

**"PEOPLE'S CHOICE" VOTE
METRO HEADQUARTERS**

	<u>EMPLOYEES</u>	<u>VISITORS</u>	<u>OTHER</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
"A" ANDERSON/BOOR/A	18	16	1	35
"B" HOFFMAN/TVA-COLE	84	8	7	99
"C" NAITO/SERA/P&C	14	12	4	30
TOTALS	<u>116</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>164</u>

PERCENTAGES

	<u>% of EMPLOYEES</u>	<u>% of VISITORS</u>	<u>% of OTHER</u>	<u>% of TOTAL</u>
A ANDERSON/BOOR/A	16%	44%	8%	21%
B HOFFMAN/TVA-COLE	72%	22%	58%	60%
C NAITO/SERA/P&C	12%	33%	33%	18%
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>99%</u>	<u>99%</u>
% of TOTAL	<u>71%</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>100%</u>

COMMENTS

"A" Anderson/BOOR/A

- 1 Building "A" has a human scale, while "B" resembles the "Bo Jackson" gymnasium at Nike World. The "A" scheme takes into consideration the livability of indoor and outdoor spaces. Scheme "C" would be great for 1928.
2. I'm for whichever one has ground-level retail! No parking on King Blvd. side!!!
3. More planting and not so slick as "B"
4. Courtyard space is great!
5. Building needs to respond to other buildings around.

6. Building "B" also nice, but seems to flashy and corporate. Extensive use of steel and glass give it a cold high-tech look. Building "A" seems to have a natural richness thru use of materials. Plaza/court very nice.
7. Know that the building takes a strong stand on recycling-government image.
8. Much more environmentally aware and responsive to the surrounding context.
9. Building A addresses public entry (particularly handicap access) better than B & C. B ignores handicap access completely and seems cold and impersonal. Building A is much more inspiring scheme.

"B" HOFFMAN/TVA-COLE

1. It looks as if it could be energy efficient.
2. Very exciting.
3. By far the best.
4. Looks like the best example of letting in light to the building and making it look modern.
5. Like roof top employee area, light. Glassy. I think the courtyard should be more park-like and pedestrian/lunch crowd oriented.
6. Given light, like use of tower. Good use of the view!
7. I like the openness. My concern would be for economics in heat costs (glass). It has a futuristic flair
8. Plaza needs landscape architect! Street level seems cold and unfriendly. More planters.
9. Very surprised at the archaic design on #C(Naito). They did such an outstanding job on Montgomery Park. Make it white like the model.
10. Maximization of natural light source is most desirable. Rooftop pedestrian access for lunches, etc. is most desirable.
11. Thanks for asking input! As part of voting, would have been nice to see more information about other options the contractor is offering, i.e., windows that open, skylights, etc. I'd hate to vote for a pretty face and find out we'd lost more important things.
12. Like tower use. Looks high tech and clean lines (C looks "too governmental") (A looks to warehouse-like).
13. Would like to have some details to see also.
14. I really like the thoughtful approach evident in Building A. Building C's restoration approach is a good idea that doesn't work in this context. Building B is clearly the best choice: the integrated design, the use of the tower, the large windows, the rooftop access all make a strong statement and evidence intelligent use of a limited budget.
15. Would like to see employee area outside covered and uncovered.

16. Like the amount of windows!
17. The green glass is very unattractive. Try a different color.
18. Less parking. Lots of windows.
19. Great design!
20. WOW!
21. Maximizes interior light,
22. Like the windows and "airy" feelings
23. Go for it!
24. I favor the high quality construction materials used by Hoffman Construction Company.
25. Take of the "awnings" on first floor. They make it look like a store still.
26. Interior and other amenities are probably more important.

"C" NAITO/SERA/P&C

1. Bldg B - Excellent use of tower; Bldg A Very poor use of tower, Bldg A Best Plaza
2. Further enhance entries (no fountains).
Do not paint brick - integral materials.
Change yellow brick color to pink/gray tones.
No green glass.
Develop useable outdoor spaces.
3. Bldg "B" looks like a sewage treatment plant designed by NASA.
4. Only proposal that preserves the historical architecture.
5. Excellent use of existing structure.