site.

The Downtown area is the oldest portion of the Atmos network and generally has coverage throughout the Downtown area. If properties to the South of Tomichi are selected, a site-specific assessment should be completed.

For any site, if the library wanted to tap into the service, the cost would relate to the overall length of main and the demand of the facility. 1M-2M BTU would have a meter provided while anything over 2M BUT would require the purchase of meter equipment.

CJ, Atmos Energy Rep, Gunnison Local Office, Phone Discussion 10/3/2018

Note: Natural gas is important to run the HVAC equipment often required for larger commercial/community buildings.
Appendix B - Van Tuyl PUD Requirements
Appendix C - City of Gunnison Building Permit Packet
Appendix D - City of Gunnison Tap Schedule