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The 1992 annual is the 10th Volume of *Architecture Chicago* in our continuing efforts to chronicle the work of the Chicago architectural community. The annual is a valuable historic document and we hope it will be considered so in the years to come. It represents the work of firms and individual members, students and long-time practitioners.

We are pleased that this issue will also be available for the National American Institute of Architects Convention in Chicago in June of 1993, where we will concurrently host the International Union of Architects for the first time in the United States as we celebrate the centennial of the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition.

This year will also commemorate the first joint awards program of the Distinguished Building Awards and the Interior Architecture Awards. Our efforts to focus our activities on strengthening the image of the architect in the community are manifested in this document, where we represent the contributions of excellent work by our members.

*Linda Searl AIA*

President Chicago Chapter AIA
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Award Submissions
1. Sportsgirl Centre
Melbourne, Australia
Anthony Belluschi
Architects, Ltd.
Photo SPG/Don DuBroff and Trevor
Mein Photography Pty. Ltd.

2. Ralph H. Metcalfe Federal
Building
Chicago, Illinois
Fujikawa Johnson and
Associates, Inc.
Photo Peter Fish Studios

3. Oak Brook Bank
Oak Brook, Illinois
Booth/Hansen & Associates
Photo Paul Schismann

4. Park National Bank
Mt. Prospect, Illinois
Cordogan, Clark &
Associates
Photo Tim Hobbs

5. Mercy Medical in Chatham
Chicago, Illinois
Photo Vol Studio Photography,
Val Constantin

6. Boogie’s Diner
New York, New York
Himmel/Bonner Architects
Photo Este Photographs,
Scott Francis

7. Randolph-Wabash Self-Park
Garage & Retail Center
Chicago, Illinois
Lucien Logrange and
Associates, Ltd. and Desman
Associates
Photo Gregory Murphey
Photographer, Inc.,
Gregory Murphey

8. 633 St. Clair Place
Chicago, Illinois
Loebl Schlossman and
Hackl, Inc.
Photo Steinkemp/Ballogg
Photography, James Steinkemp

9. Bradford Exchange
Niles, Illinois
Thomas Hickey & Associates
Photo Paul Zokoian

10. Ameritech Center
Hoffman Estates, Illinois
Lohan Associates
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Steve Hall
11 Dain Bosworth/Gaviidae
Common II
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Lohan Associates
Photo Balthzzer Korob Ltd.,
C. M. Koreb

12 Greyhound Bus Terminal
Chicago, Illinois
Negle, Horrsey &
Associates Ltd.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing,
Marco Lorenzetti

13 Masseturm
Frankfurt, Germany
Murphy/John
Photo H. G. Esch, Todd
Swiechowski, Raimund Schoeck

14 American National Bank
Mokena, Illinois
Olivieri Brothers Inc.
Photo Olivieri Brothers Inc.

15 America Plaza
San Diego, California
Murphy/John (design
architect)
Krammenhoek McKeown &
Associates (associate
architect)
Photo Ryan Roulette Associates,
Ryan Roulette
17 One North Franklin
Chicago, Illinois
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Photo Steinkamp/Bollagg
Photography, Jim Steinkamp

18 AT&T Corporate Center/USG
Buildings
Chicago, Illinois
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Photo Hedrich-Blessing,
Nick Merrick

19 DiNolfo's Banquets
Mokena, Illinois
Olivieri Brothers Inc.
Photo Olivieri Brothers Inc.

20 1770 First Street
Highland Park, Illinois
Optima, Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Bill Hedrich

21 Corporate Headquarters
HMO of Wisconsin
Souk City, Wisconsin
Rozovics & Associates
Architects
Photo Dale Holl Photography,
Dale Holl

22 No. 2 Cabot Square
London, England
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Photo Skidmore, Owings & Merrill,
Adrian Smith
Crate & Barrel Flagship Store
Chicago, Illinois
Solomon Cordwell Buenz & Associates Inc.
Photo Hedrich Blessing, Steve Hall

Oakbrook Center Expansion II
Oak Brook, Illinois
Solomon Cordwell Buenz & Associates Inc.
Photo Sadin Photo Group, Ben Altman

Momochi Housing Complex
Fukuoka, Japan
Tigerman McCurry Architects
Photo Esto Photographs, Peter Aaron

Chicago Bar Association
Chicago, Illinois
Tigerman McCurry Architects
Photo Von Inwegen Photography, B. Von Inwegen
Residential

28
Anderson Residence
Merrill, Illinois
Timothy Anderson and
Optima, Inc.
Photo David Clifton

29
The Residences of
Cityfront Place
Chicago, Illinois
Gelick Foran Associates Ltd.
Photo Gelick Foran Associates Ltd.,
Michoel Gelick AIA

30
Architect’s Residence
Longoria Key, Florida
Robert Diamont, FAIA
Photo Moore Photographic Group,
Bill Wingo

31
A Dwelling for
Michael Diversey
Chicago, Illinois
Bedine Architects
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Jon Miller

32
10 West Elm Apartments
Chicago, Illinois
Thomas Hickey & Associates
Photo Paul Zakarian
Kaplan Residence
Chicago, Illinois
Johnson and Wilson, Architects
Photo Korant & Associates, Barbara Korant

Clark/Delaware Townhomes
Chicago, Illinois
Roy H. Kruse & Associates Ltd.
Photo Roy H. Kruse & Associates Ltd., Sal Goeta

Maud Street Residential Development
Chicago, Illinois
Roy H. Kruse & Associates Ltd.
Photo Roy H. Kruse & Associates Ltd., Sal Goeta

850 West Eastwood
Chicago, Illinois
London Architects Ltd.
Photo Thomas Cinniman

Idema Residence
Glenn, Michigan
London Architects Ltd.
Photo Cable Studios, Wayne Cabin
38 401 East Ontario Apartments
    Chicago, Illinois
    Nagle, Hartray & Associates Ltd.
    Photo Hedrich Blessing, Jim Hedrich

39 The Stone Still House
    Libertyville, Illinois
    Moses Associates, AIA
    Photo H.K.M. Interiors, I.B.M.

40 Camp in Southern Michigan
    Bridgman, Michigan
    Nagle, Hartray & Associates Ltd.
    Photo David Clifton

41 Montgomery Place
    Chicago, Illinois
    Nagle, Hartray & Associates Ltd.
    Photo Hedrich Blessing, Steve Hall
Residential

The Courts of Northbrook
Northbrook, Illinois
Optimo, Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Jon Miller

North Pointe
Evanston, Illinois
Optimo, Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Bill Hedrich and Rich Sistos Photography, Rich Sistos

Private Residence
Harbert, Michigan
Michael J. Pado AIA
Architect, Ltd.
Photo Michael J. Pado

Island House
Washington Island, Wisconsin
Frederick Phillips and Associates
Photo Gregory Murphy and Bruce Van Inwegen

Garibaldi Square
Chicago, Illinois
Nagle, Hartry & Associates Ltd.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Steve Hall
Hamilton Residence
Riverside, Illinois
Sher-Bergstrom Associates
Photo Sher-Bergstrom Associates,
Dean Sher

Zaiser Residence
Naples, Florida
Harry Weese Associates
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Steve Hall

Sullivan Residence
Oxford, Maryland
John Syvertsen Architect
(O'Donnell Wicklund Pigazzi
and Peterson Architects, Inc.)
Photo John Syvertsen

Colton Palms
Colton, California
Valerio-Associates
Photo Korant & Associates,
Barbara Korant

Gunnison Townhomes
Chicago, Illinois
A. William Seegers
Architects
Photo Kildow Photography,
William H. Kildow

Lincoln Park Residence
Chicago, Illinois
Youngman & Company, Inc.
(with David Hansen, AIA)
Photo Hedrich-Blessing,
Marco Lorenzetti
Forest Bluff School
Lake Bluff, Illinois
Booth/Hansen & Associates
Photo The Arkansas Office, Timothy Hursley

Illinois State Library
Springfield, Illinois
Graham, Anderson, Probst & White
Photo Karrent & Associates, Jamie Podgett

Motorola Museum of Electronics
Schaumburg, Illinois
Booth/Hansen & Associates
Photo The Arkansas Office, Timothy Hursley

Northwestern University Residence Hall
Evanston, Illinois
Booth/Hansen & Associates
Photo George Lambros

Black Center for Curatorial Studies, Bard-College
Annandale-on-Hudson, New York
DeStefano/Goetttsch
Photo Esto Photographies, Peter Aaron

Naperville Municipal Center
Naperville, Illinois
Fujikawa Johnson and Associates, Inc.
Photo Rodrich Blessing, Scott McDonald
The Oceanarium at the John G. Shedd Aquarium
Chicago, Illinois
Lohan Associates
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick; Samuel Fein

Applied Technology Center,
Grand Rapids Community College
Grand Rapids, Michigan
Perkins & Will (in association with the WBDC Group)
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick

George W. and Edwina S. Tarry Research and Education Building,
Northwestern University
Chicago, Illinois
Perkins & Will
Photo Gregory Murphy

Ray A. Kroc Center for Family Services
Oak Park, Illinois
Garapalo & Associates
Photo David Clifton Photography, David Clifton

Toledo Museum of Art
Toledo, Ohio
Hammond Beeby and Babka, Inc. and The Collaborative, Inc.
Photo Balthauser Karab
Westminster Presbyterian Church
Peoria, Illinois
Philips-Swoger Associates
Photo Balthazar Korab Ltd.,
Daryl Littlefield

Twinkle Passage, Oakton School
Evaston, Illinois
Ross Barney +
Jankowski, Inc.
Photo HNK Architectural
Photography, Inc.,
Howard N. Kaplan

Congregate Complex for Fornof Manor
Streator, Illinois
Serena-Sturm Architects, Ltd.
Photo George Lombros

Harold Washington Library Center
Chicago, Illinois
SEBUS GROUP
Photo The Arkansas Office,
Timothy Hursley

The William G. and Marilyn M. Simpson Center
Chicago, Illinois
Solomon Cordwell Buenz & Associates Inc.
Photo George Lombros

Lake County Museum Addition
Wauconda, Illinois
David Woodhouse Architects
Photo Jess Smith Photosmith
70
Joliet Union Station
Joliet, Illinois
A. M. Kinney
Associates, Inc.
Photo Ricardo Vidargas
Photography, Ricardo Vidargas

71
One North State
Chicago, Illinois
Laubl Schlossman and Hackl, Inc.
Photo Hedrich Blessing, Scott McDonald
Steppenwolf Theater  
Chicago, Illinois  
James, Morris and Kutyla (now listed as Morris Erie Inc.) with Lisec & Bierderman Ltd.  
Photo Chicago Photographic, Russell Phillips

Northbrook Village Hall  
Northbrook, Illinois  
Decker and Kemp Architecture and Urban Design  
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Steve Hull

Village of Vernon Hills Police Department  
Vernon Hills, Illinois  
O'Donnell Wicklund Pigozzi and Peterson Architects, Inc.  
Photo Bruce C. Room AIA

Elmhurst Courts Plus Athletic Pavilion  
Elmhurst, Illinois  
Holabird & Root  
Photo HNK Architectural Photography, Howard N. Kaplan

Arlington International Racecourse  
Arlington Heights, Illinois  
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill  
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick

Chestnut Street Parking Structure  
Chicago, Illinois  
Walker Parking Consultants/Engineers, Inc.  
Photo Bakstod Photographics, Craig Bakstod
1. Mid-America Bank
   Chicago, Illinois
   Books and Dring Ltd.
   Photo: Hedrich Blessing,
   Nick Merrick

2. First National Bank of
   Chicago - Restock
   Chicago, Illinois
   The Architects
   Partnership, Ltd.
   Photo: Poul Schlismann Photography

3. LINC Group, Incorporated
   Chicago, Illinois
   Booth/Hansen & Associates
   Photo: Judith Bromley

4. AT&T Universal Card
   Services, Inc. - Customer
   Service Center
   Jacksonville, Florida
   Davis Associates Architects
   & Consultants, Inc.
   Photo: Steve Kose Photograph
   Dept: Marius Rooks, Insitie
   Horlot Hambright
Bannockburn Park Concepts, Inc.
Bannockburn, Illinois
The DePalma Group Architects, Inc.
Photo Soto Photography, A.Y. Sato

Weber Cohn & Riley
Chicago, Illinois
Environ, Inc.
Photo Coble Studio, Wayne Coble

Progress Credit Union
Chicago, Illinois
Gonzalez Associates
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Jan Miller

First Card - Illinois Bankcard Center
Elgin, Illinois
Davis Associates Architects & Consultants, Inc.
Photo Soto Photo Group, Abby Soto

American Dietetic Association National Center for Nutrition
Chicago, Illinois
Environ, Inc.
Photo Coble Studio, Wayne Coble

Van Den Bergh Foods Company
Lisle, Illinois
Griswold, Heckel & Kelly Associates, Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Marco Lorenzo

Clintec Technologies
Deerfield, Illinois
Horn + Associates, Inc.
Photo George Lombros

Executive Banking Center
Chicago, Illinois
Griskelis & Smith Architects, Ltd.
Photo David Clifton

Navistar International Transportation Corporation
Chicago, Illinois
Griswold, Heckel & Kelly Associates, Inc.
Photo Coble Studios

Bayer Boss Vanderworker
Chicago, Illinois
Thomas Hickey & Associates
Photo Peter Vanderworker

Dai-Ichi Kangyo Bank
Chicago, Illinois
Horn + Associates, Inc.
Photo George Lombros
16  Van Kampen Merritt, Inc.  
    OakBrook Terrace, Illinois  
    Horn + Associates, Inc.  
    Photo George Lombros

17  The Boston Consulting Group  
    Chicago, Illinois  
    ISI (formerly ISD Incorporated)  
    Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick

18  O'Keefe Ashenden Lyons & Ward  
    Chicago, Illinois  
    Lieber Architects Inc.  
    (completed under Swanke Hayden Connell Architects)  
    Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick

19  Ameritech Applied Technologies, Inc.  
    Chicago, Illinois  
    ISI (formerly ISD Incorporated)  
    Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick

20  Powell, Goldstein, Frazer & Murphy  
    Atlanta, Georgia  
    ISI (formerly ISD Incorporated)  
    Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick

21  Security Pacific Business Credit  
    Chicago, Illinois  
    ISI (formerly ISD Incorporated)  
    Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Marco Lorenzetti
Ticketmaster
Chicago, Illinois
McCler
Photo George Lombras

NEXT Computer, Inc.
Chicago, Illinois
Perkins & Will
Photo Hedrich-Blessing,
Marco Lorentelli

FMC Chemical Group
Headquarters
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
LSH/Hague-Richards
Associates
Photo David Clifton

Ameritech Center
Hoffman Estates, Illinois
Lohan Associates
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Steve Hall

Real Estate Office
Chicago, Illinois
Douglas Ross Associates
Photo Darrell White
Union Special
Chicago, Illinois
Techno Ltd.
Photo Poul Schlisman

A. Webster Dougherty
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Tilton & Lewis
Associates, Inc.
Photo Tom Crane, Photography

Management Office
Chicago, Illinois
HSP/Seglin Associates
Photo Paul D'Amato

Old World Trading Company
Northbrook, Illinois
Serena-Sturm Architects, Ltd.
Photo Brad Schenkel

Low Offices of Schwartz & Freeman
Chicago, Illinois
Tilton & Lewis
Associates, Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Marco Lorenzetti
Merchandise Mart Food Court
Chicago, Illinois
Anthony Belluschi Architects, Ltd.
Photo SF/Don DuBroff and Hedrich-Blessing, Bob Shimer

United Airlines O'Hare International Airport
International First Class Lounge
Chicago, Illinois
The DePalma Group Architects, Inc.
Photo Sato Photography, A. Y. Sato

Bannockburn Bath & Tennis Club
Bannockburn, Illinois
The DePalma Group Architects, Inc.
Photo Sato Photography, A. Y. Sato
Commercial / Retail

35

Henry Grethel Studio
Chicago, Illinois
The DePalmo Group
Architects, Inc.
Photo Soto Photography, A. Y. Soto

36

Sidney S. Goldin & Son
Jewelry Salon
Chicago, Illinois
Frye Gillon Molinaro
Architects, Ltd.
Photo George Lembros

37

Dain Bosworth Plaza/
Gavinde Common II
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Lohan Associates, Inc.
Photo Balthazar Korab Ltd., C. M. Korab

38

Sportsgirl Centre
Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
Anthony Belluschi Architects, Ltd.
Photo SPG/DuBoff and Trevor
Main Photography Pty. Ltd.

39

Chicago Architecture Foundation
Shop and Tour Center
Chicago, Illinois
VOA Associates Incorporated
Photo Hedrich Blessing, Mario
Lorenzetti

40

Commercial/Showroom

41

DuPont Resource Center
Los Angeles, California
Eva Maddox Associates
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick
41 Fox Residence
Glencoe, Illinois
Booth/Hansen & Associates, Ltd.
Photo Judith Bromley

42 Cax Residence
Chicago, Illinois
Hancock & Hancock Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Jon Miller

43 Lincoln Park Residence
Chicago, Illinois
Banks/Eukin
Photo William Kildew

44 Angle Remodeling
Chicago, Illinois
Bodine Architects
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Jon Miller
555 Longwood
Glencoe, Illinois
Larson Associates Inc.
Photo Hedrich Blessing, Nick Merrick

Interior Renovation
Chicago, Illinois
David Orr
Photo HNK Architectural Photography

Lincoln Park Apartment
Chicago, Illinois
Seorl and Associates, P.C.
Architects
Photo Karant and Associates, Barbara Karant and Jamie Podgett

Alouf Residence
Chicago, Illinois
Studio One Design Group Incorporated
Photo Salvatore M. Lavinello
Institutional

The Bureau of Workers Compensation and Industrial Commission
Columbus, Ohio
The Lendahl Group Inc./Knight Architects/Patrick & Associates
Photo Hedrich Blessing, Marco Lorenzetti

Massachusetts General Hospital/Ellison Building
Boston, Massachusetts
Hancock & Hancock Inc.
Photo Warren Jagger Photography

Loop Synagogue
Chicago, Illinois
Himmel/Banner Architects
Photo HNK Photography, Howard Kaplan

Chicago Union Station: Passenger Facilities Improvements
Chicago, Illinois
Lucien Lagrange and Associates, Ltd.
Photo Judith Bromley
Oak Park Hospital ICU/CCU & Telemetry Units
Oak Park, Illinois
O'Donnell Wicklund Pigozzi and Peterson Architects, Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Bob Shimer

Standard Club of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
Powell/Kleinssmitid, Inc.
Photo Sodin Photo Group, Ltd., Don DuBoff

Labor, Delivery and Recovery Facilities, Lutheran General Hospital
Park Ridge, Illinois
Rosovics & Associates Architects
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Bob Shimer

Ryerson Hall Renovation
Chicago, Illinois
Ross Barney + Jankowski, Inc.
Photo George Lombros

Harold Washington Library Center
Chicago, Illinois
SEBUS Group
Photo Judith Bromley
Merchandise Mart
Redevelopment
Chicago, Illinois
Jock Train Associates, Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Atevich Studios

Esquire Theater
Chicago, Illinois
Gelick Foran Associates Ltd.
Photo Orlando Cobonon
Photography and Gelick Foran Associates Ltd.

The Metalworks Lofts
Chicago, Illinois
HSP/Seglin Associates
Photo Paul D’Amato

Continental Bank First Floor
Renovation
Chicago, Illinois
Skidmore, Owings and Merrill
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick
Preservation

The University Club
of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
Tigerman McCurry Architects
Photo Hedrich-Blessing
Chicago Board of Trade -
Board Room
Chicago, Illinois
The Architects
Partnership, Ltd.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing,
Steve Hall

101 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois
Anthony Belluschi
Architects, Ltd.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing,
Steve Hall

Helene Curtis, Inc.
Cafeteria
Chicago, Illinois
Booth/Hansen &
Associates
Photo George Lombros

Ameritech Technology
Control Center
Chicago, Illinois
Makus Johnson, Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Jon Miller

John Hancock Center
Chicago, Illinois
Eva Maddox Associates, Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Steve Hall

WMAQ All News 67
Chicago, Illinois
Lieber Architects Inc.
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Jon Miller

Amoco Management Learning
Center
Downers Grove, Illinois
McCler
Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Steve Hall
1. Geneva Riverfront Redevelopment
   Geneva, Illinois
   Hartshorne Plunkard, Ltd.

2. Residential Addition/Renovation
   Chicago, Illinois
   HSP/Saglin Associates

3. Ruff Residence
   Lenox, Massachusetts
   Connors and Farr

4. Peterson II Residence
   Bloomfield Hills, Michigan
   Dick Denison Architect

5. Building at 840 North Michigan Avenue
   Chicago, Illinois
   Lucien Lagrange and Associates, Ltd.

6. Chicago Bar Association Headquarters
   Chicago, Illinois
   Lucien Lagrange and Associates, Ltd.

7. St. Francis Catholic High School Proposed Gymnasium
   Wheaton, Illinois
   John J. Kevil Jr. AIA
The Pyramid Hotel
Orlando, Florida
Moses Associates, AIA/
Ellerbe Becket Assoc.

Lake Geneva Yacht Club
Lake Geneva, Wisconsin
Michael J. Pado AIA
Architect, Ltd.

United States Post Office/
New Woodfield Branch
Schaumburg, Illinois
O’Donnell Wicklund Pigozzi
and Peterson Architects, Inc.
12 McCormick Place Expansion Program
Chicago, Illinois
Perkins & Will
13 Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc.
Carmel, Indiana
Perkins & Will
14 TWA/JFK Gateway USA
Jamaica, New York
Perkins & Will
15 The Westin Hotel-Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois
Perkins & Will
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
Toronto, Canada
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill

Dearborn Tower
Chicago, Illinois
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill

Friedrichstadt Passagen
Berlin, Germany
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill

Elmhurst Art Museum
Elmhurst, Illinois
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill

Fox Valley Presbyterian Church
Geneva, Illinois
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill

Global Communications Plaza
Rinku Town, Osako, Japan
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Gerhard Landman Residence
Chicago, Illinois
Yetta Starr with Lawrence Gold

Park Lane Hotel
Kyoto, Japan
Tigerman McCurry Architects

Kanseki
Utsunomiya City, Japan
Tigerman McCurry Architects

Clubhouse - River Forest
Tennis Club
River Forest, Illinois
Tilton & Lewis Associates, Inc.
1. Dunham Hall
   Aurora, Illinois
   Cordogan, Clark & Associates
   Photo Tim Hobbs

2. The Plaza Club
   Chicago, Illinois
   Folger's Architects and Facility Design
   Photo Michael Fuss FAFD

3. The Daniel F. and Ada L. Rice Building, The Art Institute of Chicago
   Chicago, Illinois
   Hammond, Beeby & Babka
   Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Jon Miller

4. Playboy Enterprises, Inc.
   Chicago, Illinois
   Himmel/Bonner Architects
   Photo Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick
5  Bouck Residence
   Oak Park, Illinois
   London Architects Ltd.
   Photo Wayne Cable

6  Peoples Residence
   Geneva, Illinois
   Longdon & Woodhouse, Architects
   Photo Judith Bromley

7  Village of Lincolnwood Municipal Center
   Lincolnwood, Illinois
   O'Donnell Wicklund Pigozzi and Peterson Architects, Inc.
   Photo Bruce C. Ream AIA

8  Audio Visual Cabinet
   Chicago, Illinois
   Longdon Associates
   Photo Judith Bromley

9  Spare Time
   Chicago, Illinois
   Longdon Associates
   Photo Judith Bromley
Lincoln Park Playroom
Chicago, Illinois
Kathryn Quinn Architects
Photo: Judith Bromley

Glenbrook North High School Fieldhouse
Northbrook, Illinois
O'Donnell Wicklund Pigozzi and Peterson Architects, Inc.
Photo: HNK Architectural Photography Inc., Howard N. Kaplan

Hyde Park Townhouse
Chicago, Illinois
Rosen and Horowitz
Photo: Salvatore Leviniello

Applied Technology Center, Grand Rapids Community College
Grand Rapids, Michigan
Perkins & Will (in association with the WBDC Group)
Photo: Hedrich-Blessing, Nick Merrick
One North Franklin
Chicago, Illinois
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Photo Steinkamp/Bollogg
Photography, Jim Steinkamp

AT&T Corporate Center
Chicago, Illinois
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Photo Wheeler Photographics,
Nick Wheeler

Continental Bank First Floor
Renovation
Chicago, Illinois
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Photo Hedrich-Blessing,
Nick Merrick

American Standard
Long Island City, New York
Tigerman McCurry Architects
Photo Timothy Hurstley

Electromagnetic Interference
Laboratory
Northbrook, Illinois
Jack Train Associates, Inc.
Photo Barry Rustin Photographer,
Barry Rustin
Allegation. This essay is about how the opinions of selected jurors become the official verdict on Chicago architecture this year. It is not about the thirty or so projects that were given awards, but rather about the circumstances under which they were given their awards. It is also about the differences between the Distinguished Building Awards (DBA) and the Interior Architecture Awards (IAA), for, despite a collaborative effort in organizing the Design Excellence Awards, it seems that there is still a schism between the cultures of the architectural and interiors community not only in Chicago but, as our jurors came from further afield, nationally too.

The Design Excellence Awards Program is important. To Chicago architects it is an accolade from one’s peers. It is great for our morale, for our practice, for our clients and for our marketing effort. The honors program takes on the role of representing the best in Chicago architecture at a national level where this program is so respected that it is replicated and used as a model across the country.

Unfortunately, the profession of architecture is cursed by opinion and how we convey these opinions to each other. It begins with the intense and oft destructive criticism unleashed by often non-practicing academics in architecture school and continues throughout our careers via assorted guises, notably design reviews, architectural magazines and awards programs. Architects are notorious gossips; whilst our intentions are honorable, we don’t always seem to practice what we preach. We are particularly vicious about the work of our colleagues not partial to the current stylistic and political vogues (as appointed and approved by ourselves, solely on the merit of magazine photography). Even in the context of the Chicago Chapter of the American Institute (CCAIA) 1992 Design Excellence Awards Program this phenomenon is manifest. But for the most part, the selections of the juries are reasonably un tarnished by any but the most honorable scholarly analysis. Hopefully, the awards will be viewed as unbiased, intelligent and insightful selections of several projects by distinguished individuals in our field to represent all that is Chicago architecture and design at the current time.

The Design Excellence Awards Program is a snapshot (though some of the images herein do not merit even the accolade of snapshot, but more of that later) of a moment in Chicago architectural history. After this year’s Architecture
Distinguished Building Awards
To recognize significant achievements in the planning, design and execution of recent building projects.

Interior Architecture Awards
The Interior Architecture Awards Program is dedicated to the recognition of excellence in interior work in Chicago, and to the celebration of Interior Architecture as a unique discipline. We look forward to honoring the broad range of quality interiors projects submitted by designers this year.

(from the 1992 Call For Entries)

Chicago has been passed on to potential clients as a marketing tool and been perused by architectural graduates looking for hints of a great design firm in their quest for employment, Architecture Chicago may gather dust for a few years until it resurfaces as a resource for a future scholar wondering why a certain project was considered one of the best new buildings or interiors produced by a Chicago architectural firm in the early 1990's. Unfortunately for the scholar of the future, this essay will not answer their question. What it may do is offer an insight as to how "Exhibit A" got to have a BIG PICTURE and a whole bunch of archiblurb in this book and as to why "Exhibit B" is only depicted via a LITTLE proportioned image. Read on....

The Charge. The jury is empowered by the CCAIA, who represent the architectural community at large, to express an opinion about current Chicago architecture by singling out what it considers to be significant projects demonstrating design excellence. How this evolves, its impartiality and the credibility of this as a process, is the subject for scrutiny here and not the current state of architecture (although this is a key witness). Is the jury process appropriate in expressing this goal of defining design excellence and just what goes on at one of those shrouded-in-secrecy juries?

Jury Selection. The Design and Interiors Committees of the CCAIA are responsible for the selection of their respective awards juries. Their goals are to select distinguished professionals, respected in their fields. As a profession we are interested in our significant peers. Seemingly, these peers are architects (all too rarely in awards programs such as these clients, or those who have to inhabit the world created for them by architects, are selected as jurors). The appointment of architects as jurors no doubt reflects that awards are made to projects for visual excellence more readily recognizable and appreciated by architects (further emphasized and dictated by the required format of the submissions). With this in mind, the members of each committee debate over their favorites starting with a small database of "star-system" names no doubt culled from magazine articles and sexy images seen in recent years. Obviously, you can't have Philip Johnson and Michael Graves every year, so some "lesser-known" names are included. Once approved by the CCAIA Directorship, individuals are asked, many refuse owing to prior commitments (the invitees are significant enough that they plan their schedules at least 6 months in advance), and the final list typically contains second-tier juror choices. First-tier choices unavailable this year are asked earlier the following year (or so the theory goes). The stratifying of potential jurors into "tier choices" in no way reflects their ability as jurors or their qualifications as professionals; more likely it says something about the personalities of the selecting committees and probably something of current trends in the profession.

Although prior jury experience was not a prerequisite in the invitation, most of those selected had done this before, or at least gave that impression. One member from each jury had served on parallel committees at a national level and the DBA jury was honored to be able to include a distinguished AIA Gold Medalist amongst its tripartite ranks.

This year's Interiors Committee threw a bit of a curve ball by the inclusion of an editor of a most significant industry publication. The presence of such an individual is a relatively rare occurrence and so criticisms of such an inclusion are not appropriate to every jury scenario. However this year's IAA jury was the exception and merits some discussion. This juror had the advantage of having seen many of these projects before and in far more detail with than the other jurors would that day. Although this individual was uniquely qualified to select quality projects (this is what she does for a living), her familiarity with those projects previously submitted to her magazine, and indeed those published previously, gave her a critical advantage.
Lesson Number 1  For future jury selection, the editor was a great juror but was perhaps more familiar with some projects than others giving those projects an unfair advantage.

Selected jurors seemed to have some recognition of previously published projects and it seemed apparent that some wholly innocent subliminal campaigning impacted juror’s responses for both the DBA and IAA juries.

Lesson Number 2  For entrants, the more exposure your project has had in magazines and journals, the more likely it is to flip some discrete switch with a juror, prompting at least a second look. The three year window in which a project may be submitted and the eligibility of repeat submissions in subsequent years gives ample opportunity for this to occur.

The Inquisition.  Over private dinners at Le Meridian and the Charnley House the IAA and DBA jurors get to know each other and to meet select AIA and committee members. All profess a great respect for Chicago architecture and expect to see much of it in the subsequent submissions. Both groups are expectant of an obvious continuity in the legacy of Louis Sullivan, Frank Lloyd Wright, Mies van der Rohe, and Skidmore, Owings & Merrill (see the Twenty-Five Year Award)....The IAA folks talk about the Far East (unflatteringly), American design as an export, quality architectural photography and a refusal to accept color xerography for initial magazine submissions. The DBA folks, on the other hand, talk of the Fountainhead, the civility of cocktails on the Charnley balcony, Ross Perot, America and a lack of “socially-aware” architecture (hand in hand with society). All subjects for other essays.

The common thread was an excitement for the projects to be seen. All were flattered by the invitation to Chicago (and for the interiors people, the consideration shown in scheduling the jury to coordinate with Neocon parties) and were truly honored to be part of the process. Both juries subconsciously appointed individuals to lead the discussion (although probably neither would admit to appointing such a spokesperson). In the case of the IAA jury it was the spirited, outgoing individual (quite used to the role no doubt), whereas the DBA jury looked towards their most experienced member. Ironically, the more excitable IAA jury exhausted much of their passion and criticism of the profession in the evening prior to the juries and were far more toned down when presented with actual work, whereas the quieter, thoughtful (though no less passionate) DBA jurors were quite the opposite.

On to the juries themselves....

Opening Remarks.  The IAA and DBA juries themselves were held on the ground floor of the Graham Foundation. Jurors are naturally bowled over by the wonderful setting. But it isn’t the most conducive setting for projection facilities. Both jury days were hot and bright and the projector lamp had to compete with streaks of sunlight through the blinds and a sail-like screen swaying in the cross-breezes from the open window overlooking the Foundation’s courtyard. And it was not until the afternoon session of the IAA jury that a suggestion was made to try and fill the screen with more than 25% of projected image.
Jury organizers should do their utmost to ensure that submissions are seen in the environment which shows them off best (if slides are the media required by the submission, then a dark room would be a good idea). Elegant surroundings and the comfort and accommodation of the jury should be a consideration, too, but without sacrificing other necessities.

"I'm glad I didn't have breakfast...."
"I wish I could have a instant lapse of memory."

Such awards contests as these are frequently criticized for being photo contests, and indeed no apologies can be made against this criticism. Given the resources of the program and the time constraints of the jury and organizers and the minimal entry fee, the standardized entry requirements of ten slides, brief text and appropriate drawings are the only realistic way to compare so many relatively far-flung projects.

Andy Warhol predicted that everyone could have their fifteen minutes....here in the jury room, 15 seconds is a luxury. With almost a hundred entries for the jury to sift, lambast and assign a pecking order in a mere nine hours (including a two hour lunch at the Chicago Historical Society), even the most devoted jurors can’t be expected to spend more than three or four seconds on each slide submitted, even less for those they can’t see so well.

Most projects failed to make the right impression to the jury. Such projects didn’t proceed further than the thirty seconds afforded them to make their first point. Not surprisingly, presentation and first impressions are crucial and whilst most projects were certainly worth a second look, many forfeited that opportunity by making a poor first impression.

If the jurors were slightly strained to pick out the detail on even the most superlative Nick Merrick (or similar) photograph, then some projects (an unfortunate but not insignificant number of entries) virtually eliminated themselves from the outset owing to what must be presumed to be (amateur) in-house 35mm photography. Ironically, both juries consciously paused to peruse these images on the off-chance that there was merit in such projects.

Despite an appreciation for office economics during the current economic climate, it would seem that if an office is serious about submitting and subsequently winning an award, it should be very serious about the impression it makes with its visual images. One sharp, focused image of a project by the best photographer an office could afford, told more than ten underexposed blurbs by another.

Perhaps a good project or two were lost in this photographic discrimination; the unscrupulous time schedule prevented jurors from affording the patience or the eye strain necessary to prevent it. Inexcusably, drawings were also subject to poor reproduction. Occasionally slides were submitted with fingerprints or were very dusty, emphasizing a particularly sloppy submission and not scoring points with any juror.
Lesson Number 5

Future entries can give themselves an immediate edge by reproducing black and white drawings in negative or by using bold color and heavy poché. Many entries had already realized this technique. If such projects did not win awards, the jury was at least able to afford the time to peruse a plan and further understand a project; it made a difference on several occasions and would have been a godsend for those seemingly tempting projects that unfortunately caused too much eyestrain.

By and large, a project made it through to the second round merely by catching a juror’s eye and provoking enough interest in the initial forty seconds of its presentation to warrant further perusal. The IAA jury spent longer in this first perusal and eliminated only half of the entries whilst the DBA jury whizzed through their 84 submissions and eliminated all but 24 entries. One eventual award winner was afforded a mere 18 seconds for its ten slides.

An average-sized project might have spanned three years from inception to completion toiled upon for thousands of hours by dedicated individuals. The sum total of the energies and resources outlaid to complete the almost two hundred projects in these two awards programs would be unimaginable. The efforts in putting together the individual submissions for these two programs probably spans the better part of a week, including photography. The two juries spent the first two hours in relative silence affording each project less than one minute. No project can be critiqued effectively in such a short span of time and this time restraint is probably the single factor that could be considered to significantly devalue the Design Excellence Awards Program.

Evidence. To date not much has been said of architecture. At this stage in the process, the jury has been bombarded by slides and has hardly had the time to be impressed. Any impression made so far has been in the name of image. There are subtle reactions from certain jurors upon seeing a familiar project or designer trademark on the screen.

By the end of the first viewing of all the projects, jurors have made certain codified scratchings in their notebooks; one juror denotes certain projects with an asterisk, others with a less frequent “A”. “A” for award perhaps? All jurors have struck off many projects. These are never seen again (review them with magnifying glasses elsewhere in this book).

It is late morning and the hitherto silent jurors begin to debate. At this point, the two juries begin to express their different personalities and occasional opinions. Differences of direction in their discussions and deliberations are perhaps the natural differences of the individual personalities present. They undoubtedly say something about the differences and rivalries between architects and interior architects.

The jury for the DBA immediately expose their social conscience, admiring community gestures in projects and criticizing their absence in others. The infrequency of inhabited photography and small amount of discussion pertaining to the users in attached verbiage does not convey the architecture in a positive light to any of the jurors. There is also an admiration for appropriately “brash” buildings and a theory emerges amongst the jurors that there are some young, energetic designers putting all that they have into their architecture and their sub-

"We’d better keep some..."
"You mean you want to see it again?"
"I know I’m being promiscuous, but keep it in..."
"I don’t want to keep it in, I’m just trying to understand the world."
missions; a little too much energy on occasion, but the spirit is applauded. These jurors also take time to read plans and question outlandish claims in the written statements some of which are manifestoes for the future of architecture, rather than simple and to the point descriptions of projects. Although the jurors don’t have a problem with architectural manifestoes, it’s difficult to see the wood for all the trees and on the day they are here to look at the wood. This mini-proliferation of manifestoes perplexes the jury who would have preferred their absence. A harmonic collaboration between project and nature coupled with a social awareness were values sought out in selecting projects for merit. Far too rarely was this kind of compassionate architecture readily apparent to the jury especially via the descriptive summaries.

Lesson Number 6

Get to the point. The DBA and IAA programs are not good testing grounds for architectural theory. Try these on your friends first.

"I've seen at least one project that will win an award if I have anything to do with it"

"I'd rather see some crappy, beat up building some farmer had done rather than give an award to this one."

"I applaud the spirit of a person trying to do something...seduced by the person dying to design."

"Interesting fragment but the rest I just don't understand."

"It's much less gooey than some of the others...."

No doubt justified by the aforementioned infamous manifesto, but far less so by the jurors’ irrefutable logic were a proliferation of recurring details that infuriated the DBA jury for the entire debate (and probably resulted in sleepless nights for at least one juror after the event): Why was there a sun screen on the north face of that building? Why was there a sun screen for the executive floors but not for a typical office floor? (Chicago architects are very fond of shading devices and canopies); “Those windows are too high for children...”; “They went to all the effort to make the process so efficient and then it’s all glass.” ...and so on. The focus of the jury is hell bent on a rigorous analysis on how and why the building works and what it does for the users. “This is great”, reports the fly-on-the-wall, and has renewed faith in the system.

A week earlier at the IAA camp, the discussion had been for more congenial and agreeable. In fact the jury had great difficulty in eliminating projects on the second round. Again there were manifestoes, but less passionate, and if the verbiage penned by the entrants for the Interior Architecture Awards should be criticized, it should be for its lack of spark and interest; all ninety or so seemed to have been written by the same marketing person. Not to say that they were badly written, but few invoked the spirit and energy the jury suspected the designers to have utilized on virtually every project.

This general lack of gusto in the IAA jury was a great disappointment. It could have been that the stylistic impression (now we are sounding like a beauty pageant) of each project was so akin to the others and to the work of two of the jurors, not to mention that published by a third, that there was little to say other than by way of compliment (which in turn was reflected in the generous number of awards relative to the DBA). Of course, there were submissions that the jury were less than kind about, and there were those that they were excited (and on one occasion passionate) about. But there was none of the occasional ecstasy or total disgust and restrained anger shown by the DBA jury. This disparity in reaction may be explained by the contrasting backgrounds (and personalities). The IAA jury was rooted firmly in one specific sector of the industry. The DBA jurors were anything but. In both awards categories, work commissioned by such commercial clients was in the majority. Such projects gaining recognition in the DBA program tended to go that extra mile in accommodating users and concurred with the “socially-conscious” needs categorized and deemed essential by the DBA jury. This was in addition to excelling on pure architectural merit (the jury would argue that the latter could not exist without the first).
Just how a project may excel in such non-visual categories and attract the support of a jury is about as ill-defined as the visual category by which architects are so enamored; such a category will be as influenced by a juror’s politics, morals and conscience as the visual category is influenced by that architect’s aesthetic and stylistic values or non-values. The inclusion of a client or user testimony as part of the required DBA and IAA submission might well be a most appropriate addition. If an architect has truly done their job and satisfied their client then such a reference can only serve to accentuate a project’s success. It could also go a long way towards bringing to the jurors’ attention those attributes of a project impossible to represent via photography; the healing qualities of a particular space in a health care project, for instance, or outstanding construction administration, could be two such examples of client testimonies that a jury could take as impartial written evidence that could assist in recognition of excellent architecture fulfilling a client’s needs.

To the credit of the Interiors Committee, they are anxious to encourage submission of traditionally “non-winning” project types; health care, government and other projects were cited in the juror manual. Naturally, this stance was applauded by the jurors but was not reflected in awards made. On the day, the casual observer felt that certain more mainstream projects more in the realm of jurors’ tendencies and experience were given more jury scrutiny and slipped into the awards category; a “minority” project with equal merit went unnoticed when perhaps it should have been given the benefit of the doubt.

Lesson Number 7
Architecture as a profession would do well to better educate itself and its users to the benefits and potential of architecture in such specialty areas as hospitality, health care and government work. The Design Excellence Program should continue to encourage such “minor categories” and ensure that suitable awards be made. Client testimonies should be a mandatory part of the submission.

Had the DBA jury not been so adamant on seeking out “God-sent” qualities the following week, the IAA jury’s relative oblivion to higher ideals might not have been so apparent. That was not the scenario however and it was a major flaw in the IAA jury (although it should not take away from the quality of the award for those who did win; perhaps there should have been even more winners in the IAA). Future programs will hopefully see the inclusion of more projects that would negate these criticisms. And undoubtedly next year when the DBA committee invites three architects specializing in low-income housing there will be parallel disparities inciting harsh criticisms from the more commercially inclined.

Lesson Number 8
When it comes to jurors, variety is the spice of life.

Prosecution. The IAA jurors were not a diverse bunch and were cautious about speaking their minds. The practitioners were quiet, somewhat in the shadow of a rather influential (style-defining) member of their profession. The architects were far more emotional (although not to unnecessary extremes) but were intent on channeling their energies into producing constructive analysis and meaningful awards. Not really interested in who is “in” or with the current vogue, the three architects were conscious and caring about quality of product and our profession. If there is any image they are concerned with, it is that of the profession and its positive contribution.
"An architect has a moral obligation to use his intellect to convey an idea to a client, but all too often we forget to create spaces where we can get God's attention."

"These ideas are so remote from my life that it annoys me."

"I wish I hadn't read the writing. It makes it seem like the building has no integrity and is just an image repository."

"It's just an art object sucking up a lot of energy and resources. Just typical of Americans today to do this."

**Defense.** Architecture certainly does not have the same spatial restrictions inherently imposed on interior architecture, where a twelve foot ceiling is a luxury. There are just not the same orthogonal restraints that inhibit almost every interiors project from the start. The resulting submissions comparatively rely far more on the quality of the image in interiors than they do in architecture where there is greater diversity of form to provide interest and distraction. This is a fact of life for interior architecture in general; the constraints are far greater for the interior architect than they are for the architect working on a building from scratch with the “mere” limitations imposed by site and client amongst others. The interior architect has all of the above plus the restrictions laid down by the architect before them.

This translates to a harder time for the jury who are charged with discovering the subtleties of a great interior space without even experiencing it. Consequently image was often the seductress of this jury. The successful IAA submissions relied often on the theatrical; sexy imagery, expensive (occasionally exhilarating) detail, moments of grace and beauty, and classic interiors were the victors. Interestingly, the DBA jury made many constructive criticisms about interior images supporting the DBA submissions. One barrel vaulted space was criticized for its being punctuated with vertical partitions and a juror illustrated an alternate solution via what he called a “Lou Kahn Sketch”. Another project mystified the jury by the chameleon qualities of its exterior and interiors and would probably have won an award had there been an obvious rationale behind the disconnection of interior and exterior spaces. In both of these cases and others, the project stayed under consideration for an award until the very last moments but ultimately fell short because the photographic evidence was not sufficiently supported by other graphic or written materials.

**Written Evidence.** It is tremendously difficult to focus the energies exerted in the design of a building into the written word. The emotional and spatial experiences are, for the most part, triggered by visual perceptions. The essay has already touched on the recurrence of manifestoes in many submissions when what would have been useful would have been some informative, pragmatic facts supporting a simple (not lofty) design statement. A favorite weakness of many of the written statements was to make a claim about the building without backing it up with any further information. One project stated it had adhered to all of the guidelines laid down in an urban master plan but failed to elaborate on any of those guidelines or how they had influenced specific aspects of the design. Another project description stressed “mystery” and “ambiguity” and really left the jury with some feelings about a project that appeared to have significant merits based upon the visual material but needed further written support to convince the jury. In all cases, short, simple and immediately understandable project statements were appreciated by the jury. Alongside the graphic imagery, the jury was more impressed by architects trying to make a difference with good solid architecture rather than a significant number who are intent on changing the course of architectural theory, thus distracting from their architecture. Despite negative criticisms of their oft well written rationales, these entrants are doing interesting and provocative work, too, but are alienating the jury with an unnecessary arrogance which, in the brevity of the jury process, is dismissing potential award winners.

The successful written pieces seemed in many cases to be descriptions from marketing materials. Such descriptions were well written and penned to support a minimum amount of visual material in an informative way with immediate impact. It would seem that the appropriate written word...
intended for a potential client also struck a positive chord with jurors. The juries were both able to acknowledge the validity of intellectual standpoints but were unable to afford the time or effort to interpret theory in the context of the awards juries and were annoyed if that was the way architects were selling their projects to clients (or envious if clients were able to afford such an extravagance and accept without question an architect’s experiments).

Alibis. The juries did not agonize (too much) at the conclusion of their task about their respective verdicts. Award winners had typically evolved out of the days’ events and the processes hitherto discussed. Time ordained that this segment of the day was somewhat rushed, an unfortunate constraint because debate about why projects were worthy of a particular award was cut short. The IAA committee had deemed fifteen an appropriate number of awards, the DBA committee five fewer for their program. These seemed achievable numbers after the third run-through of submissions. Many award winners had been apparent for much of the day and at this stage the debate was not as to whether an award should be made but as to which award should be made. Those projects that were eliminated at this stage were typically those that despite appealing to one juror still met with major criticisms from at least one of the other jurors. Neither jury awarded any project that met with strong opposition from one of their number, although technically the program permits the award of a Citation of Merit with the support of just one juror.

If it had not been apparent during the preceding eight hours as to which projects were individual juror’s favorites, it now became clear. In the DBA two projects were vehemently supported and so passionately argued for by a single juror that the remaining jurors were swayed into making unanimous awards to those projects. The two “reformed” jurors both acknowledged that had their colleague not been so forceful in conveying a rigorous analysis of the projects to them then they might have failed to make any awards at all and greatly regretted that possibility. The IAA jury spent much of their conclusion deliberating the potential for a “Best of Show”, selecting three candidates and on two occasions deciding on two separate “Bests”. Finally they backed out all together from singling out one project and acknowledged all three equally with an IAA Honor Award. This was a good moment for those participating and the recipients of these awards should feel particularly proud that this year’s Design Excellence Awards Program stimulated such debate and that the IAA program is represented by three such significant and diverse projects. This was certainly one of the messages that the IAA jurors hoped to convey in their selection.

Likewise the DBA jurors felt a responsibility to present a varied and balanced selection of Chicago architecture. Not content that their selections for awards presented that balance as a body of work, the jury went back on its decision to eliminate two earlier projects and juggled them back in. Identifying this scenario in this essay perhaps implies that those two late winners are devalued in some respects. The jury were certainly conscious of this, but insisted on laying blame upon themselves for not making those awards earlier and neglecting the responsibility of the awards program to represent the best of Chicago architecture. Without these two projects the picture would have been incomplete and the jury would have regretted it.

Juror Comments. There was a self-congratulatory air in the Graham Foundation; a feeling of relief that it was over and that it was a job well done. All jurors were truly proud of their participation, contribution and selections. Each juror felt that they could argue in favor of every award made and most certainly...
The quotes punctuating the illustrations are representative of inadmissible evidence; juror comments taken somewhat out of context but illustrating some of the more colorful verbal aspects of the proceedings.

could vouch for the collected awards program and the projects it represents.

At the end of the day, the juries were able to ask those questions that had been nagging them all day; Who did that project?, Was that interior by so-and-so?, Why wasn’t the new Banana Republic store (by New York architect Robert A. M. Stern) submitted? (or others by out of town architects, currently ineligible for the CCAIA Design Excellence Awards Program, though presumably for their own AIA Chapter programs if they are modelled on these awards). Interestingly, the guesses made by all but one juror (who had her useful editorial source) were so far off the mark that it would undoubtedly surprise Chicago architects who typically recognize and take such an interest in their colleagues’ work and assume many local firms to have identifiable signatures. Not so, perhaps, judging from the reactions of these jurors and rather distinguished and knowledgeable ones at that. This is perhaps encouraging that architects are getting on with the profession of architecture and worrying less about self image. On the down side, it was a comment made by both juries that there was an absence of the “stronger”, “tougher”, “liberated” Chicago and a more generic “prissy”, “media-fashioned” imagery that detracts from the quality architecture that the majority of Chicago architects are obviously engaged in producing. Having said that, the jury felt that their selections did transcend these negative aspects and represent a “raw”, “independent”, “tradition of Chicago architecture”.

The Verdict. What is to be learned from all of this? The recipients of the awards celebrated herein should not be distracted by the occasionally negative tones of this essay. Architects are naturally critical beasts and this essay has done nothing to dispel this unfortunate fact. It was a cross that both juries reluctantly bore and it was out of many often disparaging notes made during these “crits” (aka IAA and DBA juries) that this essay evolved. Ironically, out of all the negative energy that we call architectural criticism comes some very fine architecture. Few buildings are without their faults; go on a tour of any Frank Lloyd Wright home and there will be someone criticizing the uncomfortable furniture and complaining about the heating/cooling systems, but the fact that that person is there along with dozens of others is to acknowledge great architecture. It is a simplistic comparison to make, but these two juries spent the majority of their time making frequent caustic remarks about every single one of almost one hundred projects. But to the jury on concluding their selections, and to those of us who will subsequently experience the selections of both juries, it is clear that these projects represent the best of current architecture. To realize any project in the current economic climate should be construed as a success. To succeed in the way the projects honored in this publication have, by satisfying clients, adhering to complex building codes and zoning regulations, implementing complex building technologies and then to be singled out by one’s peers is a magnificent achievement of which both individuals and the profession should be proud.

For those participants who were not honored with awards, perhaps this essay will suggest some lessons to be learned and implemented in future submissions. For a profession that communicates through visual media, we do not always do ourselves credit. Clarity of submission in the way a project is depicted via photograph and drawing with design intents clearly stated in both graphic and written formats is essential to complement an award-worthy project. Such an approach towards presentation should be part of an office’s everyday formula and if an office is able to convince a client of their ability to do a project, then a jury should be a pushover.

It would be impossible to fault the jurors of the IAA or DBA awards. The system defined by both awards committees was the system to which they vehemently adhered. What is interesting to note is that despite personal
architectural agendas and preferences that could be construed as disparate from the agendas of projects submitted, the final awards do not indicate this bias and in the case of the DBA there was some reaction against their own biases in the name of impartiality. There would seem to be a proportional correlation between the types of projects submitted and the number of awards made in each category. Of the two juries reviewed here, it would have to be said that the diversity and directness of the DBA jury was preferred by this author to the overly compatible IAA jury. Future juror selection might take this into account as a factor for providing for more lively debate although (apart from the exception in permitting observers for the purposes of this account) as the jury is usually done behind closed doors there might be little value for this reason alone. It may, however, encourage a broader range of project types to be submitted in future years, reflecting the diversifying of project types in the evolving marketplace.

**The Sentence.** The jury process itself and the validity of it as part of the Design Excellence Awards Program culminates in this journal and its contents. It is not necessarily a debate on architecture, although the social needs of our society and how we are serving them as architects or interior architects (alluded to elsewhere in this essay) is an important topic to which we should all be responding, but it is how we are representing our work and our profession not only to ourselves but to clients and to the public. The responsibilities of this architectural trial by jury are great in acknowledging that these awards represent what the architectural profession has to offer and are what it rests its laurels upon. In a 1938 article on juries in *The Architectural Forum* it was suggested that the entrants select the winners; upon seeing this publication it would be interesting to hear from those who do not believe that these projects are not wonderful architectural ambassadors for Chicago and that their selection by distinguished outsiders adds a credibility and stature to a program of which the Chicago Chapter of the AIA should be proud. The verdict is in favor of the defense.

*Peter J. Exley AIA*

The author is an architect practicing in Chicago and a member of the Chicago Chapter of the American Institute of Architects Design Committee who invited this essay. In the preparation of this essay, two candid evenings were spent over dinner with the esteemed jurors of the Distinguished Building Awards and Interior Architecture Awards prior to “fly-on-the-wall” jury sessions the following day.
The Distinguished Building Award of the Chicago Chapter AIA began in 1955, setting a standard for design competitions at AIA chapters nationwide. The award is in recognition of significant achievements in the design, planning and execution of recent
building projects. Eligible projects include those completed between 1 January 1989 and 1 May 1992 designed by registered architects in the Chicagoland area. Projects may be located anywhere. Two Honor Awards and five Certificates of Merit were awarded this year. Three projects entered under the Preservation category were judged separately, by another jury examining different criteria. Of these, two received Honor Awards and the other a Certificates of Merit.

Jury

1. Joseph Esherick FAIA
   Esherick, Homsey, Dodge & Davis
   San Francisco, California

2. Samuel Mockbee FAIA
   Mockbee/Coker Architects
   Canton, Mississippi

3. Billie Tsien
   Tod Williams/Billie Tsien and Associates
   New York, New York

Historic Preservation Jury

4. John Belle FAIA
   Bayer, Blinder, Belle Architects & Planners
   New York, New York

5. Michael Jackson
   Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
   Springfield, Illinois

6. Anthony Putnam
   Taliesin Associated Architects
   Spring Green, Wisconsin
Manilow Residence  
Chicago, Illinois

Design Architect: Max Gordon RIBA  
Principal in Charge: John Vinci FAIA  
Project Manager: Philip Hamps AIA  
Project Architect: Thomas Conway  
General Contractor: Gerhardt F. Meyne Co.  
Consulting Engineers: Structural Associates, Inc.,  
SLS Consultants, Inc.,  
WMA Consulting Engineers, Ltd.,  
Schuler & Shook, Inc., Bruce Gregg Interiors, Inc.  
Photographer: Bob Hall

Built in the Lincoln Park neighborhood, this residence was built for a Chicago couple to house their extensive collection of modern art. The house occupies four typical residential lots (25' x 125' each), and faces south around a central courtyard onto which the principal rooms open. Major rooms are designed around the display of art work and wall assemblies have been designed to enable the hanging of the owners' collection.

Principal exterior materials are rose-colored, sand-moulded brick, Bedford limestone trim and custom steel window sashes. The interior has plaster walls and ceilings and 10" quarter-sawn oak flooring. A second floor, skylit gallery is floored with honed Indiana limestone, as are the principal stair and entry hall. Custom kitchen millwork is of curly maple veneer and the dining room/library bookcases consist of a tubular steel frame with ebonized walnut cabinetry. Of note is the system of recessed fluorescent jamb lights located at all major door and window openings.
The Morton International Building is a 36-story, multi-use high-rise built on an air-rights site over an existing, operational railyard adjacent to the Chicago River. An overhead truss supports the 150' X 55' portion of the building where the caissons could not be drilled. The suspended structure provides for a 40,000 square foot floorplate to house the anchor tenant's computer center and parking for 435 cars.

A public circulation arcade and waterfront park extend the riverside pedestrian promenade, which exists to the South. The clock tower visually anchors the scheme towards the river, as well as provides a sense of entry to the 500,000 square foot office tower.
The Peoples Bank of Cedar Rapids/
Norwest Bank
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Project Architect: Wilbert R. Hasbrouck FAIA
Project Manager: Henry G. Zimoch AIA
Coordinating Architects: OPN Architects
Owner: Norwest Bank Cedar Rapids
General Contractor: Rinderknecht Associates
Consulting Engineers: Jack Miller & Associates, Engineering Associates
Photographer: French Studios

The Peoples Savings Bank of Cedar Rapids was designed in 1911 by Louis H. Sullivan. It received immediate widespread critical acclaim. For forty years it served admirably as a bank building with little change to its design. Following the Second World War, the Peoples Bank required additional space and a large adjacent structure was built. The original bank building was remodeled several times to permit its continued use in conjunction with the newer addition. Major changes were made to the interior which effectively obliterated Sullivan's original design. However, the exterior was only slightly altered.

Fortunately, many elements of the original design survived behind later remodelings or could be rebuilt from surviving plans and early photographs. Materials, forms and colors were duplicated with exceptional fidelity. The restoration was completed in 1991. The interior has been restored to near original condition, including furniture and finishes. The exterior was completely restored at the same time. New mechanical and electrical systems were installed in an unobtrusive manner.
Originally designed by Burnham and Root and completed in 1888, the Rookery was remodeled by Frank Lloyd Wright in 1905-07, then by William Drummond ca. 1930 with several alterations over the years. The restoration concept was to restore and combine significant elements of the building’s three major periods into a unified whole, while incorporating new MEP, Security, and Telecommunication systems to make it function as a new “Class A” office building.

Major elements of restoration include:
- Restoration of exterior facades including restoration and reglazing of original wood sash.
- Reconstruction of first floor storefronts on LaSalle and Adams Streets.
- Restoration of Drummond’s bronze entrances at LaSalle and Adams Streets with handicapped access at LaSalle Street.
- Restoration of the lightwell facades.
- Addition of a skylight at the top of lightwell to protect the historic lightwell, skylight and lightcourt.
- Complete reconstruction of the LaSalle and Adams Street’s two story marble entrance lobbies including Root spaces and Wright’s marble stairs.
- Restoration of Drummond first floor elevator lobby.
- Creation of Interpretive Corner to explain the 104 year process of change.
- Restoration of Oriel Stair to Burnham and Root period.
Lee Residence
Chicago, Illinois

Design Team: Bradley I. Lynch, David Brininstool AIA
Landscape Design: Brininstool & Lynch, Ltd.
Landscape Contractor: Gethsemane
General Contractor: Owner
Construction Manager: Richard Easty
Photographer: Karonf & Associates, Jamie Padgett

When approached from its northside city street, this house offers contextual appeal, rather than an architectural statement which was an intentional decision in the complete renovation of a deteriorated 1,600 square-foot two flat into a single family residence.

Neighborhood context ends at the front door where living areas are defined by a progression of floating walls constructed of tinted plaster and structural steel, fluted glass and layered soffits, making a small floor area feel very spacious. Visitors are drawn by an influx of light to either the third floor studio, or the lush garden of the rear yard, which was designed to be viewed from the interior living areas.
120 North LaSalle
Chicago, Illinois

Design Team: Helmut John AIA, John Dunbrow AIA, Edward Wilkes AIA
General Contractor: Schol Associates, Inc.
Consulting Engineers: Martin-Martin, Inc., Cosentini Associates, Francis Krake and Associates
Mosaic Mural: Roger Brown
Photography: Steinkamp/Bollogg, James Steinkamp and Jay Wolke Photographer, Jay Wolke

The design of the project is a specific response to three criteria: the urban context, the mid-block site, and the goal of producing a building with image, strength and character.

Urban Context: The curved bay responds to the limited corner condition at Court Place and reinstates the narrower LaSalle Street canyon. The mural and curved loggia integrate the public and private realm. The projecting trellis transforms the existing alley into a pedestrian mews while the pedway connection integrates the project into the city pedestrian system.

Mid-block Site: The inherent asymmetrical site conditions ordered the disposition of functions. Unique and flexible office space is created in direct response to layouts, views and leasing strategies. The expression of function through materials and forms creates an external reading of internal conditions.

Image: Stone was selected for the image of stability. Tripartite window treatment and the exploitation of each material's inherent decorative appeal continue the Chicago architectural heritage.
Mannheimer Lebensversicherung
Mannheim, Germany

Design Team: Helmut John AIA, Rainer Schildknecht AIA,
Steven Cook AIA, Sanford Gorshow
General Contractor: Hochtief
Consulting Engineers: Krebs und Kiefer,
HL-Technik, Wolfgang Roth
Photography: Roland Holbe Fotografie, Roland Holbe

This building is a 14,000 square-meter corporate headquarters for a major German insurance company. From the Autobahn into Mannheim, the building site is at the primary entrance to the inner city at the beginning of the tree-lined Auguste-Anlage.

The design gives maximum presence to the building's corner site, guiding movement down the boulevard with an elegant curving gesture. In conjunction with the old Mannheimer Headquarters Building which stands across the street, the new building forms a gateway to the gracious boulevard leading to the old city. The curved building form reaches its maximum height of 14 stories, accentuated with a cantilevered steel top, at the corner of the Auguste-Anlage. Moving along the boulevard to the inner city, the building steps down into a series of two-story, outdoor terraces to a typical height of four stories.
Ross Barney + Jankowski, Inc.

Certificate of Merit

Illinois Bell Telephone Remote Switching Unit
Gurnee, Illinois

Sited at the entrance to a super regional discount shopping mall, the RSU houses computerized telephone switch equipment. To preserve the character of the surrounding horse farms, the developer was required to heavily bermed and landscape the perimeter of the mall. The RSU is located in this transition zone, and attempts to explore the contrasts between the forces of nature and the forces of man’s technology.

The switch is enclosed by a pristine brick box. The emergency generator flue and methane cable vents are expressed. Roof-top air dampers are covered by a corrugated metal deck. Triangular louvers form exhaust openings. Steel decking and pipes canopy the equipment door. Responding to the “machine vs. nature” dilemma, the brick at the bottom of the box is sandy-faced and earth toned. In gradually alternating courses, as if emerging from the earth, the brick changes to uniformly glazed. Concrete walls, painted teal green, rise gently from the lawn, screening equipment.

The line of seven graduated size boulders align with the edge of the metal roof pointing toward true north, reinforcing the image of technology emerging from nature.
In 1989 American Airlines initiated plans to construct a new Ground Equipment Maintenance (GEM) Facility to keep pace with the service demands of its growing fleet of ground service equipment at O'Hare International Airport. This design establishes a new level of integrated equipment usage and technology for airport/industrial mixed-use buildings and was particularly challenging because of the complexity of the mechanical, utility and structural systems and the consideration given to environmental issues.

The initial program envisioned a 67,000 square-foot facility. The project grew to 117,000 square-foot and includes a 22 bay service facility; 14,000 square-foot parts warehouse; a three-story, 45,000 square-foot office building including Medical Facilities, Employee Relations, Personnel, Purchasing and Disbursements, and Administrative Offices; site development for 110 out-of-service vehicles; 525 employee parking spaces; and a bus route.

The outstanding design of the facility has attracted attention throughout the industry and may be used by American Airlines as a model for similar facilities.
Zimmerman House
Manchester, New Hampshire

Architectural Team: John Tilton, Amy Reineri, Tim Hofstra,
Currier Gallery of Art: Michael Komonosky,
Rosalie Reed, David Rou
Associate Architects: Michael Ingram, Don Kolec
Owner: The Currier Gallery of Art
General Contractor: Harvey Construction Company, Inc.
Photography: Courtesy of the Currier Gallery of Art

The Usonian style Zimmerman House was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright in 1950. The Zimmermans lived out their lives in their dream home. Upon Lucille’s death in 1989, the house was bequeathed to the Currier Gallery of Art to be opened as a house museum. The house and its Wright designed furniture provides the most complete Usonian living environment which is open to the public.

After 40 years in the harsh New Hampshire winters, certain elements of the house had deteriorated to a point where a restoration program was required. One of the first tasks was the preparation of an Historic Structure Report to confirm the original design, subsequent modifications and items requiring restoration. Significant items requiring repair or replacement included the radiant heat systems, colored concrete floor slab, electrical upgrade, masonry repair, roof, wood finish restoration and the restoration of the furniture and textiles.
The Interior Architecture Award recognizes excellence in the design of interior space and focuses on the discipline of interior architecture. For the purpose of these awards, interior architecture is defined as the design of space within a building envelope and includes lighting, finishes and furnishings. Projects must have been completed between 1 January
1989 and 1 March 1992 by architects, interior architects and designers in the Chicagoland area to qualify for entry. There were 94 entries in eight categories for the judges to consider. This year seven Honor Awards were given, seven Certificates of Merit were awarded, and two projects were cited for Special Recognition. Five projects qualified for inclusion into the Preservation category. This category was judged by a another jury that had also participated in the Distinguished Building Preservation Awards. They gave two Honor Awards and two Certificates of Merit to Interior Architecture Preservation projects.

Jury

1. Glenn Clarke
   HOK Interiors
   Dallas, Texas

2. Paula Rice Jackson
   Interiors magazine
   New York, New York

3. Richard A. Logan AIA
   Gensler and Associates Architects
   Santa Monica, California
This 3000 square-foot office is located in a Wacker Drive highrise with expansive views of the Chicago River. The drafting studio, library and conference room are placed along the exterior window-wall while the lobby, reception and reference library are on the interior. The office is entered through two pivoting wood doors separated by a sandblasted glass pier. The focal point of the lobby is a highly crafted table light fixture and reflector set in front of a sandblasted glass pier. Beyond this fixture are two large sliding doors which lead to the library. This room features two parchment light diffusers held apart by a metal light baffle. The lower cabinets are wrapped with goatskin and topped with sandblasted glass.
The design objective was to present new product in a temporary installation and to adapt and reuse the existing architectural environment, augmenting a design direction previously established by our firm. To illustrate this issue, a sequence of overlay patterns were prepared—all rotated in plan, elevation and section to create a new three-dimensional environment.

Using three rigid principles of one-dimensional symmetry: rotation, reflection and translation, a three-dimensional relationship emerged between the implied architecture and the product. The plan pattern was rotated and translated to create the new plan, elevation, ceiling planes and objects, thus the circuitous layout and the product placement were created through the translation of the original pattern. This strong architectural imagery then translates itself into a distinct project for the client.
For their new 10,000 square-foot corporate offices, H,O Plus, a skin care products firm, desired a space that was warm and light with inventive use of lighting, color, materials and architectural forms.

When formulating our design concept, we developed our color palette and design metaphors from the actual products line: water and pure, natural ingredients. The elevator lobby provides a dramatic entrance, through the interplay of hard surface materials: glossy bird’s-eye maple wall panels, travertine floors and stainless steel elevator door jambs. The carved amorphic ceiling covered in aluminum leaf recalls the organic forms of the product line.

The fluid forms of the custom reception desk/seating area again recalls the amorphic human shapes of the product line. Light-washed silk fringe encloses the room on three sides, softening the irregular curtain wall. The color palette establishes the vocabulary for the office environment and was taken from H,O’s “luxury line" of products including cream, gray, bronze, black and white.
The Usonian style Zimmerman House was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright in 1950. The Zimmermans lived out their lives in their dream home. Upon Lucille's death in 1989, the house was bequeathed to the Currier Gallery of Art to be opened as a house museum. The house and its Wright designed furniture provides the most complete Usonian living environment which is open to the public.

After 40 years in the harsh New Hampshire winters, certain elements of the house had deteriorated to a point where a restoration program was required. One of the first tasks was the preparation of an Historic Structure Report to confirm the original design, subsequent modifications and items requiring restoration. Significant items requiring repair or replacement included the radiant heat systems, colored concrete floor slab, electrical upgrade, masonry repair, roof, wood finish restoration and the restoration of the furniture and textiles.
The Medina Athletic Club first opened its doors in 1929 as a private men's club for the Shriners organization. Arabic and Assyrian motifs are found on the Inter-Continental's exterior dome, friezes and gargoyles articulating the facades and 'art moderne' form. Interior public spaces include eclectic representations of Celtic, Medieval, Gothic, Spanish, Egyptian, Italian and French Renaissance periods, arranged chronologically as a progression through time for arriving guests.

The architectural challenge for the architect included restoration and rehabilitation while updating the building functionally and technologically. The challenge was compounded by an incomplete set of original drawings and the Owner's decision for a design-build/fast track approach. The building team worked closely together in a dynamic day-to-day process requiring fast, coordinated solutions. The exterior work included substantial stone repair, new windows, skylights, roofs and canopies.
Four Chicago architectural/interior architectural firms and an interior architectural photographer were challenged to go beyond typical levels of promotional design and photography to involve the viewer and provoke strong reactions to textural, sculptural, spatial and symbolic imagery. Newly introduced, commercially available ceiling products and systems from the client were used.

1. **Sandrift Room Set:** A temporary exhibit approach. As the only architectural material, the ceiling is emphasized by a composition of materials and methods which are decidedly non-architectural.

2. **Renditions Room Set:** The ceiling becomes the generator for the design of space. Lines, circles, dots, almost anything one can imagine can be routed into the panels. The metal suspension grid literally disappears into the design.

3. **Compasso Room Set:** Reconsider how a room is defined. Rooms most often are understood by their corners—by visually comparing where the defining surfaces intersect. This space is defined and understood by the relationship between two disks. Each is angled to the ground plane, compressing the space at the door and opening to the front. This is a different way of understanding a room.

4. **Intersections Room Set:** In an exploding room in primary colors, the ceiling communicates the excitement of a dynamic economy. An exaggerated perspective suggests the illusion of space. A glowing shard of glass describes the heart of the geometric detail; a pinwheel intersection which can house lighting, tiles or sprinkler heads.
The design of an architect's office is a learning process, an exploration of new and prior gained knowledge and experience. The existing structure is an industrial concrete frame building with large metal windows. In this design the exterior of the building is treated as a shell and the interior reacts by separating itself and creating energized individual spaces within the open austerity of the original space. This allows for the function of the office to break away from the rigidity of the conventional working environment, combining a design area for drafting, with a craftsmanship area - a woodshop. The use of Fin-Form, a red form board for concrete combined with brightly color stained birch plywood is used to build simple geometric shapes that allow color and volume to explore and define carefully crafted individual spaces.
The 25 year Award program reexamines distinguished architectural designs after a quarter century of their existence. Submitted projects, or those recommended by the Historic Resources Committee, must be designed by registered, Chicago area architects and designed or constructed at least 25 years ago.
Each nomination is evaluated on the merits of its original design, continued fidelity to that design intent and the projects present function and usage. This jury examined seven projects and after lengthy deliberation selected two crowning achievements in a noted Chicago firm’s repertoire for Honor Award recognition. Each structure has maintained, if not improved, its functional and aesthetic integrity, which allows yesterday’s cutting edge technology continues to translate into basic, bold beauty today.

**Jury**

1. Walter A. Netsch FAIA  
   Chicago, Illinois

2. Tim Samuelson  
   Commission on Chicago Historical and Architectural Landmarks  
   Chicago, Illinois

3. Paul Sprague  
   Oconomowoc, Wisconsin
The Air Force Academy Chapel has been designed as the culminating architectural feature of the campus. Its concept evolved out of the desire to achieve one symbolic structure that would represent the religious aspects in the life of the cadet yet provide three distinct chapels with respect for the individuality of the separate religious faiths. Each chapel has not only its unique architectural characteristics but separate entrances and a special relation to the Chapel plaza. In each, the building structure, glass, texture, materials and colors seek to support the religious service.

The Chapel contrasts the low flat Air Force Academy buildings set upon the desert with 17 cathedral-like spires rising 150'-0" above grade. The form is reminiscent of an A-frame tent, hinged to steel plates on 17 wedge-shaped buttresses on each side. Tilting sides are folded into tetrahedron forms made-up of a steel piping framework sheathed with anodized aluminum insulating panels. Its inspiration is inherent.
Situated on prestigious North Michigan Avenue, the 100-story, multi-use tower tapers from top to bottom in order to satisfy the different floor space requirements of a variety of uses. Commercial spaces occupy the base of the tower while parking, office and residential zones rise above. Additional facilities include amenities such as restaurants, health clubs, a swimming pool and ice rink.

The search for a new kind of structure which would accommodate multiple uses and also express the scale and grandeur of a 100-story tower lead to the diagonal tube. Skidmore, Owings & Merrill believed it was essential to expose the structure of the building, for in Chicago honesty of structure had become a tradition. No high-strength steel was used thereby reducing the weight of the structural system to less than thirty pounds per square foot of floor space.

Though the John Hancock Center has graced and defined the lakefront skyline for only a quarter of a century it will symbolize Chicago forever.
Unbuilt Design Award

This is the second year for the Unbuilt Design Award category. The award recognizes projects based on their integrity of design and quality of concept.

None of the entries, however, will be built.
Submissions include client commissioned projects as well as competition entries. Entrants must be registered architects in the metropolitan Chicagoland area. Jurors were chosen by the Toronto Society of Architects. The jury reviewed 29 submissions in this category and selected five of them for awards.

Jury

1. Christian P. Klemt MRAIC
Dunlop Farrow Inc. Architects
Toronto, Ontario Canada

2. Catherine Nasmith MRAIC
Catherine Nasmith Architect
Toronto, Ontario Canada

3. Mark Sterling MRAIC
The Kirkland Partnership Inc.
Toronto, Ontario Canada
The central idea for this house was to make more literal the phrase "Dream House". Initially, this strategy involved assembling a structure room by room; each enclosure being rethought and therefore renamed so that the house would suggest, even propagate, the dream as an activity. This subsequent collection of rooms was then sited between a split suburban driveway and the natural site characteristics in hopes of making equivalent the importance of both automobile and landscape.

The client wished to explore new possibilities in suburban residential design while at the same time promoting "Fallingwater", a 104 acre tract of rolling, wooded land intended for 120 homes.
The Broadgate development around the Liverpool Street Station in London has been the site of an intense office building program. Phases 12 and 13 represent the last unbuilt portion of the 14 phase development. The massing is in response to site constraints, contextual relationships, internal function and the client’s desire that the two buildings represent a unified composition while maintaining separate identities. Much of the construction spans over British Rail tracks.

Phase 12, an infill structure is a more regular volume, highly articulated in metal and glass. Phase 13, with its stepped profile and use of stone, is similar to the neighboring smaller scale brick and stone buildings. Exterior walls of both buildings consist of several layers allowing various colors and patterns of light to play subtly across surfaces at the building perimeter. This enhancement of natural light was a primary design consideration.
Planned in an expanding suburb where Neo-Georgian houses seem to rule, this house seeks a return to simple and unpretentious agrarian structures which were once the norm in the area and are now virtually extinct.

The linear structure of steel and glass is literally a window to (and of) the trees, and suggests formal antecedents in longhouses built of pole frames by the Miami Indians, who lived in the region in the late seventeenth century.

Free-standing walls over a sunken garage to the east recall the more recent existence of a stone farmhouse which in its current partially-constructed state, creates a 2-story belvedere looking down the valley to the north.
This project for the King Abdul Aziz International Airport serves as a successful transition between the Haj "tent structure" Terminal (designed and constructed by SOM in 1982) and existing departure/arrival buildings. The new terminal consists of a central mosque, terraces and atrium flanked by two gently curving concourses. Each concourse was conceived as a series of suspended steel wings which grow out of the desert plane to define a strong profile. The steel wings are both supported by and suspended from a double row of masts. The terminal approach road runs beneath the tips of these wings establishing a transitional zone between the outdoor glare of reflected desert sun and the protective, shaded interior. Clerestory windows, which provide the interior with a high degree of indirect, natural lighting, separate these wings. Parking is concealed beneath the central terrace gardens. Biaxial symmetry provides flexibility in this design allowing gates to be used for both arriving and departing flights as well as accommodating a phased construction schedule.
In order to consolidate all currently dispersed offices into a single facility, the Commerzbank requested an addition to the 30-story tower which now houses its corporate staff.

Desirable qualities included a sensitivity to existing low-rise structures, flexibility, environmental awareness, a modern expression and dynamism. The solution consists of a 50-story highrise connected to the existing tower by a series of hanging gardens, surrounded by a six-story office component which maintains appropriate scale along the street.

The tower is constructed with a 50-floor clear span, free of columns or other fixed elements, providing flexibility and creating exterior views for each work station as required by German regulation. The structure is an exposed steel frame contained between two glass envelopes which eliminate cold air infiltration and act as the return air plenum.
A Divine Detail captures the essence of an entire design concept through an architect's use of appropriate materials, technology and/or detail. The award category was created to celebrate the successful marriage of art and craft with architecture. Projects completed by
registered architects in the metropolitan Chicagoland area between 1 January 1989 and 1 May 1992 were eligible for consideration. The jury was comprised of three distinguished architects, each principals in their firms. Of the nineteen submissions in Divine Detail the jury selected one for Honor Award recognition.

Jury

1. Michael Gelick AIA
   Gelick Foran Associates, Ltd.
   Chicago, Illinois

2. Ronald Krueck FAIA
   Krueck & Sexton Architects
   Chicago, Illinois

3. Daniel H. Wheeler AIA
   Wheeler Keams Architects
   Chicago, Illinois
One floor within a seventy year old courtyard building was renovated to create new offices. An architecturally exposed steel and glass bridge diagonally spans the lightcourt, reorienting the interior plan and improving its functional efficiency.

Bridge construction technique:
- The bridge floor is hung from its roof structure.
- Outrigger-type brackets minimize its load on the existing concrete frame.
- The brackets tie two concrete columns with steel jackets.
- Shop-fabricated members were lifted by crane into the office through a window, assembled, and pulled across the courtyard by a winch and then hung into position.
- Installation of the brackets, final connections, and detailing occurred within one week, with minimal disturbance.

By redirecting the flow of traffic across the previously static void, the bridge dynamically transforms the lightcourt and establishes a new entry and reception area.
The Firm Award was established last year and recognizes recent outstanding achievements as well as continuing excellence in the design and construction of significant buildings. Honors will be awarded to firms who have repeatedly been recognized for their quality.
and leadership in architectural design, building technology, planning and research through publications and
other awards and honors. Tribute is paid to the recipient for their contribution to the advancement of the
architectural profession. The jury was held in New York and composed of architects and design professionals.

Jury

1. James Stewart Polshek FAIA
   James Stewart Polshek and Partners
   New York, New York

2. George Ranalli
   George Ranalli, Architect
   New York, New York

3. Susanna Torre
   Parsons School of Design
   New York, New York
Founded in 1935, Perkins & Will soon established its place in architectural history in 1940 with Crow Island School. This project was the first of hundreds of school and university projects worldwide. In 1951, Perkins & Will completed its first hospital project and by 1961 they had become the leading health care architect in America, producing two volumes which served as industry guidelines. Meanwhile, their corporate/commercial practice thrived with such Chicago landmarks as the First National Bank and its urban plaza, and the timeless Standard Oil corporate headquarters, at the time the fourth tallest structure in the world.

Perkins & Will was able to overcome the minor setback of the founding partners’ retirement in the 1980s with a new generation of principals and by repositioning the firm. The main strategies included concentration on a few distinct specialties, some of which were historically successful (education and healthcare) and some which held rich potential (aviation). At the same time they reaffirmed a commitment to design excellence in all sectors of their practice.

To accomplish these goals, the firm placed proven individuals at the head of each area of concentration. Some of these individuals had been with Perkins & Will for many years and excelled in a given area, others were sought out through their reputations in the field. The design area strengthened with the addition of a second principal designer and an interiors head. All together, these professionals formed a strong leadership group with historical perspective, enthusiasm and fresh ideas.
The post three years reflect a culmination of these efforts. The firm has made major advancements in its growth of client base and staff and in its recognition. From 185 people in three offices seven years ago, Perkins & Will now employs 450, with new offices in London and Berlin maintaining a global profile.

The education area has opened up again. Two projects, Capital High School and Desert View Elementary School, both in New Mexico, won back-to-back AIA National Honor Awards in 1989 and 1990, as well as consecutive Chicago Chapter AIA Awards. The healthcare practice is now ranked as the nation’s sixth largest coast to coast. Corporate/commercial work includes some of Chicago’s more highly visible buildings, including the new corporate headquarters buildings for Sears Merchandise Group, Kraft General Foods and the Morton International Tower. The firm’s skill in aviation design is dramatically exhibited with the International Terminal at Chicago’s O’Hare International Airport. The design departure of the distinctive Orland Park Village Center earned a 1990 Chicago Chapter AIA Distinguished Building Award and a fresh building style for which Perkins & Will is now known.

Perkins & Will has successfully regenerated over the past few years without sacrifice of history or design excellence. The firm remains enriched by time, diversity and the infusion of new energy and talent.
Young Architect Award

To honor excellent ability and exceptional contributions by architects between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-nine in the areas of design, management and technology the established the Young Architect Award. The award has
been given to recognize extraordinary work in a specific area of architectural practice as well as overall excellence in a broad scope of architecturally related activities. Nominations can be made by members of the Chicago Chapter AIA or the individuals themselves, who do not have to be AIA members to qualify. A jury consisting of professionals proficient in design, management and building technology is chosen by the Design Committee. During their deliberation the jury determines the number of awards to be given that year.

Jury

1. John R. Buenz FAIA
   Solomon Cordwell Buenz & Associates, Inc.
   Chicago, Illinois

2. John A. Holabird, Jr. FAIA
   Holabird & Root (Former partner)
   Chicago, Illinois

3. Cynthia Weese FAIA
   Weese Longley Weese Architects
   Chicago, Illinois
Darcy R. Bonner is a founding principal in the Chicago firm Himmel Bonner Architects, established in 1979. Prior to that he worked at Booth, Nagle & Hartray, Ltd. and Beran & Shelmire Architects. Mr. Bonner received a Bachelor of Architecture degree from Tulane University in 1976 and his Masters in Architecture from the University of Illinois at Chicago, Circle Campus in 1981.

His frequently awarded collaborative efforts with his partner Scott Himmel include designs for office, retail, residential projects and exhibits. Among these are: a 1984 Record Interiors of the Year Award for the Stanley Korshak Store in Chicago; a 1984 AIA Award for the Polo/Ralph Lauren Store in Chicago; a 1986 AIA Interior Architecture Award for the Ringolevio Store in Chicago; a 1986 AIA Distinguished Building Award for the Stanley Korshak Store in Dallas; a 1987 Neocon 19 AIA Outstanding Product Display Award for the Kruger Office Showroom in Chicago; an AIA Interior Architecture Award for the Matthew Hoffman Store in Chicago; an AIA Interior Architecture Award for a Private Apartment; a 1990 Interiors Interior of the Year Award for Playboy Enterprises, Inc. and, most recently and featured in this publication, two 1992 AIA Interior Architecture Awards for Boagie's Diner in New York and the office of Himmel Bonner Architects in Chicago.
Daniel J. Cinelli, AIA was appointed principal of O'Donnell Wicklund Pigozzi and Peterson Architects, Inc. in 1989. He leads the firm's design services for the elderly, an ever increasing market. In 1976 he received his Bachelor of Architecture degree with Honors and Distinction from the University of Illinois at Chicago, Circle Campus.

In his 22 years of experience, Mr. Cinelli has designed numerous facilities in the midwest for the elderly including various healthcare centers and housing complexes. His interest in the field extends outside the office, including professional affiliations with the Metropolitan Chicago Coalition on Aging Committee on Congregate Housing, the Illinois Association of Homes for the Aging, a board member for the Highland Park Housing Commission and President of the University of Illinois-Chicago Architectural School’s Alumni Association Board. He is frequently asked to speak on issues impacting design for the older adult market, having published several articles addressing this same audience.
John Eifler founded Eifler & Associates in 1990. Prior to that he worked as a Senior Associate at Booth/Hansen & Associates Ltd. Mr. Eifler was at Skidmore, Owings & Merrill for 10 years where he became a Senior Associate and Studio Head, after receiving his Masters of Architecture degree from the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee in 1979.

His architectural record reads of proficiency and passion in work that spans nearly a century of significant design. While current projects are firmly rooted in contemporary philosophy, it is important to mention his contributions toward preservation of historical midwestern structures and properties. These efforts have been deservedly rewarded with a 1991 AIA Chicago Distinguished Building Award for the restoration of the Herbert Jacobs House I (FLLW), and in 1990 both the Chicago Chapter AIA Distinguished Building Award and Interior Architecture Award for his restoration of the James Charnley House (FLLW) as project architect at Skidmore, Owings and Merrill.

His expertise makes him a sought after speaker on preservation issues nationwide. Mr. Eifler has been frequently published in this aspect of the profession, most notably for his work on Frank Lloyd Wright structures. Professional affiliations supporting this interest include board memberships on the Landmark Preservation Council of Illinois, the Technical Advisory Committee of the Frank Lloyd Wright Building Conservancy and the Chicago Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.
David E. Mikos AIA

Photography: top: Children's Memorial Speciality Pediatrics, McShane Fleming and above right: East Same Day Surgery, Jay Wolke

David Mikos is a founding principal in the architectural firm of Anderson, Mikos Architects Ltd. in Oak Brook, Illinois which specializes in health-care facilities. Prior to that he was senior health facilities designer at Perkins & Will after serving as the staff architect at The Children’s Memorial Hospital in Chicago. Mr. Mikos received his Bachelor of Architecture in Design with Honors and Highest Distinctions in Design from the University of Illinois at Chicago in 1978 after attending the L’Ecole des Beaux Arts in Versailles. He has maintained ties to his alma mater by serving as Visiting Lecturer in their School of Architecture.

His work in the commercial, institutional and healthcare areas extends nationwide and includes local projects for the University of Chicago Medical Center, Northwestern Memorial Hospital, The Children’s Memorial Hospital, St. Joseph Hospital and Medical Center, and the Central DuPage Health System. Many of the projects have been awarded and published. Professional and related affiliations include membership on the AIA National Committee on Health Architecture for the Chicago Chapter AIA Health Committee and the Forum for Health Care Planning, the International Hospital Federation, and the Illinois Municipal League.
The Distinguished Service Award of the Chicago Chapter AIA recognizes outstanding contributions to the architectural community by both individuals and organizations and can honor a body of work or a singular project. Nominations are made by Chapter members and voted on by the Board of Directors of Chicago Chapter AIA. This year, Turner Construction Company has been selected as the Distinguished Service Award recipient. Turner has been active in community activities and public service work for many years. Its Construction
Management Training Program, co-sponsored with the City of Chicago, is an eight-week course designed to assist minority business enterprises in acquiring skills to effectively plan, execute and manage work in the construction industry. Another program, Youthforce 2000, is designed to stimulate student interest in construction and engineering careers and encourage them to remain in school. As a community leader, Turner actively participates in the Newhouse Architecture Foundation, which sponsors a city-wide competition among Chicago public high schools, offering internships to students interested in architecture. Currently, through an appointment of Turner/Chicago's General Manager to Chicago's Affirmative Action Advisory Board, Turner is involved in overseeing effective implementation of the city's affirmative action ordinance. The Chicago Chapter AIA honors Turner Construction Company by acknowledging the breadth of selfless public service they have given over decades as well as their commitment to the future of the design and construction fields.
Turner Construction Company is a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Turner Corporation which is headquartered in New York City and is publicly held and traded on the American Stock Exchange.

The Turner Corporation was founded in 1902 by Henry C. Turner who continued his active direction of the company as President and Chairman of the Board until his retirement in 1946. Turner has grown into the nation’s largest general building contractor as measured by Engineering News Record; currently completing over $3 billion worth of construction annually and employing nearly 3,500. Modern Healthcare has named Turner the leading builder of healthcare facilities in this country.

Turner Construction Company/Chicago, opened in 1926, is one of 37 regional offices. In Chicago, Turner employs about 225 people and annually completes approximately $300 million of construction.

Chicago-area industrial projects built during the 1920s included projects for Western Electric, Portland Cement and American Can Company. In 1928, Turner/Chicago built a 21-building industrial complex on 16 acres for the United States Gypsum Company which at the time, was the largest complex of its kind in the world. During this same period Turner/Chicago was active as an apartment builder with downtown projects including 1242 and 1500 Lake Shore Drive.

In the 1940s Turner/Chicago managed the construction of numerous industrial facilities from Detroit to St. Paul. Clients included Portland Cement, American Can, Ford Motor Company, Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing and General Telephone. Turner/Chicago was involved with several apartment projects during the 1950s. The Inland Steel Building, completed in 1956, was Turner’s first major high-rise office building in Chicago.

Notable projects completed in the 1960s include the Harris Trust and Savings Bank Operations Center, 500 North Michigan Avenue Office Building, 625 North Michigan Avenue Office Building and the American College of Surgeons Administration Building.

In the 1970s, Turner/Chicago completed work on the Amoco Building, the Montgomery Ward Headquarters Office Building and a restoration project at the Field Museum of Natural History.

Projects including the Beckman Institute at the University of Illinois in Urbana, Siemens Gammascanics, the Chicago Bears Skyboxes and the Wrigley Field Lights and Skyboxes were completed in the 1980s. More recent work includes the Ameritech Center in Hoffman Estates, the Motorola Museum of Electronics in Schaumburg, Toyota Motor Sales in Aurora, St. Margaret’s Hospital in Hammond, and, in Chicago, Two Prudential Plaza, 633 St. Clair, and the Professional Office Building #3 at Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke’s Medical Center.
Student Awards
The Chicago Award was initiated nine years ago by William Benn AIA as a lasting honor to his partner, Fredrick Johnck AIA. This competition provides the opportunity for recognition of exceptional fourth and fifth year student work. From the regional architectural schools: the University of Illinois at Chicago, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the Illinois Institute of Technology, the University of Michigan, the University of Notre Dame, and the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Entries are pre-judged at each respective university. The first place winners of the Chicago Award share a cash prize administered through the Chicago Chapter AIA Foundation.

Annually the jurors of the Chicago Award student competition face a daunting task. Judging presentations of projects that contain an infinite number of variables; project scale, program, graphic technique, and thoroughness of presentation. This requires the jurors to weave their way through this maze to find the real underpinnings of the design and reveal the student’s

It is interesting to note how some of the recent administrative changes occurring at some of the participating universities have affected their traditional stylistic signatures. A certain level of refinement separated the five premiated entries from the pack. Each displayed a confidence that the project could be realized.

Jury

1. Ralph Johnson AIA
   Perkins & Will
   Chicago, Illinois

2. Lucien Lagrange AIA
   Lucien Lagrange and Associates, Ltd.
   Chicago, Illinois

3. Mark Sexton AIA
   Krueck & Sexton Architects
   Chicago, Illinois
AirPort/Library Proposal

This project exemplifies a new multi-media library of business exchange for the twenty-first century through the combination/ transformation of O'Hare Airport.

The rigid Miesian/Cartesian system of the airport is the catalyst for the introduction and evolution of a new epigenetic library of exchange. The airport provides a specific regional parameter within which the shifting potentials of business exchange can take place. The multiple flows of exchange emerge around the continually reconforming networks of transportation and information.

The neurological substrate (i.e. O'Hare Airport) is the basis for the emergence of a higher level of synthesis, memory. Memory (i.e. library of exchange) is the active, dynamic, intermediary space that is different but dependent on the rigid form of the brain (i.e. the airport). It is a synapse space where smooth, continuous processes of transformation/deformation occur. These active transformations of exchange are the result of a non-specific or a non-localized storage of information. Information is distributed through the combined, multiple, neuro-pathways and flows that incessantly refer back and forth among themselves to create a spatially distributed system.
Rare Books Repository

The site is an urban park in the major cultural part of the city. The existing context is a load-bearing limestone building that houses the County Historical Society. Also adjacent to the site are two sets of bridge pavilions. The bridge to the north being constructed of metal (steel and copper) and the bridge to the south of masonry (limestone and steel).

The building was conceived as a landmark for the city. The proposed building conceptually is a "wall" that becomes a backdrop to a public space. One occupies the space of the wall, but is allowed to violate its boundaries. Two load-bearing masonry walls extend perpendicular from the existing building to engage the river.

The plaza to the south steps down to the river allowing a view of the city’s skyline. The 2000 square-foot archive is lifted above ground to allow one to filter between the plaza and the Chestnut Grove. The director’s office marks the portal where the riverwalk pierces the walls. At night the illuminated office acts as a "lantern" that is viewed from the river. The "gallery" of rare books spans between the two masonry walls. The load of shelving is carried by the walls. The interior space receives controlled indirect light from above. The copper clad "scholar niches" violate the wall and articulate the south facing elevation. In these niches the scholar is able to research the history of the city, with a clear view of the present day skyline.
The Analogy of the Wing

Valencia International Terminal emanates from the idea of the "wing" which is composed of layers of intricate structural parts, each one, necessary and important. Each feather on a wing serves a specific purpose. As it extends further and further it becomes more delicate and majestic revealing the intrinsic detail which pulls it together. Physically, one can compare the terminal and its assemblage of linked, yet recognizable units to the wing. As the building extends, thereby revealing its layers and detail, it sets up a dialogue between the use and the building. This movement peels away the conventional bonds which suppress the expression of the complexities of each part to the other, and these to the whole. This turn allows for the communication of the inherent code and syntax of the airport itself.

For Valencia's terminal, these characteristics must then be translated into forms which reflect, not only the unique cultural characteristics of the present, but the aspirations for the city of tomorrow.
Instead of renovating the recently purchased property at the northeast corner of Astor and Division Streets in Chicago’s Gold Coast, the owner would demolish the existing structure and build a new home which would be a fitting tribute to his family—living and dead. The new house is actually two houses, a house for the living and a house for the dead; the two houses being separated by a monolithic masonry wall. The north half of the wall shall function as a crypt while the south half shall contain life-sustaining functions such as the hearth and bed chambers. Not only does the house of the dead provide an architectural document of the family’s history but the house of the living also physically measures the advancement of the family through future generations. A permanently mounted construction crane stands ready to celebrate the birth of a child by adding a new room to the house of the living. A family doctrine encourages the child to remain a member of the household and “the room” even after marriage. Following the death of a family member the room is permanently shuttered, henceforth, memorializing it’s former occupant.
The Chicago Award in Interior Architecture was presented for the second time this year. The award was established to reinforce excellence in interior architecture educational programs in midwestern colleges and universities. Through this student recognition a greater awareness and appreciation of the interior architecture discipline can be achieved. The eight schools that participated in the awards program this year were: Harrington Institute of Interior Design, Kansas State University, University of Cincinnati, University of Illinois at Chicago, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, Purdue University and Lawrence Technological University. All schools offer programs in either Interior Architecture or Interior Design. Winners were provided with cash prizes through the continued generosity of The Landahl Group, Inc. and awards are presented at the annual Design Excellence Award ceremony. The Distinguished Building Awards Exhibition held at the Chicago Historical Society will display the prize-winning work.

Honorable Mention is given to the following students for their submitted projects: Tim Schwering, Kansas State University; Debora Lee Weninger, School of the Art Institute of Chicago; Laina L. Bagner, University of Cincinnati, and Annika Larsson and Randy Roucka, School of the Art Institute of Chicago.

Jury

1. Ron Davidson AIA
   Architect
   Chicago, Illinois

2. Beth I. Davis
   Makus Johnson, Inc.
   Chicago, Illinois

3. J. D. McRibbon AIA
   Eva Maddox Associates
   Chicago, Illinois
Charlotte is a characteristic example of the failure of the modern city. Its growth since 1930 has destroyed much of a rich legacy that began as an Indian crossroads in 1753 and boomed in the post Civil War "New South" era. The continued desire to look ever newer and bigger has left Charlotte a vibrant city of parking lots - its history is one of "what used to be there". Currently there is no common vocabulary linking development and virtually no structures of any permanence left in existence. Through the use of traditional building elements, materials, and construction techniques, this proposal aims to serve as a foundation for future growth by establishing a language which transcends individual buildings and forms the underpinnings of the city.

Working within the formal American city grid, this complex is organized on one of the city's most prevalent axes, creating Charlotte's first public space by blocking this important street. The two buildings in front of the transportation center, flanking the public square, contain retail, a restaurant, and housing in one; with a hotel and conference facility in the other. The multi-story building contains lower level shops, office and rail management facilities. The adjoining group of buildings, located around terrace and garden space, contain additional housing, essential to any effort of urban vitality.
Problem Statement: Design for a residence using program requirements developed by a fellow student. The client is a family consisting of a corporate executive and his wife in their forties who wish to have a spacious environment for relaxation and entertainment. Large open spaces were required for viewing of a collection of paintings and sculptures which they plan to expand. The couple has a 20-year-old daughter who gives readings to groups. She has an infant. The residence will be maintained by a live-in maid during the family's travels. All spaces were specified in the program to have views to the out of doors for the purpose of expanding the large scale open interior environment. The residence is located outside of Sacramento, California.

Design Concept: In reality the project's design concept evolved through experimentation with volumetric expression required by the program. The conceptual development took many directions. All of the initial experiments with alternate visual vocabulary were developed with the goal of achieving a free and open spatial concept with views linking the interior environment to the land and sky. A primary objective was to convey a sense of freedom and release from the pressures of the clients' lifestyle.
The space planning program for this project outlined the parameters for designing a non site-specific, experimental residence. It set forth strict adjacency and functional requirements, but provided no square footage limitations. The program invited an exploration of form and volume through the development of both a visual language and a structural, grid-like skeleton. Concept evolved through experimentation with the possible relationships between these elements, incorporating both an angular and a curvilinear vocabulary. The design process itself focused on three-dimensional development through the use of elevations, axonometrics and perspective sketches, as well as studies of the distribution of color and architectural materials.

I was intrigued by the opportunity to create a largely open living environment for public spaces on the first level of the residence. Spatial separation and interaction among the three levels provided a varied definition of public, private and semi-private spaces. In three-dimensional development, the orchestration of a focal point for the first level (and second level library overlook) became key. The decision to engage form and structure through the development of a three-tiered curvilinear 'sculpture' presented a solution to this problem. These curved elements, revolving on a radius determined by the four columns rising the full height of the central open space, float at several levels over the boundaries of library, kitchen and living area. Anchored by the vertical mass of the fireplace these elements work together to unify the spatially separated architectural volumes.
The Newhouse Architecture Foundation (NAF) is a non-profit organization that was established in 1982. Its mission is to provide Chicago Public High School (CPS) students who have talent and interest in architecture and design an opportunity to recognize, develop and strengthen their creativity and talent and help them prepare for careers in architecture.

The Foundation's programs center around the annual Newhouse Architecture Competition and include:

1. Creating projects and providing materials which supplement the Chicago Public Schools' high school drafting and architecture curriculum.

2. Organizing workshops and tours for high school students and for teachers.

3. Organizing the Competition and the public exhibition of projects.

4. Placing and counseling students in paid internships in professional firms.

5. Providing college scholarship opportunities, and academic and career support groups.

NAF programs have a direct impact on curriculum content in schools participating in the NAF program. Many CPS teachers use the Foundation's architectural competition as the focus for an entire semester's work; other teachers require that students work on the projects on their own time but assist them after class. Participation in the Competition is a real builder of self-esteem and self-confidence. It is the only vehicle that prepares them for the grueling chorettes encountered as part of architecture school. Volunteers from the architectural professions work closely with CPS teachers to set professional standards for the competition entries. They share their knowledge and expertise with educators and students by leading skill-workshops, conducting building tours, and mentoring young people.

Each year the competition is professionally judged and students are awarded trophies, paid internships and given opportunities for college scholarships.
Officer Space, 1 IBM Plaza

Problem Statement: To design an office that is approximately 5,500 square-feet for a real estate development company located in One IBM Plaza. Requirements include determination of demised space in relation to the core plan; and the research, interpretation and integration of systems furniture in the design in accordance with the clients' program.

Design Concept: In determining the demised space in relation to the core plan, client access was important; and my experimentation and analysis led to the space chosen to maximize exposure to the curtain wall, the very essence of the building.

My interpretation of the building evolved into an expression of symmetry by anchoring the space with partners' offices located in the corners of the space, allowing the open office planning parallel to the linear axis. Building standard lighting was employed along the perimeter as required. Using technology and philosophy that post-dates the building, I incorporated point light sources and curved, suspended ceiling planes that occur within the interior spaces. Materials and finishes were chosen with respect to the building. Limited materials were used and expressed for their inherent qualities; and values of chroma coincide with the buildings' materials and finishes. Expressions of linear and horizontal elements are seen in the application of systems furniture.
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Chicago Chapter AIA Facility Donors

The following have generously contributed goods and/or services toward the renovation of Suite 1049 in the Merchandise Mart, the new home of the Chicago Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.
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Mary Ann Crenin
William Forst
Michael Gonzalez
Jack Hedrich
David Hoffman
Chandra Jho
Kevin Kemp AIA
Ted Kimbrough
Diane Legge Kemp FAIA
Jane Lucas
Don Maguire
Patty McHugh
George Menuez
George O'Hone
Irma Oppenheimer
Bernie Spillman, Chicago Public Schools
Julia Stasch
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Alternate</td>
<td>Frank Costelli AIA</td>
<td></td>
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<td>Director</td>
<td>Holly Gerberding AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Gregory Londahl FAIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Robert Piper FAIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post President</td>
<td>Joel Straub AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>Leonard Peterson AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>William Jermain III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Affiliate Director</td>
<td>Susanne Roubik AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Affiliate Director</td>
<td>Bill Cose AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Director</td>
<td>Gary Collins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council President</td>
<td>James K. Zehn AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council President-Elect</td>
<td>Roy Grisakis AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Alternate</td>
<td>Dirk Donker AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Delegate</td>
<td>Louis Garapol AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Delegate</td>
<td>Brian Jack AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Delegate</td>
<td>James C. Jankowski AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Alternate</td>
<td>Tannys Longdon AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Delegate</td>
<td>Geraldine McCabe Miehle AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Delegate</td>
<td>Kathleen Nogle AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Delegate</td>
<td>Michael Youngman AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Delegate</td>
<td>Walter Lewis FAIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Council Delegate</td>
<td>Cynthia Weiss FAIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Director</td>
<td>Pat Rosenzweig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>Judy Freeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee Chair and Co-Chairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Co-Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago By Design</td>
<td>John DeSalvo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>Michael Goff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Industry Affairs</td>
<td>Brian Jack AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Architects</td>
<td>Ray Ovrat AIA, Chair</td>
<td>James Gimpal AIA, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>David Seglin AIA, Chair</td>
<td>Ellen B. Dickson AIA, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Neil Sheehan AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Steven Blonz AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Affairs</td>
<td>Robert Robicsek AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Terence Houk AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Resources</td>
<td>Gunny Barrow AIA, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Deborah Stalos, Associate AIA, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interiors</td>
<td>Chris Mekus AIA, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Carol LaMar AIA, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>James Torvik AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Practice</td>
<td>Pat Rosenzweig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Urban Affairs</td>
<td>Steve Radke AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Affiliates</td>
<td>Bill Cose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Holly Gerberding AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Development</td>
<td>Rich DeLeo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Richard Fendt AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Architects</td>
<td>Tom Shafer AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 Convention</td>
<td>John Nelson AIA</td>
<td>Linda Seorl AIA, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 Convention</td>
<td>Steve Weiss AIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Grand Prize Winner in Architectural Rendering
Tremaine Ford, Senior
Dunbar High School
Harold Washington Library

Overall Grand Prize Winner in Architectural Rendering
Anthony Zamfoti, Senior
Lakeview High School

Overall Grand Prize Winner in Architectural Design
Charles Riggles, Junior
Schurz High School

Overall Grand Prize Winner in Open Category Architectural Design
Miguel Perez, Senior
Near North High School

Overall Grand Prize Winner in Architectural Model Making
Angelise Thomas, Sophomore
Near North High School

Overall Grand Prize Winner in Open Category Model Making
Touji Jones, Senior
Near North High School
225 W. Wacker Dr.

Overall Grand Prize Winner in Construction Drawings
Israel Zaragaza, Sophomore
Faragoat High School
Urban Residence

Overall Grand Prize Winner in Constructed Perspective
Charles Riggles, Junior
Schurz High School
Art Institute Interior Court

Overall Grand Prize Winner in Open Drawing Category
Tremaine Ford, Senior
Dunbar High School
House on Tree-lined Lane
Miglin-Beitler, Inc.
Chicago, Illinois

Architect: The Landahl Group Inc.
Client: Miglin-Beitler, Inc.
Design Principal: Gregory W. Landahl FAIA
Design Coordinator: Ann Weigand
Project Architect: Judy Avanzodo
General Contractor: Continental Interiors
Photographer: Hedrich-Blessing, Jon Miller

The new corporate offices for Miglin-Beitler, Inc. embody a number of design concepts and themes. The planning is very direct: private offices line the perimeter with secretarial support opposite; the east side of the building is a two partner suite; and the center encompasses the Presentation and Tower Marketing Suite. The design of the office is a series of contrasts: light vs. dark, expansion vs. contraction, hard vs. soft materials.

The expansive reception area has a glowing quality from a combination of pristine furniture, exotically materials and backlit glass. The terrazzo floor patterning, with zinc for North-South streets, bronze for East-West streets and a bronze strip spiralling out from the plaques, represents the partner’s principal real estate projects, and serves as a metaphor for the city grid and their continuing growth and influence.

Mr. Miglin’s private office embodies an open plan, a vast gallery-like space to display his unusual collection of contemporary furniture and fine art. Mr. Beitler’s imposing offices represent a strong personal design statement and attention to luxurious details which are Mr. Beitler’s trademark.
Simplicity and elegance characterize the 4,500 square-foot midwestern regional office for The Siam Bank, Ltd. The bank requested colors and materials indigenous to the West, but the space is organized according to typical Oriental business practice, progressing from public-oriented to private-oriented spaces.

Beginning the sequence is the formal reception area which features a travertine floor, custom reception desk of stainless steel and stained ash, fabric-wrapped panels that conceal storage, and laminated panels that lead to the general office area. The adjacent boardroom features a unique system of mechanically-operated doors which remain open when the space is not in use, visually extending the limited space. Continuity of design is maintained in the general office area.
This project involved the space planning and interior design of the Chicago Kent College of Law for the Illinois Institute of Technology. The 280,000 square-foot structure houses 23 classrooms, an auditorium and moot court facility, and is one of the largest repositories of United Nations documents in the country.

The primary focus in design was the humanization of technology and the modern interpretation of a traditional academic environment.

The solution has its genesis in the careful incorporation of computer equipment and data cabling throughout. This was accomplished through the utilization of standard furniture products capable of providing a discrete electronic interface. Ergonomic seating further accommodates the technological impact and promotes a professional atmosphere in various classroom, library, and faculty office applications.
Renovation of a former one bedroom apartment in 880 Lake Shore Drive, Mies van der Rohe’s 1959 landmark building. The owner, a librarian at a prestigious midwestern liberal arts college, uses it as an urban vacation retreat - calling it a city home for a country mouse. He asked for an ambiance combining monastic simplicity with functional elegance.

The original bedroom partition had been removed; the owner liked the feeling of one large room but wanted some measure of privacy for sleeping. He also wanted a study as the author of three books on naval history.

The two enclosed areas - study and sleeping - are defined by curving partitions alternating with perforated metal screens simultaneously allowing visual penetration and privacy. The curves play against the rectilinearity of the Miesian box. White walls contrast with dark ebony flooring. Furnishings combine modern classics with soft-edged Neo-Beidermeir wood chairs and loveseat.
The Rookery
Chicago, Illinois

Originally designed by Burnham and Root and completed in 1888, the Rookery was remodeled by Frank Lloyd Wright in 1905-07, then by William Drummond co. 1930 with several alterations over the years. The restoration concept was to restore and combine significant elements of the building’s three major periods into a unified whole, while incorporating new MEP, Security, and Telecommunication systems to make it function as a new “Class A” office building.

Major elements of restoration include:
- Restoration of exterior facades including restoration and reglazing of original wood sash.
- Reconstruction of first floor storefronts on LaSalle and Adams Streets.
- Restoration of Drummond’s bronze entrances at LaSalle and Adams Streets with handicapped access at LaSalle Street.
- Restoration of the lightwell facades.
- Addition of a skylight at the top of lightwell to protect the historic lightwell, skylight and lightcourt.
- Complete reconstruction of the LaSalle and Adams Street’s two story marble entrance lobbies including Root spaces and Wright’s marble stairs.
- Restoration of Drummond first floor elevator lobby.
- Creation of Interpretive Corner to explain the 104 year process of change.
- Restoration of Oriel Stair to Burnham and Root period.
A free press stands as one of the great intermediiaries between the government and the people. To allow it to be fettered is to fetter ourselves.

The newspaper is an institution developed by modern civilization. To present the news of the day, to foster commerce and industry, to inform and lead public opinion, and to furnish that check upon government which no constitution has ever been able to provide.

— Robert E. McNamara, Associate Justice, United States
This project combined historical research with on-site investigation to achieve the restoration of Raymond Hood and John Mead Howell’s Tribune Tower lobby to its 1925 appearance. The original plaster relief map of North America was retrieved from the Field Museum and restored with a period color scheme. The reception desk, discarded in 1938, was reconstructed from historic photographs and modified to accommodate modern communication and security equipment. Other handcrafted woodwork was replicated from original shop drawings and includes the lobby doors and the reredos framing the map. Travertine walls and Napoleon gray marble floors were repaired and cleaned, as was the lobby’s metalwork, including the cast and wrought iron elevator doors, ventilation grilles, mailboxes and the iron directory. Original chandeliers were restored and supplemental lighting installed.
Boogie's Diner
New York, New York

Architect: Himmel/Bonner Architects
Client: Merry-Go-Round Enterprises, Inc.
Design Team: Scott Himmel AIA, Dorcy Bonner AIA, James Stapleton, David Piper, David Hudgy, Heidi Goebel
General Contractor: Boyridge Construction
Consultants: A. Epstein and Sons, Wheeler Gersztoff, Friedman Shanker
Photographer: Esto Photographics, Scott Frances

The design approach for the store's interior was to integrate the restaurant and retail functions through the use of bold architectural elements, striking colors and spatial energy that would complement and enhance the store's merchandising. The focus of the interior is the sleek aircraft inspired elevator tower which rises from the store's lower level to the underside of the skylight above, interconnecting functionally and aesthetically the restaurant and the retail space. The 75-seat restaurant on the upper floor evokes memories of a 50's diner, the Jetsons and M1V video through an eclectic mixture of multi-colored neon illuminated millwork soffits, traditional booths and counter balanced dining tables and perforated metal display panels.
Offices of Holabird & Root
Chicago, Illinois

Architect: Holabird & Root
Owner: Holabird & Root
Partner in Charge: Gerald Horn FAIA
Partners: James Baird AIA, Frank Costelli AIA, Jeff Case AIA
Director of Interior Design: Patricia Sticha
Designer: Tod Desmarais AIA
Project Architect: Elaine Miller
Architects: Doug Clark, Charles Brochler
General Contractor: Turner Special Projects
Consultants: American Bridge Construction
Photographers: David Clifton and Angelique Noughton

A seventy-year-old courtyard building was renovated to create new offices for this architectural/engineering firm. An architectural steel and glass bridge diagonally spans the lightcourt, re-orienting the 22,500 square-foot interior plan with a dynamic entry.

Curved glass walls and slate floors define public and administrative space; fritted glass maintains privacy in executive offices. In work areas, exposed structure with mechanical services, custom lighting, power drops, and raw finishes reinforce the machine aesthetic. Low drafting stations, organized on the perimeter, maximize interior daylight and create spatial continuity.

Focus on the lightcourt and bridge establishes a unified architectural concept.
Illinois Bell Learning Center
Chicago, Illinois

Architect: O'Donnell Wicklund Pigozzi and Peterson Architects, Inc.
Client: Illinois Bell Telephone Co.
Project Principal: George H. Hays
Principal Designer: Robert D. Hunter AIA
Project Designer: Kathleen M. Orser IBD
Project Manager: Scott F. Franzen
Project Architect: Jeffrey P. Gluvno
Graphics Designer: Jacqueline M. Koglin
Interior Designer/Space Planner: Rita U. Brouillette IBD
Project Team: Stuart A. Brodsky
General Contractor: Rousch Construction
Consultants: Gerry Zekowski Lighting Consultants, Inc.,
Environmental Systems Design, Inc.
Photographer: Hedrich-Blessing, Jon Miller

This 144,000 square-foot learning center conveys a balance between the client's high-tech communications/human touch and service-oriented philosophy. The project accommodates approximately 200 administrative staff, 64 classrooms to serve 10,000 statewide employees, a central computer switching center and vending/lunchroom.

The reception area exudes an energetic first impression, as contrasting wood tones and high tech materials create dynamic tension. Cross-over corridors are treated with an animated mix of violet plexiglas and carpet insets, perforated metal and anodized aluminum light enclosures to minimize corridor length.

To meet diversified client training needs integrating maximum flexibility and coordination of Audio Visual interface capabilities was crucial to classroom design.
Located within a two story lobby of a downtown high rise this 1500 square-foot space needed to house the flagship retail store for an Ecuadorian rose grower. The "fishbowl" situation created by the existing perimeter glass walls was turned to an advantage. The store was designed in such a way that allowed circulation and product visibility to be maximized. A display system was located that allowed for adjustable shelving in the flower display area, storage cabinets and fixturing for an office, and a counter/wrap station.

Metal trusses were used overhead to stabilize the entire free standing system and to support lighting referring to an outdoor trellis by rendering the otherwise tall space more intimate. The actual roses (at least 16 different types) provide the color in the space as all fixturing was specified black. Two red canvas canopies designate the counter area which itself is situated on a smooth field of green tile. The effect is that of a tent in a freshly cut meadow.

A bluish-purple mural on the only solid wall reinterprets the pre-Columbian atmosphere and adds a touch of history to this contemporary solution for this new large volume sales operation.
The compression of this century's timeclock has had a perverse effect on architecture: its increasingly rapid rate of change has profoundly affected architectural movements. Coinciding with the 75th anniversary of the founding of The Arts Club, four such movements have come about. Each one is the result of its predecessor divided by two; i.e. Half-Time.

A (re)presentation of a characteristic project by each of 75 architects within these four movements is featured in the exhibition installation. Analyzing their work as it relates to the category each one inhabits fosters a greater understanding of the role they (and others) play in the evolution of Chicago architecture.

Based on Chicago's historically preeminent position in the field, the installation presents our city's architectural heritage in the straightforward manner in which it was executed, while the cult of the particular architects selected for scrutiny is lionized, befitting the authors of the city's premier art form.
The Ernest Graham Study Center
Chicago, Illinois

Architect: Tigerman McCurry Architects
Associate Architect: Barnett & Smith
Client: The Art Institute of Chicago
Design Team: Stanley Tigerman F.AIA,
Charles Smith/Bennett Smith, Melony Telleen,
Karen Elliday AIA, Mark Lehmann
General Contractor: Norcon
Photographer: Van Inwegen Photography

Located in the Art Institute, the Graham Study Center is home to the architecture department's curatorial staff, as well as the drawings archive and fragments amassed by its distinguished department. It is also a study center providing work space for scholars working on projects connected with the Institute's archival material.

The parti was evolved simply as a product of the bi-partite nature of the Study Center's use: 50% of the space accommodates the archive (including exhibition prep workspace); and 50% is the site of staff, as well as scholars and conferencing. A gallery leads to the Study Center, which houses certain archival material that is permanently exhibited there. Following this gallery is a transition space which is clad in aluminum checker plate, enunciating the entrance to the Study Center. A deteriorating three-dimensional grid is employed so as to structure work space and establish both hierarchy for the director and his staff, as well as to provide individuated work stations for scholarly research. The organizational structure of the deteriorating grid emanates from the cross-axis leading to exhibition prep. The space of the grid expands as a function of the arithmetic erosion of its own materiality, allowing for a subtle hierarchy to occur directed toward the director's work station as well as toward the conferencing area. As the grid materially deteriorates, that erosion is marked by the increasing presence of its underlying structure.
Municipal Government Center
Leesburg, Virginia

Architect of Record: Hanno Weber & Associates
Client: Town of Leesburg, Virginia
Project Principal: Hanno Weber AIA
Interior Architect: Kathleen Hess
Project Team: Kathleen Ditsko, Christopher Hole, Joseph Heinowski, Yun Jung, Gary Jaeger, Gregg Loescher AIA, Thomas Mozino
General Contractor: Manhattan Construction Company
Furnishings Contractors: Rainbow Custom Woodworking, Inc., Chosen's Business Interiors
Photographer: Hedrich Blessing, Steve Hall

Office and assembly spaces in a 32,000 square-foot new town hall of a Colonial Virginia settlement. The organization reinforces the order of a town green that is punctuated by a figural set piece accommodating the symbolic spaces. Municipal service departments capitalize on daylight and engage the public across open counters enframing single-loaded concourses, while reception, assembly and the council chamber function independently during off hours in the set piece. Ceiling heights maintain a civic scale while accommodating indirect lighting and a glare-free environment.

Surface finishes emulate an eighteenth-century grammar and color palette that complements the building fabric. Custom millwork furnishings provide a flexible system of components adaptable to role hierarchy identification. Light-scale task and lounge seating were designed for the project.