

<b>Comment as provided on comment card.*</b>	<b>See Question #:</b>
All of the information at the meeting was about the building - what about education? What's being taught at Hamilton?	20
Hi – Thank you. Designs look great. I'm disappointed over removal of on-site parking and geo-thermal. I understand the "politics" but I'm disappointed that these 2 issues weren't retained, for staff convenience and environmental issues.	7 & 10
How can the 2 <sup>nd</sup> ADA exit join the only other exit out of the gym? What happens if there is a fire in the entry area?	16
How can you be going to bid when you don't have permits?	4
How can you design a building that does not fit within the neighborhood?	12
How can you have no ADA access to the playground except thru the gym lobby?	18
How can you ignore the code and place an emergency generator on the west side of facility? I'm sure the noise from running the generator will not meet code. And I'm sure the folks that live across will be very happy about this.	23
How can you ignore the code by blocking the public view of the city from the park? These views are specifically protected by city code.	14
How can you not look @ the security issues and not address them? The playground is 9-14' above Woodlawn. How can police officers monitor this area when they cannot see into this space?	19
How can you waste tax payers money and simply fill the parking structure with dirt?	17
I am a life long Wallingford resident and product of the Seattle Public Schools. I am raising my 2 young children here, and I am so pleased and proud that they will have the option of attending such a fantastic school. Thanks for your hard work.	
I am disappointed that SPS started this project assuming it could dig up and change half the park and has not heard the community concerns. The school and the park can be better integrated to the mutual support of both. The gym and playfield levels should be from the main (first) floor, making the entire floor plan more accessible to all.	17
I attended the last meeting @ Hamilton to discuss the interface with the park. At that meeting, I expressed frustration with the task of addressing the problems with elevation - the sunken garden the height of the park, and the elevation of the playground. I pointed out that several problems are caused by elevating the playground. I asked why now that there is no longer a parking garage, the playground could not be built at current level. I was not satisfied with the answer I received. After the meeting I asked for a further response via email, but I have not received it.	17
I don't feel the whole process has been very open.	
I find the cost estimate for the change dubious.	6
I have just seen alternate design five. This seems to be a much better use of space – better views of play area from Woodlawn, less hidden space, larger play area.	19

Comment as provided on comment card.*	See Question #:
I strongly believe in our schools and our community. My daughter attends Garfield and both my kids were/are in public school. The plan needs to be modified to be better integrated w/ the community concerns, responsive to the hearing examiner's legally binding decision, while still supporting the kids. All this can be done & I plead with the district to listen & respond.	8
I would like to see the \$5-8 million increase in cost estimated for Alt. Design 5.	6
I'm 83 y.o. man who invariably supports public school financing efforts, but I'm now rethinking that kind of support. It seems that consideration is a one-way street – we citizens give, the School District takes. In this case, the District is taking, in effect, our community garden, the kind of space we have precious little of in Wallingford. Please think of the childless, but normally school-supportive community.	9
I'm concerned that the current architect's project at Garfield is \$40 million dollars over budget – this does not create much confidence in the the budget #s.	5
It is unfortunate that the design progressed to a point that it was not re-evaluated to include the benefits of alternative design five. It does not take a rocket scientist to recognize the errors associated with the district redesign. Shame on whoever was responsible for letting it get to a point of no return.	2
Looks like a good design. 3D art studio good. Wish I was in Middle School. I'm a neighbor – let's move forward!	
Plan and space use appears to be successful & well thought out. Gym roof is a visual disaster! Why cannot the roof be in context with the main building? Curved roof is expensive & will require acoustic expensive treatment. The gym roof is "corney" & appears as a mistake.	12
Re: Hamilton Renovation: Please send confirmation that during construction all current noise ordinance requirements will be met (per DPD) without exceptions or exemptions. Also – dust control. Thanks,	24
The "podding" of age groups is an expensive and needless demolition of the historic interiors – cost overruns for a short-term fad.	22
The current design poses huge safety and security issues w/ the students and the community. Adopt community deign alternate #5.	17
The district could have moved the gym to the west of the site and lowered it so access would be @ grade. The play area would be on the east side and also @ grade. Why didn't anyone use some common sense?	17
The district is saying the design is final - what about the alternative designs?	3
The emergency egress exits into a well – wouldn't this make a great place for homeless folks to sleep? Again a security issue.	15
The facilities dealings w/ the community and development of this design after all the community objection is exactly how Seattle schools alienates community.	2

<b>Comment as provided on comment card.*</b>	<b>See Question #:</b>
The gym and the play area designs make no sense. Building up the play area with fill creates an imposing space that will have limited visibility from the street (which therefore reduces safety) and provides limited access to the community on weekends, etc. Moving the gym to the west side would allow lowering the gym to reduce the imposing structure. A play area on the east side would be visible and accessible from the street, and still at a level that would allow easy access to the park.	13
The gym size is not based on middle school needs, but on adult use.	11
The gym will block protected views, loom over the park, and needlessly eat up open space.	14
The inside of the historic bldg looks great.	
There are significant safety issues with the proposed design that alt. des. 5 addresses (visibility, etc) Can these be incorporated into the design? Too many places to hide, too many places that lack views in.	19
There are significant view issues and linkage issues created by the proposed design that are addressed by alt. des. 5 – can these be incorporated? e.g. rotate and move gym.	14
When the district was relieved of the need for a parking garage why did the designers not look at the opportunity to move and lower the gymnasium, yielding a better project for the school and the community (why not look at win-win solutions!)	17
Why are proposed windows not double pane?	25
Why did you solicit community input?	1
Why didn't you take the opportunity when you found out that a parking structure wasn't need to make the gym fit in better?	13
Why include so much fill when the parking lot is no longer included? Don't fill (save \$) and have a better design on lower level (same as park).	17
Why re-use old energy insufficient windows! We can keep historical aspects in other ways. If we are boasting being a green city – why can't we save energy by using insulated windows. Let's look at the big picture.	25
Why spend \$200,000 ± on bringing fill in and building retaining walls that are not necessary?	17
Will the new Hamilton teach ethics?	21
With the proposed layout can EMS get in and out of the elevated play area? Is it inviting for homeless people?	19
Would like to see info regarding how the alt. des. 5 is \$5-8 million more than current design. Please show cost info,	6

\* We have transcribed comments verbatim. However, it is the practice of Seattle Public Schools that portions of comments that include reference to specific individuals are not published. When such comments are submitted, they will be read by a director.