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Manitou Springs Carnegie Library Design
Introduction
By the Preserve and Renew Our Carnegie Library Task Force

- **Topic**: Review and adoption of Resolution 1721 to approve the design of the Historic Carnegie Library Building
- Thrilled and honored to introduce tonight’s topic
- Excited about the functional, accessible, and beautiful design that
  - Rehabilitates our historic library building to be a 21st century library
  - Keeps our historic gem the prominent presence in the park
  - Allows the library building to be accessible to all regardless of ability
  - Provides newly accessible park space via the rooftop garden
  - Provides a place with spaces open to everyone where books, ideas, and culture are shared

**The new design helps create community!**
Preserving our Carnegie Library Has Many Benefits

• Historic icon serving Manitou Springs since 1911 preserved
  – Though Andrew Carnegie provided philanthropic dollars to build the library, it is the citizens of Manitou Springs who have and continue to sustain the library
  – Deferred maintenance and code violations will be addressed
  – Most recent assessment conducted Feb 2021 assessed building condition as poor

• All citizens of our community will be able to access and use this historic building

• Manitou Springs Library remains 1 of only 18 continuous use Carnegie libraries in Colorado
  – Pikes Peak Library District (PPLD) plans to return to the Carnegie building when it meets their needs
  – PPLD supplies staffing, programs and resources

• New accessible outdoor space will allow all Manitou Springs residents to participate in outdoor activities in this park

• This city building will continue to generate rental income
Community-Centric Design Used

• Ratio Architects led a community-centric design process to inform the plans to rehabilitate the historic library building to best serve all our citizens

• Exemplar for the Manitou Springs Community Engagement Process
  – Task Force did extensive outreach across the community
  – City and PPLD facilitated community outreach
  – Ratio Architects held two rounds of community engagement
  – The Ratio design evolved in response to community input

Carnegie Library Community-centric Design demonstrates that community engagement works!
Our Carnegie Library Expansion History
Focusing on Recent History (1 of 2)

• Expansion has been in the works for over 20 years
• Thorp design approved in 2017; used as design starting point
• Manitou Springs Arts, Culture, and Heritage (MACH) ballot measure passed in 2019 demonstrating community support
• Preserve and Renew Our Carnegie Library Task Force formed July 2020
• Resolution No. 3620, to Affirm Support for Expansion of the Historical Carnegie Library Building approved in Dec 2020
Our Carnegie Library Expansion History
Focusing on Recent History (2 of 2)

- City led RFP process resulted in an impressive response from 7 highly qualified firms, a rigorous review process, and a contract with Ratio Architects that was approved by City Council in Apr 2021

- Ratio Architects community engagements included:
  - Carnegie Project Kickoff Meeting – May 25, 2021
  - Community Input on 3 conceptual design options – Jun 29, 2021
  - Informational presentation to HPC – Aug 4, 2021
  - Informational presentation to PARAB – Aug 9, 2021
  - Presentation of design options to City Council – Aug 10, 2021
  - Community outreach meeting #2 – Sep 9, 2021
  - Presentations for approval of community driven design
    - PARAB – Oct 4, 2021
    - HPC – Oct 6, 2021
    - City Council – Nov 2, 2021
Ratio Architects

233 Public Libraries

Total Public Libraries

6,385,468 gsf

15.67M gross square ft.

96 Academic Libraries
MANITOU SPRINGS CARNEGIE LIBRARY ADDITION
Concept Design Narrative
CITY OF MANITOU SPRINGS
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## Design Team

**Architecture**
- **RATIO**
  - Dennis Humphries, Principal
  - Eric Grebliunas, Architect

**LANDSCAPE**
- **RATIO**
  - Lisa Esterrich, Landscape Architect
  - Anna Grace FitzGerald, Landscape Designer

**Structural**
- **JVA, Incorporated**
  - Chris Taylor, Project Manager

**Civil Narrative**
- **Elevation Consulting Group, Ltd.**
  - Brad Disner, Principal

**Mechanical & Plumbing**
- **The Ballard Group, Inc.**
  - Peter Failla II, Principal
  - Tim Harris, Vice-President

**Electrical**
- **Innovative Electrical Systems**
  - Kevin Yinglin, Principal
ARCHITECTURE NARRATIVE

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The Manitou Springs Carnegie Library renovation and addition project is the culmination of an in-depth process conducted by the City of Manitou Springs and Pikes Peak Library District. The proposed scope has been influenced over the years by PPLD, library staff, Friends of the Library, Historic Preservation Commission, PARAB, and community members. The resulting consensus for the best path forward for the library was to explore three design options that study various ways for the addition to support accessibility, achieve 21st century library principals, and enhance community opportunities. The three design options were created to show diverse possibilities that create a dialogue to best determine the path forward. The final concept design option presented in this package is a direct reaction to the plethora of feedback received to date. We have distilled the diverse perspectives into a single design vision with the goal of finding a solution that truly represents its community.

HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE
The following was taken from the provided Historic Structures Assessment report on September 12 2002.

The building is within the National Historic District of Manitou Springs and is important for two reasons.

First, it is one of the 16 public libraries throughout the United States that were funded by grants from Andrew Carnegie.

Second, the building was designed by Thomas MacLaren a Formally trained Scottish Architect who had immigrated to Colorado Springs for health reasons.

Ground was broken in 1910 and the library opened on February 22, 1912.

The basement was originally unfinished but intended to be used to provide living quarters for the caretaker. A few years after the building was opened the offices of the Town Clerk were moved into the basement where it remained for over thirty years. The city constructed a vault for their more important records as an addition to the lower level. This vault is still in place today. Another modification was made to the building to accommodate the city offices. The center window of the lower level was opened into a door to provide an entry (and egress) for the city offices.

After the city offices were moved to other quarters the basement was used as a kindergarten room and later as a sixth grade classroom for the public school across the street.

Other then small exterior changes, the building has no major alterations or additions and appears much as it did in 1912.

All three design options take the historical significance of the existing structure into consideration in their own way and strive to follow the Secretary of Interiors (SOI) guidelines.

PRELIMINARY CODE REVIEW
This project will use the 2015 IBC, IECC, and IEBC. The existing masonry and wood structure will likely fall under the Type VB construction type with an Assembly Occupancy. With those designations, the maximum number of floors without a sprinkler system is two. The maximum floor area of a non sprinklered Type VB building is 6000sf. With allowable frontage increase, this number will grow to allow the total project area. Rated assemblies (floor, roof, wall, etc) are not anticipated to be required. No sprinkler system appears to be required due to the building area as well as anticipated occupant load being well below the 300 occupant threshold.
COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

- MUST FEEL LIKE MANITOU!

- EXISTING CARNEGIE LIBRARY TO BE THE PROMINENT STRUCTURE

- ARCHITECTURAL STYLE TO COMPLIMENT THE CARNEGIE

- SAVE AS MUCH PARK SPACE AS WE CAN

- LIKE THE IDEA OF COMMUNITY AND PARK SPACE ON THE ADDITION ROOF

- DONT LIKE STRUCTURES FEELING “MONUMENTAL” OR OVERPOWERING THE CARNEGIE

- EXPLORE OPPORTUNITY TO SET THE ADDITION OPTIONS FURTHER SOUTH
HPC FEEDBACK
- THIS IS A SPECIAL SITE WITH THE PRIMARY CONTEXT BEING THE EXISTING STRUCTURE
- ADDITION MUST BE SUBMISSIVE TO EXISTING STRUCTURE
- MINIMIZE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE ADDITION TO HIDE CHARACTER DEFINING ELEMENTS OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURE
- ADDITION IS NOT TO REPLICATE - ARCHITECTURAL STYLE TO BE COMPLIMENTARY
- MATERIALITY AND COLORATION TO BE COMPLIMENTARY
- EXPLORE OPPORTUNITY TO SET THE ADDITION OPTIONS FURTHER SOUTH

PARAB FEEDBACK
- MINIMIZE HARD SCAPE AND MAXIMISE GRASS AREA
- MINIMIZE THE IMPACT THE ADDITION HAS ON THE PARK SPACE
- EXPLORE OPPORTUNITY TO SET THE ADDITION OPTIONS FURTHER SOUTH
The site strategy revolves around the two main goals below. These goals were equally shared among the HPC, PARAB, and Community members.

1) **Assure the existing Carnegie Library is celebrated and remains the prominent structure on the site.**

2) **Preserve as much park space as possible.**

The two story portion of the addition was located to the secondary south elevation of the Carnegie. This preserves the Carnegie’s historic view from Manitou Ave. This also allows for the new main entry to serve the ADA parking space while not requiring a road to pass through the site further saving park space.

By keeping the upper level addition to 450sf and burying the remaining library addition area, we were able to minimise the amount of park space lost to the building footprint. The buried portion of the library will allow the park space to spill onto its roof and therefore save functional exterior park space. This saved park space on the roof area will activate the park in an accessible manner not previously available to the community due to the site slopes.
While not the final interior floor plan layout, the current strategy celebrates the existing Carnegie’s main floor by turning it into a flexible community room. It is intended to be programmed for a plethora of activities such as library programs, gallery space, educational seminars, and after hour community use. By locating this function on the upper floor there is the potential for the community room and roof deck to have after hour use while keeping the lower floor of the library secured. The addition on this level has been kept as small as possible to minimise the projects visible size from around the site while still allowing for accessibility between floors.

The lower level of the existing Carnegie is intended to remain the Children's area and is sized to host a class of 25 students. The addition on the lower level has been dug into the mountain side with the intent of minimising its presence on the site while still providing the needed flexible area to house a 21st century library. This flexible collection space combined with the new admin area will provide accessibility and update this Library to bring it in-line with the other PPLD branches of similar size.
The project scope consists of a 2,950sf addition onto the 3,486sf existing historic Carnegie Library as well as interior remodeling of the existing space. The addition is located on the secondary elevations of the south and west side of the existing library and has the majority of building located on the lower level. The historic strategy for this design strives to allow the Carnegie Library to remain the prominent element on site with the addition taking on a lower profile supporting role. The addition is set back into the earth to allow for views from the North, East, and West sides of the existing library to remain as untouched as possible and takes on a coloration and materiality intended to compliment the Carnegie’s materiality. A benefit of tucking the program into the earth is that it allows the park space to spill onto the roof to make sure minimal park area is lost from the addition. Outdoor reading or community events can be planned to take advantage of this accessible outdoor space.

Accessibility stems from the added ADA parking space. From arrival, an accessible path will connect the user to the new main entry located on the East side of the addition. A lift and stair was added to the interior space to allow for accessible travel between floors.
STREET PERSPECTIVE
ECO TREE REPORT

Overall, trees on the Library lawn receive a C+ grade which is actually pretty good compared to most places. This means that most trees are nearing the end of their lifespan but there shouldn't be an urgency to remove trees unless there is a safety issue. Most trees seem to be 50-70 years old.

Several trees need to be pruned in order to preserve health and be on a regular trimming schedule. (FYI, 5 trees are scheduled to be trimmed on Oct 8th)

The lawn has excellent drainage so trees should thrive in this area. All tree species should do particularly well here.

The 2 trees that will be removed are diseased with questionable life remaining. No concerns from Marty to remove those trees. However, we should require 2-3 new trees to be planted in their place. Marty offered to help identify locations for new trees as well as the appropriate tree species.

DESIGN TEAM NOTES:
- WE WILL PUT IN 2 TREES FOR EVERY TREE REMOVED
- LOOK INTO WAYS TO RE-USE TREES IN A SPECIAL WAY
- THERE IS A LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT ON TEAM
STRUCTURAL NARRATIVE

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Summary:
The project consists of a 2,950 square foot addition to the existing 2-story, 3,486 square foot Carnegie library building constructed circa 1910. The existing building was constructed with load-bearing masonry walls, spread footings, slab-on-grade at the first floor, wood joists at the second floor and wood trusses at the hipped roof. The grade slopes down from just below the level of the second floor on the south side of the existing building to the level of the 1st floor on the north side.

The new addition will wrap the southwest corner of the existing building and be built further into the hillside. The portion of the addition that is directly south of the existing building will be two stories like the existing building. It will have an overhanging hipped roof similar in appearance to the roof of the existing building and an elevator and steel stair providing access between levels. To the west, the addition will transition to a single story with an accessible outdoor roof deck that aligns vertically with the upper floor of the existing building. The above-grade walls of the addition will have punched window and door openings and will be constructed with load-bearing concrete or CMU backing brick veneer.

Structural modifications to the existing building will be minimal and are expected to include installation of new openings or enlargement of existing openings in the existing masonry walls, as well as new overframing where the roof of the addition abuts the hipped roof of the existing building. The roof and upper level floor of the addition will be structured in such a way that new gravity and lateral loads will not be imposed on the existing building.

DESIGN CODES, DESIGN CRITERIA AND MATERIALS

Design Codes:

Design Criteria:

Risk Category: II
Roof Snow Load: 30 psf, Is = 1.0
Second Floor Live Load: 100 psf (reducible)
Ultimate Design Wind Speed: 130 mph, Exposure B
Seismic: Design Category B, IE = 1.0
Frost Depth 30 inches

Structural Materials:
Concrete: Material Code: ACI 318-14 Building Code Requirements for Structural Concrete
Normal-weight, stone concrete with Type I/II cement, typical
Footings: f'c = 3,000 psi, w/c = 0.52
Foundation walls: f'c = 4,500 psi, w/c = 0.45
Interior slabs-on-grade: 4,000 psi, w/c = 0.45
Slabs-on-deck: 3,500 psi, w/c = 0.50
Reinforcing steel: ASTM A615, Grade 60

Strength of masonry assemblies: f’m = 2,000 psi (net)
Reinforcing steel: ASTM A615, Grade 60
Structural Steel: Material Code: ANSI/AISC 360-10 Specification for Structural Steel Buildings

- Wide flange shapes: ASTM A992, 50 ksi yield
- Plates, channels, WT's and angles: ASTM A36, 36 ksi yield
- Hollow structural section (HSS) shapes: ASTM A500, Grade C, 50 ksi yield
- Framed beam connections shall be bearing type w/ 7/8" diameter, snug tight, ASTM F3125 bolts.
- Anchor rods: ASTM F1554, Grades 36, 55 and 105 as needed.
- Headed anchor studs: ASTM A108
- Welding electrodes: E70XX
- Base plate grout: 7,000 psi, non-shrink, non-metallic

Cold-Formed Steel: Material Code: AISI S100-12 North American Specification for the Design of Cold-Formed Steel Structural Members

- C-studs and tracks: ASTM A653 (54 mil or thicker 50 ksi, 43 mil and thinner 33 ksi). G60 Galvanized

SYSTEMS DESCRIPTIONS

a. Foundations: The geotechnical report for this project has yet to be issued; however, it is expected that the foundation system for the addition will be spread footings. Cantilevered foundation retaining walls will be required to resist lateral soil loads where the building addition cuts into the hillside. We estimate that these retaining walls will be at least 12" thick reinforced vertically with #7 @ 8" on-center each face and horizontally with #4 @ 12" on-center each face and that the continuous retaining wall footings will be 12 ft. wide x 24" thick with #7 @ 12" on-center top and bottom transverse and (12) #5 top and bottom longitudinal.

b. The lower level floor slab-on-grade is expected to be 5" thick, with #4 @ 16" on-center each way on engineered fill. The thickness of the fill layer will be determined by the geotechnical engineer.

c. The upper level floor will be constructed with normal weight concrete on 2" x 19 gage Type 2VLJ composite steel deck (5 1/2" minimum/6" maximum slab thickness, screeded to level) reinforced with #3 @ 16" on-center each way. Supported floors will use composite wide flange steel sections for beams and girders. Beam depths will range from 12" to 16", and have 3/4"ø x 4" headed anchor studs @ 12" on-center. Beam spacings will range from 8 ft. to 10 ft. on-center. Girder depths will range from 18" to 24". Girders will also be composite with (2) 3/4"ø x 4" headed anchor studs at 12" on-center.

d. The hipped roof will be framed with 1 1/2" x 20 gage Type B steel deck on cold-formed steel trusses @ 16" on-center.

e. Vertical support at the perimeter of roofs and supported floors will be provided by the foundation walls described above and by 8" CMU bearing walls reinforced vertically with #5 @ 24" on-center and horizontally with 9 gage joint reinforcing @ 16" on-center and bond beams with (2) #5 @ 48" on-center. Steel W10 wide flange column sections ranging from 40 to 90 plf will provide interior support for the supported floors.

f. At this stage of development, we estimate the weight for the upper level steel floor framing to be 14 psf.

g. Connections between steel beams and girders, and between steel girders and steel columns will be shear tab plates with 7/8" diameter high-strength bolts.

h. Lateral load resistance will be provided by the foundation walls and CMU walls described above.
CIVIL NARRATIVE

Depending on the size of the existing water service line, a new upsized water service line will likely be brought into the building from a proposed connection to the existing adjacent water main in the street, with a new tap and meter. The service line and meter size are estimated to be between ¾” and 1”, upsized to 1” or 1 ½” after the meter, respectively.

The existing sanitary sewer service line is likely adequately sized for the proposed building improvements and is anticipated to be re-used.

A foundation perimeter drain system will likely be installed around the lower-level foundation. The foundation drain is estimated to be 4” perforated PVC surrounded in washed gravel and geotextile fabric with cleanouts at changes in direction. The foundation drain will connect to a proposed on-site storm sewer system within the site.

The existing drive cut in Pawnee Avenue will be removed and replaced to meet current standards and to accommodate a wider drive entrance. See landscape narrative for proposed dimensions.

The existing storm sewer inlet in Pawnee Avenue will be relocated as part of the drive entrance improvements.

It is assumed that an underground stormwater treatment vault will be installed near Manitou Avenue to treat site storm water for both 100-year storm detention and provision of water quality. The site has enough slope that a pumping system should not be required to discharge stormwater from this vault. A gravity system should suffice. For the purposes of this narrative, it is assumed a 12” RCP will outfall from the vault and connect to the existing storm sewer system in Manitou Avenue with a new manhole.

An on-site storm sewer system is anticipated to collect storm runoff from the site, and direct flows into the stormwater treatment vault. This system will be comprised of piping all roof drains (assume 6” PVC with clean outs), site area drains (assume 6 – 24” dia. Nyloplast area drains), and HDPE storm sewer pipe (assume — 450 LF of 12”-18” pipe).

A new drive will be constructed on the east side of the building with one signed and striped van accessible ADA parking stall. This parking area will require a retaining wall to be constructed. It is assumed a block wall less than 30” in height will suffice. An ADA route from this parking area to the proposed building entrance will also be constructed. This drive will be constructed of permeable pavers with an associated underdrain system tying into the proposed on-site storm sewer system. Site grading will be modified in these areas to achieve ADA compliance. See landscape narrative for parking and ADA route layout descriptions.

Site grading will be modified around the existing building and proposed building addition to promote positive drainage away from the building. These grading modifications will be limited to the greatest extent possible but should be anticipated to extend a minimum of 10’ from the face of the building.

Site grading will be modified to accommodate improvements associated with proposed amenity areas immediately adjacent to the building.
MECHANICAL/ PLUMBING NARRATIVE

Project Description
An addition to (3,600 Square Feet) and renovation (1,900 Square Feet) of the existing Carnegie Library. Renovation and addition program spaces shall consist of library collection areas, meeting room, children’s library, study rooms, administration areas and outdoor deck area(s).

Design Criteria

Temperatures:

| Summer Outdoor: | 95°F db, 61°F wb |
| Summer Indoor:  | Library Collections: 72°F |
|                | Meeting Room: 72°F |
|                | Administration: 72°F |
| Winter Outdoor:| -20°F |
| Winter Indoor: | Library Collections: 70°F |
|                | Meeting Room: 70°F |
|                | Administration: 70°F |

Humidity:

Humidity is not specifically controlled other than dehumidification that occurs with the cooling process. Spaces will likely fluctuate between 10% to 50% RH.

Outside Air Ventilation:

Per local code requirements: 2017 Pikes Peak Regional Building Code
Lighting/Power:

- Lighting: 1.2 watts/sf
- Power: 0.5 watts/sf

Occupancy:

Per local code requirements: 2017 Pikes Peak Regional Building Code
Or... Occupancy quantities as dictated by the architect/owner.

Occupant Heat Gain:

Library Collections – Seated at Rest: 350 BTUH/person
Meeting Room – SEDENTARY WORK: 550 BTUH/person
Administration – SEDENTARY WORK: 550 BTUH/person
Remaining Areas – SEDENTARY WORK: 550 BTUH/person

Building Components:
The following values are based on the 2017 Pikes Peak Regional Building Code:

- Metal Framed Walls: \( U = 0.064 \)
- Mass Walls: \( U = 0.090 \)
- Roof: \( U = 0.032 \)
- Glass (Metal Frame Assembly):
  - U = 0.38
  - SHGC - North = 0.53
  - SHGC – All other Orientations = 0.40

Mechanical (HVAC, Plumbing & Fire Protection) Systems Narrative

Existing Systems
HVAC
The existing furnace, associated condensing unit and all ductwork, controls, venting and appurtenances will be removed.

The existing exhaust fan serving the lower level restroom and all associated ductwork, controls and appurtenances will be removed.

It is assumed that the existing radon mitigation fan will be relocated as required to maintain operation.

Plumbing
All existing gas fired water heater appears to be less than (6) years old and we
will try and reuse but may need to relocate depending on furnace layout.

The existing ¾” domestic water serves will be utilized for option 1 and 2 but may need to be up-sized for option #3.

All existing plumbing fixtures will be removed.

**Heating/Cooling/Air Distribution**

**Source:**
Split system packaged furnaces with natural gas fired heat exchangers; direct expansion cooling coils and associated air-cooled condensing units. Furnaces shall be 95% efficient and condensing units shall be 18 SEER or better. Furnace and condensing unit shall be fully modulating. Provide a packaged economizer to set in the return and outside air ductwork. Manufacturer’s Wi-Fi enabled thermostat with web interface shall be provided. Tonnages are approximate. Acceptable manufacturers shall be Trane, Daikin & Carrier.

F-1
- Areas served: Administration, Study
- 4.0 tons
- 100 MBH input (heating)

F-2
- Areas served: Young Adult, Collection
- 3.0 tons
- 80 MBH input (heating)

F-3
- Areas served: Children’s Library
- 2.0 tons
- 60 MBH input (heating)

F-3
- Areas served: Community Room, Upper Level
- 5.0 tons
- 100 MBH input (heating)

**Miscellaneous Cooling:**
Ductless Split System air conditioning system with indoor evaporator and a remote air cooled condensing unit. Unit shall be controlled from a local factory provided thermostat. Acceptable manufacturers shall be Daikin, Carrier and Mitsubishi.

AC-1 & CU-1
- Area Served: IT
- 3.0 tons

**Miscellaneous Heating:**
Provide (2) electric wall heaters. One in the Vestibule and one in the Stair Lobby.

EWH-1 & EWH-2
- 1.0 kW

**General:**
Starters shall be provided by the Mechanical Contractor.
Provide fire/smoke dampers at all rated penetrations per local code requirements.

**Ductwork:**
Materials:
Galvanized sheetmetal ductwork shall be used throughout, except as noted.

All exposed ducts shall be spiral and shall have a Paint-Lock finish to facilitate painting by the GC.

**Insulation & Acoustic Liner:**
All supply and return ductwork shall have 1” duct liner, including spiral ductwork. Outside air ductwork shall have 3” insulation.

**Flues and Venting**
Provide direct-vent flues and combustion air ducts of materials listed and as required by the appliance manufacturer for the following pieces of equipment:

Furnaces
- Flue – CPVC (PVC is not acceptable)
- Combustion air – PVC with 1” fiberglass insulation.
Sizing:  
All low velocity supply, return and exhaust ducts shall be sized at 0.08”/100’.

Exhaust:  
Provide the following exhaust fans. It is assumed that a new radon mitigation fan will be required to service the new addition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAN</th>
<th>FAN TYPE</th>
<th>SERVING</th>
<th>Design Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EF-1</td>
<td>Ceiling mounted fan tied into the lighting occupancy sensor for control.</td>
<td>RR1, RR2</td>
<td>All Design Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-2</td>
<td>Ceiling mounted fan tied into the lighting occupancy sensor for control.</td>
<td>Staff RR</td>
<td>All Design Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-3</td>
<td>Ceiling mounted fan run of off a time-clock to operate during occupied hours.</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>All Design Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-4</td>
<td>Ceiling mounted fan tied into the lighting occupancy sensor for control.</td>
<td>RR3, RR4</td>
<td>Design Option 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF-5</td>
<td>Ceiling mounted fan tied into the lighting occupancy sensor for control.</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>All Design Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF-1</td>
<td>Radon mitigation fan.</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Design Options</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temperature Controls:  
All temperature controls shall be stand-alone.

Domestic Water:  
Water: We are not currently sure if the existing water service is a ¾” or possible due to age 5/8” water meter. Further investigation with water department will need to be done.

Flush tank toilets will used and the calculated flow is 21.86 gpm. This would require a ¾” water meter with upsized 1” service.

Option Flush valve toilets will be used and the calculated flow is 46.4 gpm. This would require a 1” water meter with 1-1/2” upsized service. However, we are getting very close to the maximum the meter can handle and will need to verify existing water pressure and distanced of existing piping runs to verify if we will need to upsize.

Piping:  
The domestic cold water, hot water and hot water recirculation, condensate and pool condensate piping above ground in the building shall be Type "L" hard copper with no-lead solder and fittings.

Provide at the cold water service entry a reduced pressure backflow preventer and new PRV.

Water Heater:  
It is anticipated that we will reuse the existing 40MBH, 40 gallon gas fired water heater. We will repipe to provide code required thermostatic mixing valve (TMV).

Domestic Water Recirculation Pump:  
The domestic hot water circulation pump will be added to provide instantaneous hot water at all fixtures and will operate continuously in the occupied mode.

Waste and Vent Piping:  
Waste: The existing 4” waste service this building will be more than adequate for this renovation.

Piping:  
Construct below ground waste piping of schedule 40 PVC with solvent welded joints within +/-5’-0” of the building.

Waste and vent piping above grade in building shall be service weight cast iron with no-hub fittings. All plumbing VTR’s shall be located 15’ minimum from any outside air intakes.
Storm Piping:
The building roof drainage will be gutters and downspouts specified by the architect.

Green roof will be provided for this option. Area drains and overflow area drains will be located to allow for drain in green roof area. Irrigation will be provided by landscape consultant.

Gas Piping:
Natural gas piping shall be Schedule 40 black steel. Piping sizes 2” and smaller shall be screwed joints. Piping sizes 2-1/2” and larger shall have welded joints. Gas piping will be routed to the furnaces and water heaters.

Plumbing Fixtures:
Water Closets: Floor mounted, vitreous china, tank type, (1.28 GPF) water closet.

Lavatories: Vitreous china, wall hung type. Faucet shall have an electronically operated faucet with a .5 GPM flow restrictor for water saving feature.

Sinks: 18-gauge stainless steel self-rimming type. Faucet shall be manually operated with a 1.5 GPM flow restrictor for water saving feature

Mop Service Basins: Floor type, molded stone, 24”x24”x10” size.

Electric Water Cooler with Bottle Fill Station: Stainless steel, ADA, high/low with bottle fill station, 120/60/1 power.

Insulation:
Domestic cold water will have 1” of fiberglass insulation.

Domestic hot and hot water recirculation will have 1” of fiberglass insulation for up to 1” piping, 1-1/2” fiberglass for piping above 1”.

Indoor condensate piping from air conditioning units and similar equipment shall have ½” of fiberglass insulation.

Miscellaneous Plumbing:
Provide exposed, chrome hose bibs with vacuum breaker in mechanical rooms.

Provide wall hydrant spaced on the exterior of the building at maximum 150’. Also included wall hydrants on the green roof areas.

Provide floor drains as shown on architectural plans and/or as follows:
  Toilet rooms.
  Mechanical equipment rooms.

Provide elevator sump pump and oil sensing control system for new elevator pit.

Provide or continue existing foundation drainage around lower building area in all option. System shall slope to outfall area, continuation by Civil Engineer.

Fire Protection
  No fire sprinkler system is anticipated based on building type and occupant count.
ELECTRICAL NARRATIVE

Electrical Service:
The electrical service for this building is an existing 240/120V, single phase, three wire system. The existing service is fed to the building overhead to an exterior mounted meter. Given the size of the addition and the age of the existing equipment the electrical service should be replaced with a new larger service. Coordination with the utility company will determine any new routing required to get the new larger service to the new service entry location. Meter location will still be on the exterior of the building.

Electrical Distribution:
The existing service panels and any sub panels in the existing building should be removed. Typical electrical gear lasts 30-40 years. With a large remodel like this it is a great time to replace the existing distribution.

Provide a new 600 amp, 240/120V, single phase, three wire service panel. New service panel will be located in the storage/mechanical room on the lower level of the existing building. This will feed a lighting panel, a two section power panel as well as any mechanical equipment and the new lift. Service panel will be provided with an integral SPD device for surge protection.

Power:
Existing power that can be reused will be. However, since the panel that feeds the existing devices is being removed most receptacles will simply be removed. In addition, many of the existing receptacles are run in exposed conduits, where the new construction will make efforts to hide as much of the conduit in new walls, furred out walls or new ceilings as possible. New outlets will be placed as described below for the new use of the spaces.

All outlets are to be commercial grade, 20A devices with stainless steel cover plates. Provide NEMA 5-20R unless a different device is noted in the details below.

Lower Level
Vestibule: Provide a duplex in the vestibule.

Childrens Library: Provide at least (4) duplex outlets, one on each wall, of the childrens library.

Childrens Storage: Provide a duplex in the childrens storage room mounted at 48”.

Mechanical: Provide a general use duplex in the two mechanical spaces as well as one in the storage room, mounted at 48”, adjacent to the door.

Collections: Provide general use duplex outlets every 25 in the non fiction and fiction collection area. Provide a duplex for each computer station, estimated to be (4) computers. Provide (3) quad outlets with USB at the reception desk in the new display collection area.

Restrooms: Provide a GFCI duplex in each of the restrooms, mounted above the counter, adjacent to the sink.

Study Rooms: Provide three duplex outlets in each study room as well as a quad with USB at the work table. Typical of three studies.
Young Adult: Provide (3) duplex outlets in the young adult area. Provide a quad outlet at the video wall for a TV and gaming devices.

Offices: Provide (4) duplex outlets in each office, one on each wall. On the wall with the desk provide an additional quad outlet with USB,
Break Area: In the break area provide a dedicated GFCI duplex for a refrigerator, and provide (6) GFCI duplex outlets mounted above a counter for things like a coffee maker and microwave.

Upper Level
Elevator Lobby: Provide a duplex in the stair and elevator lobby.

Entry: Provide (4) duplex outlets in the entry.

Hall: Provide a duplex outlet in the hall.

Storage: Provide a duplex in the meeting storage room mounted at 48”.

Restroom: Provide a GFCI duplex in the staff restroom, mounted above the counter, adjacent to the sink.

Community: Provide (9) floor boxes in the meeting room to meet NEC 210.71. Provide (12) duplex outlets around the perimeter of the space. Provide a duplex on the ceiling for a projector. Provide power to the projector drop down screen.

Green Roof: Provide a GFCI duplex with weather proof in use covers on the green roof adjacent to seating areas. Typical of eight.

Security:
Existing cameras will be removed and relocated in the new building layout. Additional cameras will match the existing manufacturer so that the existing system can be reused.

Lower Level

Vestibule: Provide a security camera in the existing vestibule to monitor the door.

Childrens Library: Provide two security cameras in the childrens library to monitor the childrens library area.

North Entry into Collections: Provide a security camera to monitor the door.

Young Adult: Provide a camera in the young adult section.

Upper Floor
Elevator Lobby: Provide a camera at the new vestibule to monitor door.

Community: Provide (2) security cameras in the meeting room, one to monitor the door to the green roof.

Access Control:
Access control for libraries is typically pretty limited. The assumption for this stage of the design is to provide a card reader at all exterior doors. These will connect to an access control system panel located in the electrical room.

Provide (4) card readers, one for each exterior door.

Tele/Data:
The existing low voltage system services enter the building on the lower level. Currently they terminate of a wall below pipes. This location should be relocated to a more appropriate space dedicated for low voltage. A new
small MDF closet will be created to house the low voltage system services as well as a rack to hold the patch panels for the facility. All three options will have this and all horizontal cabling will terminate in this room.

Lower Level
Childrens Library: Provide a WAP on the ceiling of the childrens library area for wifi access.

Mechanical: Provide a hard wire data line to mechanical system control panel

Collections: Provide a WAP on the ceiling of the fiction and non fiction collection area for wifi access. Provide three data outlets, each with two drops, at the reception desk for hardwire connections to telephone and data. Provide a data outlet with two drops at each computer station, estimate (4) stations.

Study Room: Provide two data outlets with two data drops in each study room. Typical of (3) rooms.

Young Adult: Provide a WAP on the ceiling of the young adult area for wifi access

Offices: Provide two data outlets with two drops each in each office for hardwire connections to telephone and data.

Break Area: Provide (3) data outlets with two data drops in each at the counter for printers and other equipment. In addition put a WAP on the ceiling for wifi access.

Upper Level
Entry: Provide a WAP on the ceiling for wifi access.

Community: Provide a WAP on the ceiling of the meeting room for wifi access. Provide a data line to the projector for in house data connection.

Green Roof: Provide two exterior WAP devices on the green roof for wifi access.

Audio/Visual:
AV equipment will be in the community room and the young adult room. It is assumed that all video equipment is provided by the owner. Contractor to provide power (noted in the power section), data (noted in the tele/data section) and other low voltage AV connections which will be noted in this section.

Community
The meeting room will be provided with a ceiling mounted projector. On the wall at the front of the room will be a wall plate, this will have HDMI, VGA, USB and AUX connections so users can connect computers to the projector. In addition, this room will have a wireless microphone as well as speakers to amplify sound from the microphone or from video being played on the projector.

Young Adult
Provide COAX to the gaming TV in the young adult space. All other AV connections regarding games will come with the gaming systems.

Fire Alarm:
The building is a type A-3 occupancy with a load of less than 300. There is no existing sprinkler system nor will one be added. The IBC does not require a fire alarm system in this type of building. The existing fire alarm systems appears to include smoke detection in...
all spaces. It should be assumed that all spaces will have at least one smoke detector. Detectors shall not be further than 30’ apart so large rooms will require multiple detectors. Existing detectors can be reused. New detectors should match the existing devices.

**Mechanical Equipment:**
Existing mechanical equipment that is remaining will be reconnected to the new electrical panels. New feeders and service disconnects will be provided for all new and existing mechanical and plumbing equipment. Refer to mechanical and plumbing narratives for new devices that will require power. The main components of the mechanical system will be furnaces and condensing units.

**Lighting & Lighting Controls:**
In general emergency lighting will be provided in batteries within the fixtures of the space. All exit signs will be replaced with new exits, with new batteries, red letters on a white background.

Lower Level
Vestibule: Provide 4’ ring pendants in the vestibule and the stairs, type P3. The lighting in this space will be connected to a relay panel and will be controlled by a touch screen at the reception desk. Lights will be on/off manual control. Light in the vestibule will be automatically dimmed by a daylight sensor dimming the light when daylight is present.

Childrens Library: Provide a round surface mounted fixture, type C1. The fixture will follow the color scheme of the space. The lighting in this space will be connected to a relay panel and will be controlled by a touch screen at the reception desk. Lights will be dimmable.

Childrens Storage: Provide surface mounted LED strip lights, type S1. Lighting will be controlled with a wall mounted motion sensor that has an on/off switch on it.

Mechanical and Storage/Mechanical: Provide 4’ LED surface mounted strips in these spaces, type S1. Lighting will be controlled by toggle switches in spaces with mechanical units so lights don’t turn off during maintenance operations.

Collections: Provide recessed linear fixtures, type R2. Over reception desk provide downlights with decorative drop glass, type D3. The lighting in this space will be connected to a relay panel and will be controlled by a touch screen at the reception desk. Lights will be dimmable with the gallery lights and reception desk lights being controlled separate from the recessed linear. Daylight sensors will automatically dim lights.

Restrooms: Provide recessed 2” downlights in restrooms, type D1. Provide wall sconces above each mirror, type W1. Lighting will be controlled by a wall mounted motion sensor with an on/off switch on it.

Study Rooms: Provide a small pendant over the work table in each study room, type P4. Provide 2” downlights in addition to the pendant, type D1. Lighting will be controlled by a ceiling mounted motion sensor and dimmer switches on the wall. The pendant and the downlights will be controlled separate.

Young Adult: Provide recessed linear fixtures, type R2. The lighting in this space will be connected to a relay panel and will be controlled by a touch screen at the reception desk. Lights will be dimmable.

Offices: Provide 2x2 recessed troffers that provide indirect light, type R1. Lighting will be controlled by a wall mounted motion sensor with a dimmer on it.

Breakroom: Provide 2x2 recessed troffers that provide indirect light, type R1.
R1. Lighting will be controlled by ceiling mounted motion sensors and a wall dimmer.

Upper Level
Elevator Lobby: Provide 2” downlights in vestibule, type D1. The lighting in this space will be connected to a relay panel and will be controlled by a touch screen at the reception desk. Light will be on/off manual control. Light in the vestibule will be automatically dimmed by a daylight sensor dimming the light when daylight is present.

Entry: Provide 2” downlights in lobby, type D1. The lighting in this space will be connected to a relay panel and will be controlled by a touch screen at the reception desk. Light will be on/off manual control. Light in the vestibule will be automatically dimmed by a daylight sensor dimming the light when daylight is present.

Hall: Provide 2” downlights in lobby, type D1. The lighting in this space will be connected to a relay panel and will be controlled by a touch screen at the reception desk. Light will be on/off manual control. Light in the vestibule will be automatically dimmed by a daylight sensor dimming the light when daylight is present.

Restrooms: Provide recessed 2” downlights in restroom, type D1. Provide a wall sconce above the mirror, type W1. Lighting will be controlled by a wall mounted motion sensor with an on/off switch on it.

Community: Provide recessed linear fixtures in the meeting room, type R2. Provide square downlights with a drop decorative glass around the perimeter of the meeting room. Lighting will be controlled by ceiling mounted motion sensors and dimmers on the wall. The perimeter downlights will be controlled separate from the linear. The linear will be controlled in two zones, one at the front of the room and all the others.

Storage: Provide 4’ LED strip lights, type S1. Lighting will be controlled by a wall mounted motion sensor with an on/off switch on it.

Exterior
Green Roof: Provide short bollard fixtures with a post top that matches the Manitou Springs downtown pole lights, type EB1. Lights will be connected to a relay panel and automatically controlled with a timeclock as well as a photosensor.

Original Building: Provide full cutoff wall sconces around the perimeter of the building, type ES1. Full cutoff is to preserve the night sky of this small mountain city. The style will match the lantern like fixtures found around the main street. Lights will be connected to a relay panel and automatically controlled with a timeclock as well as a photosensor.

New Building: Match sconces on the original building.
LANDSCAPE NARRATIVE

The landscape design for the renovations to the Manitou Springs Library is to be a reflection of the historical context of the site while providing new amenity spaces to suit the needs of a 21st century community. The existing historic wall is to be preserved in place. An existing opening in the wall is to continue to serve as vehicular access to the interior of the site but will be limited to allow for accessible parking and emergency access only. One new accessible space will be provided directly east of the existing library. A new retaining wall will be constructed to raise the grade in this area and provide a pad for the parking space that meets accessibility code. The back up area to accommodate exit from the accessible space will be connected to the pedestrian access to the new east entry of the library. A bollard will be provided to restrict vehicles. A new site sign will be located to the south of the new ADA parking space.

A majority of the outdoor amenity space to be developed with the library renovation will be located on the roof terrace of the library addition to be located west of the existing structure. The space on top of the roof terrace will be a combination of pedestal pavers and green roof planting trays in an arrangement to create outdoor gathering spaces to support new seating. Additional plantings will be incorporated west of the roof terrace to provide screening from the adjacent neighbors. A rain garden with underdrainage will be developed south of the roof terrace to capture runoff using drainable soil materials and new rain garden plantings. Additional tree plantings of native species will be provided to offset any removal of existing trees that will be required to allow for construction of the library addition.

Site improvements to the north of the library and addition will be kept to a minimum. The existing planter circle and garden walls will be preserved. New pavement will connect the circle to the new entry on the northwest face of the addition. The remainder of the surrounding site is to be preserved open lawn space.
## APPENDIX

### A - Cost Estimates

### B - Community Feedback

### Manitou Springs Library - OPTION 2 Revised

#### Conceptual Estimate

October 25, 2021

#### ESTIMATE SUMMARY (Schedule: 7 mo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site Amenity (Elevated Deck)</th>
<th>Addition</th>
<th>Renovation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grow Area (sf)</td>
<td>8,000 sf</td>
<td>1,981 sf</td>
<td>3,011 sf</td>
<td>2,703 sf</td>
<td>5,714 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A - Substructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel or Steel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Gas Mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substructure Related Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>387,594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B - Shell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>90,277</td>
<td>540,632</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>673,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>222,383</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>331,383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Vertical Enclosures</td>
<td></td>
<td>232,499</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>274,499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Horizontal Enclosures</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,377</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>40,877</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C - Interiors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>290,664</td>
<td>118,192</td>
<td>388,856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,326</td>
<td>40,777</td>
<td>149,103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior Finishes</td>
<td></td>
<td>109,438</td>
<td>77,463</td>
<td>226,901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D - Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,601</td>
<td>347,101</td>
<td>175,685</td>
<td>564,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conveying</td>
<td></td>
<td>95,068</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,342</td>
<td>57,048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>160,440</td>
<td>160,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection - Assumed N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td></td>
<td>121,478</td>
<td>121,635</td>
<td>284,722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Safety and Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Automation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E - Equipment &amp; Furnishings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,198</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F - Special Construction &amp; Demolition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td>13,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Remediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,310</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G - Sitework</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>212,206</td>
<td></td>
<td>212,206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,947</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>111,039</td>
<td></td>
<td>111,039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid and Gas Site Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Site Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Site Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z - General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>34,581</td>
<td>215,628</td>
<td>370,109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Requirements (Ex. General Conditions)</td>
<td>15,276</td>
<td>12,563</td>
<td>27,839</td>
<td>134,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Facilities &amp; Controls (Ex. Project Requirements)</td>
<td>15,276</td>
<td>12,563</td>
<td>27,839</td>
<td>134,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontractor/Owner's Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>4,346</td>
<td>7,008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Subcontractor Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,412</td>
<td>19,803</td>
<td>36,215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Unit Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>247,537</td>
<td>154,107</td>
<td>401,657</td>
<td>2,714,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating Contingency</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,803</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>20,887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration - Excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,262</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>14,464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - Excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,262</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>14,464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contingency Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,379</td>
<td>20,605</td>
<td>41,984</td>
<td>365,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,379</td>
<td>20,605</td>
<td>41,984</td>
<td>365,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Permit &amp; Plan Review Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>5,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>2,671</td>
<td>5,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder's Risk Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td>473</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance and Payment Bond - Excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFVC Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,803</td>
<td>6,235</td>
<td>25,038</td>
<td>110,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contractor Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,422</td>
<td>9,905</td>
<td>29,327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>279,118</td>
<td>164,914</td>
<td>444,032</td>
<td>3,288,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Range: $3.1M to $3.4M</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Project Costs to be By Owner:

- City: Improved Impact & Site Development Fees
- Utility: (including Building, Office, Furniture, etc.)
- Construction Materials Testing
- Owner’s Project Contingency
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COMMUNITY DESIGN MEETING #2 FEEDBACK

DESIGN OPTION RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK
What would you like to "KEEP" from this Design?

Responses

- Can the footprint be smaller?
- What will be the materials on the outside of the addition to work with the existing structure.
- Cut Teenage Area, Community Room, Study Rooms, and Staff Rooms from the program as much as possible.
- Love the roof top! And saving the grass!
- Rooftop love it.
- OMG this is the 4th time I'm typing this. Good work. Like the responsivity to the community this represents. Still wonder if we're not using enough vertical space on the side, but maybe that's just me.
- I appreciated your understanding that where the library is on Manitou Ave. makes it more prominent.
- Also like the way accessibility has been incorporated.
- Great idea putting it behind! Like it all.
- Love the south side!
- Much better design! Keep addition to rear. Like roof deck
- Preserves existing character of library everything
- All of it! Kept the Carnegie has the center piece
- LOVE that you saved the park!!! Thank you!!$
- Putting it on the south side. keeping the addition in the ground. Even lower would be ok.
- Nice new entry...but this has to be a lot smaller. The Park is important.
Responses

The deck area
All of it!
Love the minimal approach!
Love roof top!

Preservation of the park and addition to the back of the existing building.

The outdoor space 37607
What would you like to "TOSS" from this Design?

Responses

Stop

Attention on young people is a very welcome addition. Rooftop "garden" area is perfect for numerous events, classes, etc. as well casual reading and meeting area.

Building is the perfect size. Keep as is.

We need to give Ratio a different program so that the building can be smaller and the park can be maintained.

I think that you've addressed the ADA accessibility with the north.

Don't see anything I'd toss

Pleasantly surprised by this design! Great job!

The rooftop space is brilliant, but I can't stop wondering if it shouldn't be taller so that the addition brings more value to the footprint? Still. LOVE THIS CONCEPT.

Keep the rooftop. Very important to have outdoor learning space and a place to gather.

Good redesign. Are those planters in front of the lower level facing Manitou Ave?

I love the roof top deck

Don't toss rooftop

Increase the parking? Two ada and one drop off/10 minute spot...

Don't toss anything

Nothing. This is a great design. You listened. Thank you.

This is an improvement over all of the previous designs. Can you shrink the Previous-Thorp program so that the building can be a lot smaller?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't toss roof top!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of outside learning can take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooftop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like it all particularly the deck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would you like to "CREATE" from this Design?

Responses

Fantastic presentation! Please do not go smaller. :-)  
We'll also have Hiawatha Gardens community center in the future for community functions. 
With the MAC space and Hiawatha we would only need a small addi

This was a good presentation 😊

Thank you for your kind consideration of the comments and concerns of the folks of Manitou!

I really like the design as presented. The library needs to be large and have good ventilation for future pandemics.

"Literary arts" belong in the LIBRARY, not at the MAC. It would split library staff between two buildings, and increase workload on the MAC staff which consists of just THREE full time staff.

Bird houses.

Please reduce the size of the building more, Denise.

Where are the spaces for public art/interactive moments for patrons?

Permanent We live in the hills! Of course it's Streep..

How about a geo exchange system for heating and cooling?

Thankyou for retaining the historic look!

Being outdoors with children is so important. This space is invaluable.

More windows and doors opening onto the patio.

Community garden/learning/pollination park?
Responses

Bird Feeders  Solar panels? Since it's in south side?

Yes to outside learning

Need to think about how to keep this cool with climate change and adapt plantings, yes. Love the flexibility.

Shift some of the functions to the MAC.

Having the literary arts at the MAC is a positive addition and allows the addition to be even less.

More outside seating.

Rooftop outdoor space for learning, concerts, meeting space, enjoying the park with sitting area. So many options for the outdoor space.

All of that! Pollinator, yoga, public art, events, performances...so many possibilities!

Yes, a more open flat area for yoga, music, (maybe with an awning just in case) and move pollinator plants to the edges?

It would be great for Ratio to make a more "permeable" wall between the inside and outside at the roof garden.

What to do with the steep area in the front of the library...

I believe we should consider continuing to use the MAC to fulfill some of the community functions that the Library District wants to have in the CL libra

Yes to outside living and learning!  Like the rooftop

Yes yoga!!!!  Yes!!!! BEEES!!!!!
COMMUNITY DESIGN MEETING
#1 FEEDBACK

3 DESIGN OPTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>86% Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keep</strong></td>
<td>69 Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes over the front too much. I fear this would be a terrible look standing on the sidewalk and the avenue. It sticks out too much.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the out of the box thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the mix of old and new but need to soften the sharp edges and blend into the park more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very creative and exciting ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative, but it is not Manitou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not do the minimal required by the ADA instead of making a monster?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm really afraid of this. I think it dominates the park with this wedge thing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold looking new construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are kidding right? this would really take over the front of the park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that it moves Children's from the current area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenness of park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection of park views from inside the library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library park with slab sticking out. do not like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love how it puts the Carnegie library on a pedestal visually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subterranean idea is exciting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The view is of the building and park setting. There are not really views from the library--its a parking lot across the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses

Large after hour space for use to all, including non library users.

It is a bold approach, but is a bit visually jarring?

I'm not sure I like the deck.

does not do it for me. Really disturbs the park the library is in.

Can this "deck" be minimized?

Lose the freeness off park, but easy access

Low impact to park

Wonderful presentation from the street (Craig Evans Carnick)

We don't need more meeting space. We have lots of other building options in town for that.

Flexibility of library space - nice and open

It preserves greenspace yuck

make the original building look small and silly

No no no I think it is visually interesting.

This option is great for community gatherings still keeps all the open space

The roof top deck is a good idea. But the rest of the design clashes too much.

makes the library look silly

Low profile. But roof maintenance!

Great use of this space and showcase the original library

Are we doing #3 or #1? Like the use of the rooftop deck but might be noisier for music.
Responses

Love the community focus  Rooftop deck is great

Meeting room flexibility to be open after hours

How much additional Sq ft is added?

Nope, this is horrid  Keep it all! Toss nothing!
(Craig Evans Carnick)

Ruins the front pf the building and disrupts the timeless design

position in middle of park  I like it all

Keep trees, sledding hill, and wall  Low profile

Nothing  what is the increase in sft? why so big?

Large amount of glass/windows; the Carnegie is still the focal point; it actually allows for more use of the park than currently available; easy flow of the library.

This significantly obscures the historic structure and park setting.

Community meeting space outside of meeting room.

Can you do park roof instead of sterile looking space?

Not much, but the concept of the usable rooftop is a good idea. The modern design just clashes with the beautiful building.

Outdoor deck is fantastic!

I like the impact on the hill, and how it enhances the original Carnegie. I like the outdoor options, but I feel like it does relatively little to increase usable space

low/small profile and large accesible patio

It welcomes good views, with open space.

Yuck, it overwhelms the space.
Responses

| Love the community focus |
| Meeting room flexibility to be open after hours. |
| Outdoor space. | Low impact to park | I like it all! |
| That it preserves the green space on each side. |
| low profile of addition | Hill is more manageable |
What would you like to "TOSS" from Design Option 3?

Responses

Very light

nice effort, but it really trashes the park setting. I've never heard that we need a massive deck thing

who really cares what people wanted 20 years ago? we have internet now and i'd like to see us compliant with the ADA with the smallest possible increase in footprint.

The design team is off base to have presented #3 in such a contrasting finish. Had the finish been much more complementary to the original building, ma
cuts the park with this wedge, to much of a square thing jutting out
cReaTive, but I would toss most of this

some of the square footage

I would toss the size of the addition. Maybe 2000 sq feet instead of what is proposed

this is a monster gang plank - go away go away
toss this. In 20 years this thing will be REMOVED. I like almost nothing with this concept.
hides too much of the first floor from the avenue

The ADA accessibility on this design doesn't feel as feasible as the others

We need to put the meeting rooms and study rooms etc in the MAC as a PPLD annex.

Could the facade of the pedestal be red brick? (Craig Evans Carnick)

blend the 2 designs better
too modern, it takes over the cute building

78% Engagement

61 Responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can this design be softened to match the existing library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing! I love it. Please soften the look though</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it takes over the park too much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of addition in front of building - any chance of shrinking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are Options 2 and 3 intended to be So jarring that we have no choice but to accept the overly massive/expensive/unneeded addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too cold and modern look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The view from street level is great. Carnegie would love this!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Craig Evans Carnick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing. This seems to address the issues that have been raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to meet code the railing would have to be much more dense than you show it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toss the slab idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty much everything. The modern design clashes with the historic building. It looks horrible from the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you plan to work in the Rockey sculpture that the Morlands are working on. It was intended to be front and center in the a garden that would no longer exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultramodern design is too harsh. It hurts my brain when I try to visualize how it would look from the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toss any thing that takes over as this one does the front of the site. Creative, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hides the beauty of the existing structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor street view - looks like a jumble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep all of it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses

Love it | Nothing

Perhaps not as far out from the front of the Carnegie?

Although I love modern architecture, this addition is SO VERY OUT OF CONTEXT.

all of these options at >3600 sf are way too big....

I’m worried about the maintenance of that flat roof.

the deck | toss this option

It welcomes good views and open spaces

materiality seems to clash with most of Manitou

The stark glass and metal feel that is at odds with the historic feel of the library.

I love this option. Keep the deck.

Creates both indoor and outdoor space (Craig Evans Carnick)

I worry about foundation conservation with it mostly underground/semi-underground

The whole addition.

Trees and sled hill are preserved.

Do not like how it impacts the front

The modern structure | Preserves more green space

Visually it doesn’t really make any sense. Looks really strange.

How much does this cost?

Like the low impact and making center useable

Do not like it as it disturbs the front of the building. NO NO
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After hours use of meeting room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| what is the sft? why so big? | I love it  
(Craig Evans Carnick) |
| retain same entrance | Good outdoor space useful |
**What would you like to "CREATE" from Design Option 3?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>create? not much here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great space for music venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can think of little I like about this that could be taken to the next level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More historic look, green roof, railing that is more historic looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does upper and lower patios need to be so large?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce footprint by 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrap this idea and move on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blend with park and historic structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sitting areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic rail and green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blend the deck into the park contour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can think of little that could be taken forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blend in with park more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A park that would flow all around the Manitou Library...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railing isn’t to code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed, blend in with more appropriate building materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses

Green roof.  Green roof is a great idea

Blend with existing structure

Use more appropriate materials to tie it into the existing structure

change fascia to more historic look  recycled paper

Green space  Make the deck a green roof.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The &quot;heart of the park &quot;gets used as it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would keep nothing from Design Option 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why scale back? Make a great, not second class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shove this to back of the lot!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better than the first option, that dominated the front of the building. At least this is to the right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find the addition a jarring contrast to the existing building -- I do not think that the modern design can complement the aesthetics of the park and the Carnegie Building. Although it would be somewhat less conspicuous by being on the west side, it would still be a disturbing design. The existing building is a cultural and aesthetic icon; this would be a mess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did you choose to submit such &quot;blends&quot;? Every meeting I've attended has stressed the appreciation of our historic building and the continuation of that period of architecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the glass and openness. Like #3 for the roof gives more meeting space. Our community needs space for meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We like the footprint of #3 and with more complimentary matching of exterior finish we think it would be a winner. Given the same changes to #2, it would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like off to the side better. #3 took away from C bldg rather than enhance it. If #2 could be soften a bit while keeping the modern looking glass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soften to match historic building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like that it honors historic building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can’t something like this be pushed behind the existing building? This really takes over the western part of the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still need to keep the functionality on the inside, but keep trying to reduce the outside visual impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the glass upper story looks like a prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a minimal ADA accessibility option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love this option the most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a lot is underground; preserves the front approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that more goes underground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of underground space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option allows for more green space not as obtrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detracts less from historical structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like the deck for outdoor reading and green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can more be built to get back and less to the side?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People keep talking about making it smaller. Is that an option?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could this be moved underground with a green roof?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that more of the addition is in the ground. But can’t this be on the south or back of the existing building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views from library of the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to know what is the actual research on 21st century libraries. Community meeting and children after hours space is a separate issue. We have other building in town, like the schools and possibly Hiawatha Gardens for these uses. Everyone agrees we need to add ADA accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks like really functional space and aesthetically pleasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like that this doesn't overtake the original building and park quite as much.....but it still seems a bit overwhelming. I like windows, but its too modern looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love this option. Makes me think of the Louvre addition in Paris.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to be able to compare floorplans to really speak to the function of all additions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can the floor plan be reconfigured to allow access to after hours meeting space use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love being able to see through the entry!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preserving a lot of the park by going into the hillside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i prefer this over #3 because the addition is hidden from the main road through town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like this better than the addition to the front but the size is very overwhelming from the front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love the green roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTHING!!! Why did you just throw on a modern building to our historic library? HPC will never approve this as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is ok. Love the green roof. Needs to blend a bit better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGain, I like the glass and windows. The environmental aspects are wonderful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the green roof</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses

again.. who decided all of your options have to be so large? why not an option to do the minimal required to comply with ADA?

Smaller visual footprint

Keep the prominence of existing building

I like this better---less intrusive at the front. Like the bermed concept.

This is my 2nd favorite. I like #3 better. Green roof

Like how this blends history with modern day

move all this to the back Centralized entrance

Negative or problematic comments need to provide solutions
What would you like to "TOSS" from Design Option 2?

Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why didn’t RATIO listen to the feedback of keeping with the material use? Now, are they going to go back and render new designs? What a waste of time.</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are options 3 and 2 intended to be so jarring/contrasting with the existing building that we are left with the gigantic option 1?</td>
<td>14 Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>still too much of a slab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow is not as open for flexible use of interior space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>option 2 seems very large; I would toss its extension into the hill; I would toss the removal of a tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe just move it further back a little bit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make it smaller! It takes over too much of the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much, pretty cool! This is a great design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to see the addition set back into the hill even more.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore this concept on the east side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ultra modern look.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takes over too much of the western part of the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too far forward!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What would you like to "CREATE" from Design Option 2?

Responses

- the idea of changing the geometry has merit
- smaller footprint.
- The kids use the other side of the park for sledding too!
- This could be improved by moving it to Duclo, to the back!
- Keep additions on the west side. Just reduce size
- Slightly varied shape to save hill
- Reduce sledding hill impact  save the sledding hill!
- Natural light is great......but will there be sufficient natural light on the bottom level? )of design 2 and 3)
- Ratio could design a fantastic library annex within the MAC 515.
- The narrower and farther back option
- create from this, the cute, historic, well sized building to this space. SAVE the park and western part of the park!
- It would be great if the addition only took care of Handicap Access and was very small----and if all of the other functions were built at the MAC.
- How many people actually use the sledding hill?
- can't it go behind the existing building!
What would you like to "KEEP" from Design Option 1?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This design does not highlight the beauty of the original building, but detracts from it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only think is that the brick and massing honored the original building, but this think takes over the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like this design the best, in terms of aesthetics. It blends better with the existing building and the park. I do feel the emphasis on the sledding area is overdone. Nonetheless, this tends to be somewhat grandiose. Does the addition really need to be this large? Would half of the apparent expansion satisfy our needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 is the only decent option. It can be scaled back and still serve the purpose of expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So ugly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it's not the hill... it's the park!! Most of us don't want to replace the park with a concrete monster. For me, the problem with all of these options is their size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how does this honor the small historic building? Little here worth saving, unless it can be moved to the back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I agree that the sledding hill needs to be put in perspective. As does the emphasis on retaining a single evergreen tree (evergreens tend to grow quite quickly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for many &quot;sledding hill&quot; is moniker for &quot;open park space&quot; not sledding per se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love historic presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why give up open space and a priceless sledding hill for meeting rooms??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It at least flows with the original design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least appealing option by far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much outdoor space.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses

Nothing. I realize you had to do this one. It isn't as functional as the other two.

Historical compatibility

Really appreciate the attempt to blend with the historical style of the original building. The scale seems appropriate as well.

This is not my favorite choice    It's beautiful

I'd like to see the flower garden preserved in the front of the building.

Looks big    Blending w existing sr

we are here because, this is a GIANT imposing addition.

Definitely looks like it honors the original Carnegie design...seamless!

Keep the sledding hill it is used every time there is snow

it attempts to mimic the historic architecture

Options 2 and 3 do not match any Architectural design In The entire city of Manitou Springs . If anyone has noticed one of the trees in question is dying.

Historic design feels like Manitou!

Opt 1 is a behemoth - hate it.

When institutions like the sledding hill are destroyed it incrementally kills community cohesion.

this was terrible, with a drive way in the back - we do not need more drive throughs

It looks functional and safe.

Sledding hill needs to be put in perspective

I can't tell if its the materiality or the design....but this one definitely blends best with the original structure.
Responses

little  I agree with Nancy  a monster, a beast

almost nothing
## What would you like to "TOSS" from Design Option 1?

### Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hope someone considers how many responses recommend downsizing these monster options...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we vote on which option we like the best?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of these are to large. No smaller scales presented!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominates the original building and takes over the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How about bees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - art element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please no talking trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we toss the negative attitudes that are not grounded in reality? If you love that building and want it to continue as a library, expansion has to happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it takes over the park, does little to respect the historic building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many ways to connect 2 or 3 to the original bldg. Extended brick walls, brick side and complimentary facia are just two. Modern can be warm!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Library Park has become a very important place for people who live here. An oversized addition and parking lot will ruin the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's be creative! This is Manitou Springs!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the trick here is to take care of ADA needs and not make the building dominate the park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create more of a contrast with something bold and beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if this can be saved, why can't it be moved behind</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses

I have concerns about the size. It seems oppressive and feels like it will crowd the park.

Like the modern design with low height impact

Looks like a state hospital

Seems like it would require more staffing

we are here because this is too big, it dominates the site.

I support the 3656sq ft, that seems right given its smaller than OCC library, which feels small. The current size of the library is way to small, feels c

Perhaps the size could be toned down. I do think it could fit into the spirit of the neighborhood. I don’t like the big deck approach of one of the other designs -- this is a library, not a helipad.

It seems that we are in love with and care more about a building (Carnegie) than the purpose of that building (library). If this isn’t as functional, let it go.

The modern designs 2&3 take us into the future! This addition can’t possibly match the beautiful original.

Totally agree about not letting the sledding hill drive the design. Need data: how many days per year are used for this and how many people does it serve, compared to the number of people who will be served by a well-designed library. Also, how many trees total are on the site and how many will be removed. Again, any design needs to serve the greater good, not special interests.

Looks like an institution and does not feel open and welcoming.

put as much of this to the back of the building

One of the Ponderosa on the west side is dying

good bye park. This is a overwhelming
Responses

Give it more depth and varying roof lines?
this option has no pizazz  Stuck in the past

We need an addition that takes care of handicap access exclusively.
Toss it Boring, monotonous, stuck I agree boring.
Need SOME new elements.
make a basement under this thing and reduce its mass
interior not flexible  Move it the the east side
Boring and repetitive  Highest visual impact, too high
Too huge, not much flex space inside
Toss this option - it's so ugly
Too little emphasis on and integration of outdoors
reduce its size
If anyone has noticed, one of the trees is already dying.
toss the entire concept of option 1
After seeing the other options, this one feels boring.

#3: Boring. Why continue to portray Manitou as a community held hostage to the past?
(Craig Evans Carnick)

How many trees do we loose with this design too big.
The size
monotonous - to be thinking and going into the future the glass of the other two designs (and open view to the outside is a big plus)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I just heard you say the DETAIL of all three of these. How about a 4th and 5th design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please consider scaling back and respecting OUR nature OUR children’s NEEDS for grass and outdoor space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wow. will there be a place to see all the feedback?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks like we got only 2 new ideas. I was hoping we would get THREE fresh ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>why can't Randy's idea of putting it behind, with a large underground element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where can we see the input that others offered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take ideas from this and come up with some more concepts. Where can we see the input????</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build some thing exceptional so that it can become a historical gene in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are a community of nature and small historical preservations. This is all modern large scale! Shame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You keep fiddlingly with your screens so I can't type my answer. STOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murals of mosaics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Central Park is functional community space already</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even new construction in the residential sector of Manitou Springs Hass to be historically sensitive in someway. Options two and three totally ignore the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The greenness of the park is so important in the surround...grass, trees, gardens!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed with the lack of creativity in all these designs. It seems as if Ratio just did what they wanted without listening to community input.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses

Move it behind and to the East too massive
to massive

Change the Program for Ratio so that they can design a smaller addition that addresses Handicap Access alone.

Just looks bigger! shrink it

Isn't this the same square footage as the other two designs?

Explore design to the East.

move behind original building.

Sculpture garden as well as green garden

Add our to the park

wack it back, to the back, to the back. I hope the drive way of this original thing went away

It's entirely possible to do more to match the richness of texture and material in the original. We are lucky to still have an original Carnegie and honoring that while also improving its function should be the goal. The park is the setting for the important function of serving the community's lifelong learning needs. We have other parks but only one Carnegie.

Lighten up interior with skylights on the back

Doesn't seem that there will be a way to make people happy. Can the library just stay at the Mac?

Somehow smaller. So large. put it behind

Make the facade something to be proud to have in our town, rather than a begrudged addition

Too massive - scale it WAY back.

make this beast smaller
Responses

revisit the 3600 sft requirement....make it as small as possible to comply with ADA.

I think the second option could be scaled down if you did away with the deck and made it interior space

Add art

I like #2 with some digging back and alittle bit of Carnegie touches

SHRINK IT

this option 1 doesn't work at all for me. it's so ugly, too much mass.

Recess the addition further back on the hill

Move this behind, make it less massive

Bigger windows more natural light.

Perhaps set it back a bit? Let the Carnegie be the centerpiece.

looks like an ugly institution

Nothing. I lacks creativity.

Integrate outdoor space and make indoor and outdoor flow

toss the entire design of #1 Nothing