### July Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 5</td>
<td>LA/AIA Board of Directors Meeting</td>
<td>Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 6</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>1988 CALE Exam prep lecture series, 3141 E. Broadway, Long Beach, 6:30-9 pm. Call (213) 426-4039.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 7</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>1988 CALE Exam prep lecture series, 3141 E. Broadway, Long Beach, 6:30-9 pm. Call (213) 426-4039.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 8</td>
<td>California Lifeguard Towers Exhibition</td>
<td>904 N. L发财, through July 31. Call (213) 870-7012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 11</td>
<td>LA/AIA Architecture for Health Committee</td>
<td>Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 12</td>
<td>LA/AIA Professional Practices Committee</td>
<td>Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 13</td>
<td>Women and Minority Resources Committee</td>
<td>Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 14</td>
<td>National CACE</td>
<td>Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 15</td>
<td>CCCAIA Board Meeting</td>
<td>San Francisco. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 18</td>
<td>Building Standards and Regulations Committee</td>
<td>Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 19</td>
<td>Women and Minority Resources Committee</td>
<td>Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 20</td>
<td>Professional Practices Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 21</td>
<td>Professional Practices Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 22</td>
<td>1988 Design Awards Deadline for Submittals</td>
<td>Entries must be submitted before 5 pm to LA/AIA Chapter Office. 8668 Melrose Avenue, M-72, Los Angeles, CA 90069. Call (213) 659-2282.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Weekend

- **Saturday, July 2**
  - Vernacular Square
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
  - Broadway Theaters
    - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
  - Terre Cotta
    - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.

- **Sunday, July 3**
  - The Schnieder House
    - Architecture and Social History
    - Exhibition continues at the Schnieder House, 835 N. Kings Road, weekends only, 1 pm to 4 pm. Call (213) 651-1110.

### Monday, July 4
- **1988 CALE Exam prep lecture series, 3141 E. Broadway, Long Beach, 6:30-9 pm. Call (213) 426-4039.**
- **LA/AIA Board of Directors Meeting**
  - Call (213) 659-2282.
- **CCCAIA Delegate Meeting**
  - 3:30 pm. Call (213) 426-4039.
- **LA Architect Editorial Board Meeting**
  - Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5:30 am. Call (213) 659-2282.
- **LA/AIA Government Relations Committee**
  - Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.
- **LA/AIA Associate Board**
  - Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 6:30 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.
- **New Member Orientation**
  - 4 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.
- **National CACE**
  - Call (213) 659-2282.
- **Women and Minority Resources Committee**
  - Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.
- **Professional Practices Committee Meeting**
  - Pacific Design Center, Room 259C, 5 pm. Call (213) 659-2282.
- **1988 Design Awards-Deadline for Submittals**
  - Entries must be submitted before 5 pm to LA/AIA Chapter Office. 8668 Melrose Avenue, M-72, Los Angeles, CA 90069. Call (213) 659-2282.
- **Sandcastle Competition**
  - Registration deadline for 1989 LA/AIA Officers Sue
  - Nominations due at noon in Chapter Office, for review and accreditation by committee. Call (213) 659-2282.
- **Richard Morris Hunt**
  - Exhibition at LA County Museum of Art, continues through July 31.

### Weekend

- **Saturday, July 9**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 2 pm and 3 pm. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 10**
  - Ballbuck's Wildfire LA Conservancy Tour, 2 pm and 3 pm. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Saturday, July 16**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 17**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 24**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Summer Street: Mecca for Merchants**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Pershing Square**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Broadway Theaters**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 20**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Saturday, July 21**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 22**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 23**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 24**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 25**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 26**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 27**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
- **Sunday, July 28**
  - LA Conservancy Walking Tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-CITY.
It is appropriate that the only monograph to date on an active or retired Skidmore, Owings & Merrill General Partner is this one on the work of Myron Goldsmith. Although he executed his work at a time when SOM was the bastion of corporate anonymity during a post-war search for a rational and universal architecture, Mr. Goldsmith's work stands alone as reflective of a rigorous personal idealism and philosophical inquiry.

Myron Goldsmith, Buildings and Concepts illustrates the full scope of Mr. Goldsmith's career incuding his early work as a Fulbright Fellow in Rome, his completed and proposed projects as general partner at Skidmore, Owings & Merrill until his retirement in 1983, and his research on tall and long-span structures conducted during his tenure as Professor at the Illinois Institute of Technol­ogy, a position he still holds today. The book also includes two concise introductory essays, one by Werner Blaser and the other by Allan Temko, as well as two essays by Myron Goldsmith in which he clearly outlines his quest for a logical and minimalist approach to architecture.

Myron Goldsmith was the architect for some of SOM's most memorable, inventive and sophisticated modernist work. As the book shows through the illustration of some of his most compelling work, such as the Kitt Peak Solar Telescope, the United Airlines Hangar, the Republic Newspaper Plant, the Rack-A-Checky Bridge and the Brunswick Building, Goldsmith's genius lies in his intuitive and analytical approach to architec­ture. Each one of his projects is a three-dimensional form derived from its literal purpose and expressive of the qualities inherent in the materials and methods of construction. It is Goldsmith's concern for how things are built that, to a large extent, shapes the aesthetic of his buildings. The common thread through his work is a persistent quest for a direction based on the laws of nature as applied to contemporary mate­rials and structural systems. In contrast to the dehumanized modernism of the past several decades and the recent flurry of facadism, Goldsmith's work holds that high ground of minimalism which deliberately sculpt man­made materials into rational and provoking forms.

Furthermore, at a time when we seek to find direction in chaos and complexity, Goldsmith's work transcends its logical minimalism and informs us about man's relationship to nature. Although at first this work seems to belong to an earlier modernism, his idealism is timeless in its intellectual rigor. All three of Goldsmith's best projects, the Kitt Peak Telescope, the Rack-A-Checky Bridge, and the Columbus Newspaper Plant, are environmentalist and structuralist responses to specific site and program requirements. All three are man-made objects placed in diverse settings with clear and deliberate purpose. All of these are "industrial" projects, yet by using the most sophisticated technologies in an esthetically convincing way, these buildings are an affirmation that there can be a contiguity between the environ­ment and man-made objects. It is the making of this connection between nature, esthetics and logic that places Goldsmith's work in history. In this vein, Werner writes of the Rack-A-Checky Bridge, "...the anchoring of the bridge's main cables in a mountain makes nature a part of an intellectual effort; an effort which only finds its culmination in the aesthetic interchange between nature and technology".

The last section of the book is devoted to Goldsmith's pioneering research on tall and long-span structures which he did in collabor­ation with engineer Fazlur Khan at Illinois Institute of Technology. In each of these projects the structural system is treated as the primary architectural element. Earlier archi­tecture, such as Doric temples, Gothic cathedrals or even Mies van Der Rohe's highrises, developed vocabularies made of components which, when assembled, expressed their respective technologies. In Goldsmith's highrise studies the structural system, solely and in its entirety, becomes the expressive component. In contrast to Mies van der Rohe, under whom he studied and worked during his formative years, Gold­smith's minimalism makes the expression of technology a de facto by-product. His work reflects a poetic understanding of the struc­ture as a whole. His buildings are sculptural solutions which defy the stylization to which Mies' work fell prey, and results in a body of work which, according to Allan Temko, "stands singularly immune to passing archi­tectural fashion".

The essays, photographs and project descriptions illustrate this significant body of work spanning some 40 years. Although the book lacks a critical essay which puts Myron Goldsmith's work in context with his contem­poraries, Werner Blaser's and Allan Temko's essays clearly place his work in the historic realm of a timeless architecture, which it well deserves.

Aleks Instanbullu, AIA, has practiced with SOM under Myron Goldsmith in the early seventies, is a practic­ing architect in Los Angeles.
Last Remaining Seats
This summer, the Los Angeles conservancy will host "The Last Remaining Seats II", a sequel to last year's successful film series, including four evenings of reminiscences of Hollywood's golden years, live entertainment and classic films staged in historic movie palaces. The dates are July 27, August 3, 10 and 17, and the theaters are the Orpheum and the Mayan Theaters downtown, the Wilshire in Mid-Wilshire, and Pasadena's Rialto Theater. Ticket prices for the event for Con-
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Itself. Our experiences become jumbled in our memories. That jumble is what we try to keep secret. It is the means we draw upon for our presentation of ourselves, ie. how we move through the world, our communicative language."

Joy Wulke's work was also presented at the University of Idaho in late June, and will be in Copenhagen in October.

Miguel Baltierra

Continued from 5
library and archives of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. Those recognized were the Academy, The Friends of the Beverly Hills Waterworks, the law firm of Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, and the Beverly Hills City Council.

Four projects were awarded the Certificate of Merit. The Feola/Deenihan Partnership, Architects, received a certificate for their renovation of 818 West Seventh Street, the historic Barker Brothers building in downtown Los Angeles. Paramount Pictures Corporation was recognized for extensive efforts in preservation and renovation of the Paramount Studios lot. Steven Stockwell was cited for adaptive reuse of an historic house in Santa Monica as the Law Offices of Garrity and Golden. Eddie Blake, owner of The Tall of the Pop hot dog stand, received an award for preserving that whimsical landmark.

Award winners were selected by a jury consisting of Robert Harris, Dean of the USC School of Architecture (Chair); Jeffrey Blydenburgh, architect; Tom Hines, historian; Ruthann Lehrer, preservationist; Ragnar Quisle, architect; Richard Rowe, planner; Emmet Wemple, landscape architect.

Errata
In Esther McCoy's tribute to Reyner Banham in the May issue of LA Architect, she credited him with authorship of a guide to architecture in Buffalo. The book was, in fact, written by his wife, Mary Banham.

In the June article, "Search for Shelter", the site plan pictured as designed by Gerlinde Leiding and Yashuhiro Tonom was actually designed by Christa FroestL The project by Gerlinde Leiding and Yashuhiro Tonom was not pictured.

The 1926 Orpheum Theater, designed by G. Albert Lansburgh, is one of four theaters to be featured in this summer's "Last Remaining Seats II" film series sponsored by the LA Conservancy. (Photo, J. Thomas Owen.)
When Philip Johnson and Henry Russell Hitchcock curated their landmark 1932 International Style show at New York's Museum of Modern Art, Rudolph Michael Schindler was not included. The Schindlerfest at UCLA was, consequently, a belated tribute to his work. The Schindlerfest participants had ample opportunity to form their own opinions of Schindler's work in Los Angeles, on the one hundredth anniversary of his birth. The Schindlerfest Symposium was a series of lectures by noted architects, historians, and other California architects, which began with a review of Schindler’s work in the 1930s at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Scherr Center and continued with a screening of the 1982 documentary The Architecture of Rudolph Schindler, followed by a panel discussion, at the Schindler House, Los Angeles. The Schindlerfest at UCLA was a three-day event, including exhibitions, lectures, and tours in Los Angeles. The event was organized by the Architecture Department at UCLA, and was sponsored by the Los Angeles Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

Mincreasing attention is being devoted to the work of Rudolph Michael Schindler, who is often referred to as a precursor of the International Style. Schindler’s work, which was characterized by its use of industrial materials and its focus on the relationship between interior and exterior space, was influential in the development of modern architecture. The Schindlerfest at UCLA was an opportunity to revisit Schindler’s work and to reflect on his legacy.

Barbara Giella, a New York architectural historian, discussed the influence of the International Style on Schindler’s work in the Oliver, Van Patten, deKeyser and Walker houses, which she called the “30s style”. Giella stated that these houses were among the most problematic for Schindler, because his concerns with space, color, transparency, and “micro-environments” within rooms were at odds with the formal language of the International Style. She commented that, as a result, a series of collisions and contradictions which forced Schindler to abandon the “canonical” uses of materials and forms which he would have preferred, left the houses somewhat incoherent.

David Gebhard, author of numerous writings on Schindler and other California architects, talked about Schindler’s later buildings. He began by observing that Schindler’s work is often hard to categorize. If Schindler’s work is not included, at least in part, in this historic oversight. If there was any fault with the proceedings of this undertaking, it was exactly this sense of defensively justifying Schindler’s work in terms of historical movements in Europe and the United States. However, with exhibitions, evening lectures and ten houses available for tours, in addition to the morning symposium on May 21, Schindlerfest participants had ample opportunity to form their own opinions of Schindler’s work in Los Angeles, on the one hundredth anniversary of his birth.

The Schindlerfest Symposium was a series of lectures by noted architects, historians, and other California architects, which began with a review of Schindler’s work in the 1930s at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Scherr Center and continued with a screening of the 1982 documentary The Architecture of Rudolph Schindler, followed by a panel discussion, at the Schindler House, Los Angeles. The Schindlerfest at UCLA was a three-day event, including exhibitions, lectures, and tours in Los Angeles. The event was organized by the Architecture Department at UCLA, and was sponsored by the Los Angeles Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.
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Kahawai panels on the outside of the building will allow filtered natural light to illuminate the Japanese screens within.

(We descend to the gallery on the third level.)

Now you get to see how the light works. The middle space is for works like Japanese prints, which need a small, dark, controlled space. Beyond is the all-purpose west gallery, which didn't exist in Goff's design. That building was to be a smaller, basically private museum, with only two levels. When we came to Los Angeles, we didn't have to provide office space because it was already in the other building. I put the vault and some of the things that used to be in this level underneath the building, making this a large open gallery. The additional gallery space, which wasn't exclusively assigned to the collection, was an incentive for the museum to go ahead with the project. There is a skylight in the center, and steel beams are inside the radiating elements in the ceiling. These ramps are reminiscent of the Guggenheim.

In terms of use, there is no relationship between this building and the Guggenheim, but when people see ramps, they immediately say "Guggenheim". In this building there are large, level viewing areas, and the ramps are strictly to get from level to level, whereas the Guggenheim is a continuous ramp, and you are always standing on it. It is ideal to come up to the third level and then have people filter down, because it's more natural to be walking down.

The shape of the gallery was determined by viewing distances. Certain artworks, scrolls for instance, are on concave surfaces. These pieces you want to be able to see close up, whereas screens are on other surfaces from which you might want to get 50 or 60 feet away. The gallery is narrow and long. You walk down the ramp and you can see a screen from a distance, and then turn to look at the scrolls and you're very close.

How are the tokonomas going to be finished?

The inside of the tokonomas will have raw silk on the display surfaces, Philippine mahogany on the floor, ceramic tile on the columns.

How will the art be stored?

A screen has basically two halves, twelve feet on each side, and it folds up, so we're going to stack half in one slot and half in another. If the curators want to look at the screen, they pull each half out and stand it up, and look at it right in place. There is a rolling teak door that comes across to close the slot. The scroll storage and scrollroom are not typical museum storage rooms with trolleys running back and forth and pipes hanging above. They will be beautifully finished in a way that is compatible with this kind of artwork. A scholar will be able to pull a screen out and unfold it, without carrying or tripping over it, and yet he doesn't have to look at it in an industrial setting. These spaces didn't exist at all in the original drawing.

It has been my intention from the beginning to build the design as outlined, with the art as the client. Everything has been done with the intention of making the art look its best. It's been years of work, but I'd hate to have spent that amount of time and have only a big box at the end.
The Pavilion for Japanese Art at LACMA is approaching completion. With horns which echo the curved tusks of the mastodons in the tar pits, and a face like a giant samurai helmet, the museum suspends Japanese art over the La Brea tar pits in a celebration of temporal and spatial suspension.

The roof and connections to the existing buildings and ramps inside and out are suspended over gardens and pools of water cascading into a grotto. The suspended ramps are lit to make the visitor feel as if he is floating. In a recreation of the Japanese presentation, freestanding one, two, and three story "tokonoma", with thatch-like plaster caps topped by cartoon-like ridge beams, will hold each piece of art. Unlike the rest of the building, which is a symphony of exquisite material richness, these look like they were transplanted from the Aku-Aku Inn on Ventura Boulevard.

But for all its faults, the Pavilion is not a one-liner like the Guggenheim. The layout demonstrates sound logic. Support functions are housed on the lower floors, with display functions above. Large works of art are displayed in bigger rooms, and small works are displayed in more intimate spaces which allow closer viewing.

The Pavilion for Japanese Art, along with the Shin'enkan collection which it houses, was Joe Price's gift to Los Angeles. Price, whose family made its fortune manufacturing oil and gas pipelines, developed an interest in art when he worked as his father's liaison to Frank Lloyd Wright on Price Tower in Bartlesville. He began collecting the Japanese merchant class, Edo period (1615-1868) art 30 years ago, before it was valued in Japan, and his collection of ink paintings is now the largest in the Western world. Through Wright, Price became associated with Bruce Goff, who designed a pavilion in 1982, before the site in Los Angeles was chosen. The following is an interview with associate architect Bart Prince, conducted by Nir Buras for LA Architect:

**How did the idea for the building develop?**

We worked on several different preliminary schemes, and the building got closer and closer to working spatially, although it was still planned for a site in Bartlesville. Bruce and I had decided we would do the project together, wherever it was eventually built. At the time of his death in August of 1982, there were two schematic plans and an elevation. We had a very small-scale drawing with an outline of the shape of the gallery indicating where the tokonomas would go, and we were going to have Kalwall perimeter, a translucent plastic which would filter natural light like a Japanese shoji screen.

**What is the biggest difference between the original and the final schemes in terms of adapting to site?**

In terms of adapting to site, there's a floor that didn't exist in the original scheme, but you'd never know it. When this building is finished and there are stone walls that step up to it, anybody looking at the schematic drawings and the building would know that this is what those drawings were trying to represent. And you realize how seldom that happens in architecture. (We walk up an internal security stair and emerge onto a rooftop bridge which joins two green quartzite stair towers. From here we see the roof suspended on large piers.)

There are three main columns on each side, and big steel box beams which curve in plan and section, and cables which come down to radiating steel beams inside.

**Were the beams a preconceived notion, a result of engineering, or both?**

There was really nothing preconceived. We tried to cut down the amount of perimeter structure that could cast big shadows. The idea was to support the roof on the main columns and let the perimeter wall be a very light, open material. The solution included the beams. The shape of the beams was determined by the kind of feeling that we wanted the building to have. In those schematic drawings there was one elevation which gave the general idea that there were beams and columns coming up, and cables coming down. In working it out after Goff died, it had to be what worked structurally and visually.
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Robert Allen Reed
President, LA/AIA

The members of the board would like to welcome the following new directors: Randy Swanson, a new Director of the IDP Committee. Randy is new to the state, but has been active in Student Associates at the national level, so is quite familiar with AIA and the value of the IDP Program. IDP, the Intern-Architect Development Program, is a professional comprehensive internship program. Designed to assure skills in all aspects of the architectural practice, it is a means of assessing and documenting individual activities for both licensure and NCARB certification. It is also designed to augment professional training with the aid of advisors and periodic reviews. Interest is growing in the IDP program in California (some states currently have IDP required) and Randy has some good ideas to share with us. For an IDP packet, write to Robert Rosenfeld, Director of Intern­ship Programs, NCARB, 1735 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20006, (202) 783-6500, or call the local AIA Chapter Office for information and referrals.

Associate President Mark Gelbrie repre­

sents the Associates in Corporate board meetings in an official capacity, and LA/AIA President-Elect Fernando Juarez has returned input and guidance to Associates from the Chapter level by attending Associates monthly board meetings. With the appointment by the Corporate Board, and further discussion by the Associate members, now it is official: Fernando Juarez, AIA is the liaison between the Corporate and Associate Boards, and future President-Elect will con­tinue to fill the position on the Corporate Board.

LA/AIA Associate President Mark Gelbrie and the elected Barbara Horcas-Gibbs have recently returned from New York where they represented our Los Angeles Associates at the AIA National Convention. It was a chance to participate in discussions and seminars with other Chapter representatives nationwide, discussions ranging from direc­tions of the future for the architectural practice to lobbying issues in government. Ideas were exchanged and chapter concerns and activities compared, and it was a great educational opportunity for Mark and Barbara and the Associates Board.

Intern architects and architectural student are invited to attend the Associates board meeting on Tuesday, August 10. We will meet at 6:30 pm with refreshments, and commence at 7:00 pm in room 259 at the Pacific Design Center. For further information contact the LA/AIA Chapter Office at (213) 659-2282.

Contracts and Specifications Classes

Beginning in September, Hans Meier, a construction specifications consultant and author of “Construction Specifications Hand­book” and “Library of Specifications Sections”, will teach a series of courses on construction contracts and specifications.

Topics to be covered include the essential elements of construction contracts, proper preparation of front-end documents, learning to live with the CSI format, “short-form” specs, construction contract administration, contract closeouts and construction dispute settlement. The series, sponsored by the LA/ AIA, will begin Thursday, September 15 from 6:30-9:00 at the Pacific Design Center, Room 299C. It will run for 13 sessions and be divided into three consecutive courses. Reserve your place early, as seating capacity is extremely limited. For a descriptive mailer and to make reservations, call (213) 659-2282.

Members

AIA: Pasquale Victor Gutierrez, Reel/Gro­

man & Associates; Morris R. Poindexter, Jenklaus, Gates & Martin, Inc.; Gary Houston, Widow Winon Cohen; John J. Silber, Los Angeles Design Center; Peter Becker, Lehrer Architects; Michael B. Burch, Michael Burch Architects; Robert A. Schiller, H. Wendell

Mounce AIA & Associates.

Transfer In: Ron Golan, Central Office of Architecture, From San Francisco; Harry Korshak, from Palm Beach.

Transfer Out: David L. Mieger, Green Associates, to Phoenix; Sigrid Miller Pollin, Miller Pollin Planners, to Inland.


Professional Affiliates, Alvin Chan, Department of Water and Power.

Student, Christy L. Ishimine Hatfield, SCI-ARC.

Preservation Awards

On May 11, the Los Angeles Conservancy presented its seventh annual preservation awards. The awards recognize exceptional achievement in preservation of historically or architecturally significant buildings or sites in greater Los Angeles, or tangible contributions to furthering historic preservation.

President’s Awards were made for lifetime achievement to Esther McCoy, outstanding architectural historian, and Julius Shulman, dean of Los Angeles architectural photogra­phers. A special award was made to the Getty Grants Program for establishing its new Architectural Conservation Grants Program. Five Preservation Awards were made. Engine Company No. 28, Ltd. was recog­nized for adaptive reuse of an historic fire station in downtown Los Angeles into offices and a restaurant. The St. James Club was cited for restoration and adaptive reuse of the Art Deco landmark, Sunset Tower building in West Hollywood. W.I. Simonson, Inc. received an award for a faithful reconstruction of their historic automobile dealership in Santa Monica, which was destroyed in a fire.

The architectural firm Woodland Parkin­son and Partners was recognized for their restoration of the exterior of the Monte to Apartments in Hollywood. Four organizations were cited for efforts that led to preservation of the monumental Beverly Hills Waterworks, which will be renovated and reused as the...
As many of you are aware, the nationwide system of reciprocity is being compromised by an ongoing dispute between the California Board of Architectural Examiners (CBAE) and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB). The CCAIA is trying to help resolve this serious problem; and your active support is solicited to help bring the two parties into mediation.

Due to the entrenched positions of both the CBAE and the NCARB, CCAIA believes that third-party mediation represents the best opportunity for resolution. To further this process, CCAIA contacted the American Arbitration Association in February to request their assistance in bringing the CBAE and NCARB together. This action is in concert with National AIA's December 1987 resolution asking for mediation and we are working closely with AIA President Ted Pappas, FAIA, in these efforts. While the CBAE has agreed to enter into mediation, NCARB has not yet responded favorably to our request.

Therefore, as a further show of good faith to encourage mediation, CCAIA will erect legislation to temporarily suspend implementation of our AB 1113 (Bradley, 1987) while the CBAE and NCARB work toward permanent resolution of their disagreements.

AB 1113 established that reciprocity into California be tied to reciprocity out of California based on individual state's agreements to accept the new California Architects Licensing Examination (CALE), CCAIA's new legislation, AB 4419 (Bradley), suspending implementation of AB 1113 has been introduced and will be sent to the Governor contingent upon progress between the CBAE and NCARB to enter into mediation. As an urgent measure, the bill will become effective immediately upon the Governor's signature. The suspension of AB 1113 will remain in effect until July 1, 1989, providing ample opportunity for the two parties to negotiate. CCAIA will prepare legislation in 1989 to allow for the permanent repeal of AB 1113 upon successful conclusion of mediation.

CCAIA has dedicated substantial resources to preserving a nationwide system of reciprocity. It has met with every national AIA President since 1981 in an attempt to keep this issue as a national priority, in addition to consistently initiating andsupporting efforts to bring about third-party mediation. While these positive actions have gone largely unrecognized, our efforts with AB 1113 have unfortunately been misconstrued. AB 1113 was a direct response to NCARB's Resolution 13, which provided for expulsion of any member state which did not administer the ARE. Once NCARB passed Resolution 13, CCAIA had little choice but to proceed with AB 1113.

In light of the CBAE's decision to administer an independent California Architects Licensing Examination (CALE) beginning in 1987, AB 1113 was designed to protect the ability of California architects to gain out-of-state licensure. NCARB had indicated that it would not accept passage of the CALE for the purposes of NCARB certification. Additionally, CBAE had publicly stated that even if other states took retaliatory action against California architects that CBAE would continue to grant out-of-state architects reciprocal licensure. These statements by CBAE and NCARB threatened to create a situation where California architects would be prevented from practicing in other states, while out-of-state architects would be unfairly allowed to compete for work in California. Therefore, CCAIA enacted AB 1113 to provide that reciprocity with California be contingent upon reciprocity out of California based on individual state's agreements to accept the CALE.

You can play a vital role in bringing this matter to mediation by writing to encourage CBAE to enter into meaningful negotiation with the CBAE and the NCARB. Your letters will demonstrate to the NCARB that the California profession is deeply committed to resolving the current dispute. Please write to NCARB President Walter Cary, AIA at 1735 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20006 and send a copy of your correspondence to CCAIA.

Betsy Olenick Dougherty, AIA
Ms. Dougherty is President of the CCAIA.

Input Needed

The CCAIA Professional Practice Program has formed a three member Task Force to review and produce an annotated summary of AIA Document A201: General Conditions of the Contract for Construction. Chaired by Melvin G. Cole, AIA, PCs, the Task Force is seeking input from members who have used the 1987 edition of A201. The Professional Practice Program is beginning to hear about problems with its use of A201, now that it has been "on the street" for a while.

Problems need to be identified so that the Task Force can address them in its final publication of A201. Any information you can provide ("marked up" copies of A201, suggestions for improving its language, problems associated with its use) will assist the Task Force in producing a comprehensive, useful summary. Please send your information as soon as possible to CCAIA Professional Practice Program, Attention: Jeri L. Davis, 1303 J Street, Suite 200, Sacramento, California 95814 (916) 448-9082.

President's Letter

Your delegation to the AIA National Convention has recently returned to Los Angeles and while the New York past even is fresh in mind, it is prudent to begin thinking about the 1994 AIA National Convention in Los Angeles.

Based upon get-togethers with some members of our delegation and review of what New York did as compared with what Los Angeles could do, the following are some suggestions of money-making and other events our Chapter might investigate.

Windowmaster Products... For the Finishing Touch

Windowmaster Products provides colorful finish options. These finishes can be applied to window and door frames to complement your overall residential or commercial building design. You gain design flexibility without sacrificing performance and durability.

We offer a variety of metal finishes: from Class I and II anodized finishes to Polyester, Silicone Polyester and Kynar paint coatings. Our painted finishes are available in six standard colors and virtually any custom-color you wish to specify.

Make it a lasting finish. Choose Windowmaster, the company with the finishing touch.


The legislative reaction to the First Interstate Bank fire will have a significant impact on existing and planned highrise buildings in Los Angeles. While the investigators are still attempting to determine the initial cause of the fire and how it spread to such proportions, it is clear that a serious fire can occur in a well-maintained building and, given the right combination of circumstances, can spread to serious proportions before being controlled by manual fire-fighting tactics.

The results of the fire have focused attention on certain properties that have not yet been upgraded to include automatic sprinkler systems. While the specific requirements of the ordinance have not been finalized, it appears that a retroactive requirement to install of automatic sprinklers in a majority of existing highrise buildings will be passed by the Los Angeles City Council.

Similar to the reaction of the MGM fire in 1980, retromactive legislation will probably include mandatory sprinkler installation in most highrise buildings with exceptions being permitted for a limited number of properties that may technically meet the definition of a highrise structure but do not present the fire-fighting and life-safety hazard of highrises.

Sprinkler statistics have shown that the effect of a sprinkler system in a fire are quite impressive. The overall success rate at all reported cases shows more than 90% of the fires either controlled or extinguished with ten or fewer sprinklers operating. Highrise fire experience has shown a dramatic increase in these numbers to indicate almost a 100% success ratio and almost 90% of the fires being under control with four or fewer sprinklers operating.

Improvements in technology have reduced the response time of the individual sprinkler as well as improved its spray pattern at operating pressures.

A sprinkler system is a specially connected piping system bringing a water supply from a source to the individual sprinklers. Each individual sprinkler has a heat sensitive nozzle designed to activate individually by being heated to a predetermined temperature. The common temperature of the sprinkler's fusible element is 165 degrees. Air temperatures required to transfer the heat energy from the air to the sprinkler may, at the time of actuation, actually rise to temperature levels in excess of 1,000 degrees Fahrenheit. Water supply requirements for sprinkler systems in the typical office buildings range from 100 to 200 gallons per minute. Other simultaneous fire usage might bring the total demand of the fire protection system to 500 gallons per minute. Manufacturing facilities may require additional water, bringing total demand to approximately 750 gallons per minute. A typical fire service hose uses 250 gallons per minute.

Pipe sizes are generally based on hydraulic calculation design that determines the required pressure of the sprinklers and determines the actual pipe sizes considering the pressure available from the source. Typically, the main pipe sizes in the highrise office environment range from 2 1/2 inch to 4 inch for the main supply pipe, with smaller pipes in the system down to 1 inch diameter.

Depending upon the time-frame permitted for retroactive compliance (currently proposed as three years), the installation of sprinkler systems in existing properties will cause increased costs on a temporary basis due to the demand on the highrise contractors and the resultant strain on resources.

For those properties with a standpipe system connected to a water supply system, the cost of a sprinkler retrofit should be less, since sprinkler standpipe combination systems will not increase the demand of water quantities and the pressure required for a standpipe system is generally at or above that of a sprinkler system operation.

When an adequate water supply is unsatisfactory, the cost of the retrofit must increase to include the costs of the water supply. This may include not only the cost of a 90% of the fires being under control with four or fewer sprinklers operating. Improvements in technology have reduced the response time of the individual sprinkler as well as improved its spray pattern at operating pressures.

A sprinkler system is a specially connected piping system bringing a water supply from a source to the individual sprinklers. Each individual sprinkler has a heat sensitive nozzle designed to activate individually by being heated to a predetermined temperature. The common temperature of the sprinkler's fusible element is 165 degrees. Air temperatures required to transfer the heat energy from the air to the sprinkler may, at the time of actuation, actually rise to temperature levels in excess of 1,000 degrees Fahrenheit. Water supply requirements for sprinkler systems in the typical office buildings range from 100 to 200 gallons per minute. Other simultaneous fire usage might bring the total demand of the fire protection system to 500 gallons per minute. Manufacturing facilities may require additional water, bringing total demand to approximately 750 gallons per minute. A typical fire service hose uses 250 gallons per minute.

Pipe sizes are generally based on hydraulic calculation design that determines the required pressure of the sprinklers and determines the actual pipe sizes considering the pressure available from the source. Typically, the main pipe sizes in the highrise office environment range from 2 1/2 inch to 4 inch for the main supply pipe, with smaller pipes in the system down to 1 inch diameter.

Depending upon the time-frame permitted for retroactive compliance (currently proposed as three years), the installation of sprinkler systems in existing properties will cause increased costs on a temporary basis due to the demand on the highrise contractors and the resultant strain on resources.

For those properties with a standpipe system connected to a water supply system, the cost of a sprinkler retrofit should be less, since sprinkler standpipe combination systems will not increase the demand of water quantities and the pressure required for a standpipe system is generally at or above that of a sprinkler system operation.

When an adequate water supply is unsatisfactory, the cost of the retrofit must increase to include the costs of the water supply. This may include not only the cost of a connection to the city water system, but also the pumps necessary to provide adequate pressure for system operation. An alarm system is also necessary to notify management in the event of system activation or malfunction.

The ability to retrofit a sprinkler system in an existing structure is a problem that must be evaluated on the basis of both cost and installation, overall esthetics of the system, and the ability to coordinate with other building elements to make an acceptable configuration. Flexibility for future remodeling of tenant spaces should also be considered in piping system design.

Installation of the sprinkler system must be coordinated with the working schedule of the building to do that it causes minimum disruption to normal building operations. Older, well-compartmented buildings offer additional design alternatives that may reduce the sprinkler water supply requirement to quantities less than 100 gallons per minute.

The need for planning and specification preparation to develop the retrofit installation program is of prime importance. The ability to coordinate contract efforts with owner's expectations and operation requirements needs to be developed and spelled out well before the start of construction so that efforts of various parties required during installation can be coordinated.

The decision to prepare specific design documents or to provide performance specifications for the installation should not be based solely on the cost of the design effort, but should also consider the project requirements.

Gerald W. O'Rourke
Mr. O’Rourke is Western Engineering Manager for Schwerin Engineering of Pleasant Hill, a firm specializing in fire protection, safety and code consultation.
Professional land use planning is at a crossroads in Los Angeles. Comprehensive planning, which generally determines the land use, zoning and traffic circulation elements of a city's general plan, is undergoing a crisis of confidence.

Both the courts and the City Council are increasingly being called upon to establish criteria for land use, building heights and limitations on project size, usurping what has traditionally been the responsibility of planning professionals. A recent example is the "Friends of Westwood" case, which determined that projects which substantially affect the community shall undergo an environmental impact review regardless of whether the projects comply with existing zoning plans. As a result, a moratorium is in effect on new construction in Westwood, and the City of Los Angeles Planning Commission is currently considering legislation which would require an environmental impact review for all projects over a certain size (40,000 sf) to insure "compatibility with" the neighborhood.

In effect, the past efforts of the Los Angeles Department of Planning are unravelling before our eyes, calling into question the validity of the planning process as we know it.

The legal foundation for most of this court action stems from legislation called the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA essentially requires that a project not adversely affect the environment in which it is to be located. Given the state of traffic congestion everywhere and the condition of the Los Angeles sewer system, the CEQA checklist used by the City of Los Angeles questions the environmental impact of any project with respect to its transportation/circulation, public services, utilities, sewer systems and solid waste disposal. Thus, all projects of any consequence can be subject to a complete EIR review, and can be held up at any time by court actions that produce costly delays.

Even though a project conforms with the zoning called for in the approved city plan, the uncertainty produced by the threat of court action and subsequent delays effectively transforms adopted city plans into useless reams of paper and poses the question: "Has comprehensive planning failed in the City of Los Angeles and, for that matter, throughout the State of California?"

If the answer is "yes," then another question must be asked: "Is there any hope for the property investor in Los Angeles, or anywhere in the state, if there is no assurance of the right to develop property to its full potential or of the preservation of properties within the residential zoning umbrella?"

My answer is an emphatic "yes," and I offer the following recommendations to assist in safe passage through the current mine fields of moratoriums, growth limits, discretionary reviews and conditional use permits.

First, we must work within the framework provided by existing general plans. The Los Angeles General Plan is made up of 35 individual community plans that combine under the "Centers Concept." A tremendous amount of citizen participation went into the development of these comprehensive community plans, and the fact that the effort necessary to implement them was never completely carried out is not sufficient reason to abandon the entire process.

The community plans should be reviewed with community participation similar to the process that occurred when the plans were initially developed. The city's zoning plans must be made to conform with these community land-use plans. Past failure to reconcile these plans has resulted in the construction of many of the most controversial projects.

A balanced transportation system, which provides an alternative to the automobile, must be developed throughout Southern California. The failure of our transportation system is the single distinguishing factor in the collapse of this city's planning process. When community plans were approved in the 1970's, and included transportation elements calling for the completion of several planned freeways (including the Beverly Hills Freeway), a downtown people mover, a light rail system and Metrotrolley. None of these were carried out, and essentially we are left with a transportation system which was designed in the 1950's.

These actions will require a tremendous effort. If additional personnel are required by the city's planning department (personnel shortages due to Proposition 13 cutbacks are the uncertainty produced by the threat of court action and subsequent delays effectively transforms adopted city plans into useless reams of paper and poses the question: "Has comprehensive planning failed in the City of Los Angeles and, for that matter, throughout the State of California?"
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1988 Sandcastle Competition

The tide goes out and hundreds of architects, developers and contractors, along with family and friends, converge on a familiar Southern California beach. Armed with buckets and shovels, they hurry to create masterpieces of art and architecture in the sand before the tide comes in. Add colorful t-shirts, awards, refreshments and members of the media, and you have the 1988 LA/AIA Sandcastle Competition.

On Saturday, August 6, beginning at 10:00 am, teams and individuals from the southland will gather at Dockweiler State Beach, just south of Los Angeles Airport where the Imperial Highway meets the Pacific Ocean, to compete in the annual event. Last year, more than 200 people attended, and this year promises to be even more spectacular.

Returning to defend their honor will be Lee Saylor, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, Kurt Meyer Partners, Johnson, Pain and Pernida Associates, and Landworth, DeBolske & Brown, to name a few.

Some of the highlights of last year’s event were a replica of Catalina Island’s Casino, “Guldiver” and “Noah’s Ark.” There were also a variety of traditional and not-so-traditional sandcastles for spectators to view.

The public is encouraged to participate in the unique experience of beachfront architecture. All proceeds benefit the Landworth Memorial Scholarship Fund, which assists local students of architecture.

Committee Solicits Nominations

The Chapter Nominations Committee is soliciting nominations from LA/AIA architects for the 1989 Officers of Vice President-President Elect (one-year term), Treasurer (two-year term), and directors (four positions open, two-year terms).

CCAAI Delegates. Currently, the Chapter is allocated six CCAAIA delegates. In accordance with Chapter Bylaws, election to office as President, Vice President-President Elect, Treasurer or Secretary also constitutes election as a Chapter delegate to the California Council. Two delegate positions will be open (two-year term) in 1989.

Any AIA member-in-good-standing may nominate an AIA member-in-good-standing for each office to be filled. The person making the nomination must have determined that the nominee will serve if elected.

Each nominee must be seconded by four AIA members-in-good-standing; a member may only second one person for a given office.

Properly executed nominations should be received at the Chapter Office, 8687 Melrose Avenue B4-72, Los Angeles, CA 90069, by noon on Friday, July 29, 1988 for review and accreditation by the committee.

The names of all the accredited nominees will be published in the September issue of LA Architect. After such publication, LA/AIA architects will have three weeks to submit additional nominations for accreditation in accordance with the above procedure.

Nominations will then be closed and election ballots prepared and sent to the membership. Ballots will be tabulated and the results announced at our regular Chapter election meeting on Tuesday, November 8, 1988.

Design Awards Jurors

The jurors for the 1988 LA/AIA Design Awards program will be Robert Campbell, Ronald Krueck, and Rodolfo Machado. The jurors promise to bring varied backgrounds, interests and viewpoints to bear in evaluating the entries of the Chapter architects. The jurors’ experience in practice, theory, education and criticism represents a balance of major factors in the field.

Robert Campbell, a practicing architect in Boston, Massachusetts, is Architectural Critic of the Boston Globe, a contributing editor of Architecture magazine, and has written for many other publications. In 1980, he received the AIA medal for Architectural Criticism. Mr. Campbell has been in private practice as an architect since 1975, chiefly as a consultant to non-profit institutions including the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Boston Symphony Orchestra, the Planning Board of the City of San Francisco and others.

Ronald Krueck is a practicing architect in Chicago, Illinois. Since 1987, he has been a partner in the firm Krueck and Olsen Architects in Chicago. Prior to that association, since graduating from Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT), Mr. Krueck worked as an architect for CF Murphy and Associates and Hammond Beeby and Associates. In his current association, he is known for his lyrical and elegantly detailed interiors. Mr. Krueck has been a professor at IIT, the Harvard Graduate School of Design, and the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Rodolfo Machado is a full-time professor and practicing architect in Boston, Massachusetts. Machado has taught full-time at the University of California at Berkeley, Carnegie Mellon University and the Rhode Island School of Design, where he chaired the department of architecture from 1978 until 1986. He has been Bishop Professor of Architecture at Yale University and Smith College and a contributing professor at Harvard University Graduate School of Design, and is a partner in Machado and Silvetti Associates in Boston, Massachusetts.

Solicits Nominations

Any AIA member-in-good-standing may nominate an AIA member-in-good-standing for each office to be filled. The person making the nomination must have determined that the nominee will serve if elected.

Each nominee must be seconded by four AIA members-in-good-standing; a member may only second one person for a given office.

Properly executed nominations should be received at the Chapter Office, 8687 Melrose Avenue B4-72, Los Angeles, CA 90069, by noon on Friday, July 29, 1988 for review and accreditation by the committee.

The names of all the accredited nominees will be published in the September issue of LA Architect. After such publication, LA/AIA architects will have three weeks to submit additional nominations for accreditation in accordance with the above procedure.

Nominations will then be closed and election ballots prepared and sent to the membership. Ballots will be tabulated and the results announced at our regular Chapter election meeting on Tuesday, November 8, 1988.
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