24/4

NC Architect

July-August 1977



MID-STATE BRINGS YOU BIG BUCKSKIN PAVERS. AND A LITTLE RELIEF FROM RED TILE FLOORS.

Our new Buckskin Pavers come in all the regular shapes and sizes, as well as the big 8x8 size shown here. But what's really new is the warm, natural Buckskin color. And nobody has it but Mid-State. So fill out this coupon and we'll send you a free Buckskin Paver sample.

ID-STATE TILE

Mid-State Tile Company, Box 627, Lexington, N.C. 27292

TO: Mid-State Tile Co Please send me a	mpany, Box 627, L sample of your nev	exington, N.C. 27292 v Buckskin Pavers.	
Name			
Company			
Address			
City	State	Zip	

actual size

When insurance companies need a total insurance package for themselves, they look to Associated Insurers.

Why?

Basically three reasons:

Objectivity in the marketplace. As brokers, Associated Insurers shops among an unlimited number of insurance markets for the most complete insurance coverage for our client's dollar. We represent clients.

Expertise in a wide range of areas. A life insurance company, for example, though in the insurance business, may not necessarily have an expertise in property or liability insurance. As brokers and professionals, we do. And in all other areas too: officers and directors liability, errors and omissions, difference in conditions, mortgage protection, workmen's com-

pensation, and more. We design specific programs. We sell no prepackaged insurance plans. Instead, we specifically design each client's programs to meet speci-

fic insurance needs. Associated Insurers has been evaluating and marketing insurance since 1933. We're staffed with highly qualified professionals in every area of insurance. As brokers we represent a variety of clients, both large and small, national and local. Two of our clients are among the Top 50 insurance companies in the South. We also provide insurance programs for 11 other insurance companies.

If insurance companies are coming to Associated Insurers for their own insurance needs, shouldn't you?





Fire Station Three Chapel Hill, N. C.

Architect: Cogswell/Hausler Associates

General Contractor: Delta Construction Co.

Masonry Contractor: W. L. McAuley



24/4

July August 1977 Published by the North Carolina Chapter of The American Institute of Architects

Dr. J. L. Pierce

School Facilities Planning: Past, Present and Future	The former Director poses some questions	7
A Standard Specification	A bit of nonsense	13
Yo-Yo, Sculpture or Art?	"A Happening"	14
New Price List for AIA Documents		15
Stagville: A Unique Preser- vation Center	Experiencing historic preservation	17
Index to Advertisers		18

NORTH CAROLINA CHAPTER THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Tebee P. Hawkins Thomas T. Hayes, Jr., FAIA President 1st Vice-President Marvin R. A. Johnson, FAIA Elizabeth B. Lee Vice-President Vice-President Harry Wolf III Vice-President Secretary Wesley A. McClure Conrad B. Wessell, Jr. Treasurer Michael Newman Director Director Thomas P. Turner, Jr. A. Lewis Polier Director John E. Cort William H. Sigmon Benjamin M. Pearce Director Director Director James C. Buie John T. Wall Tan F. Ersoy Gary W. Partin Louise Hall Director Director Director Director Archivist Legal Counsel R. Mayne Albright **Betty Silver** Executive Director Branda Spaanbroek Office Assistant

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Brian Shawcroft, Chairman James L. Brandt Robert P. Burns, Jr.

Cover photo: Mountain Heritage High School North Carolina Architect is published by the North Carolina Chapter of The American Institute of Architects, Mrs. Betty W. Silver, Executive Director, 115 W. Morgan Street, Raleigh, North Carolina 27601. Advertising rates on request.

North Carolina Architect was formerly published as Southern Architect, Volume I, No. 1, through Volume XI, No. 11, 1954-1964.

Opinions expressed by contributors are not necessarily those of the North Carolina Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

look-in cool

Cool to keep your perishables perfect and at their most tempting advantage. While displayed with a look of quality your customers can sense. A cool, colorful, ''carry-all'' case from W. A. Brown.



Prefabricated three or four inch urethane walls for economical, custom-designed display and storage refrigerators. NSF approved and listed UL electrical. W. A. BROWN & SON, INC. P. O. Box 1408, Salisbury, N. C. 28144





Urethane Walk-in Coolers/Freezers — Adjustable Shelving — Specialty Equipment for Food Stores — Engineering and Food Store Planning Service



SCHOOL FACILITIES PLANNING: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

by: J. L. "Jet" Pierce

Educational Professional Services, Inc. Director, Division of School Planning 1959-1976

During the fall of 1976, the Division of School Planning, State Department of Public Instruction, conducted a series of workshops across the state. Participating in the workshops were superintendents, members of their staffs, architects, engineers, landscape architects, a few board members and a number of county commissioners. At each of these workshops, we discussed with those participating some of our thoughts about the progress and achievements in school planning in North Carolina during the past twenty years, as well as our concerns about the future. We indicated our appreciation for the very fine staff available in the Division of School Planning and for the excellent relationships which we have enjoyed during these years with various professional groups, with the construction industry as a whole, and with official governmental bodies. In our remarks, we attributed the degree of success in these relationships to good communications among and between the various groups. We then pointed out to workshop participants the fact that our situation has changed considerably during the past 20-25 years.

Twenty-five years ago the process of planning and constructing school facilities was rather simple in comparison with the complex situation that we find ourselves in today. The changes and attending problems are coming at a rather rapid rate. Among the problems are those related to recent legal decisions, to new technological developments, to the changing character of public education, and to increasingly complex relationships which are created as our society in North Carolina moves from a predominantly rural to an urban-industrialized situation. To continue

progressing and to meet the challenge of the future, we feel very strongly that we must work diligently to strengthen and to improve communications between and among all of those involved in planning and constructing facilities for the public schools.

The major challenge immediatley facing us, in our opinion, is how we can effect lines of communication which produce a clear understanding of each individual's or group's responsibilities and opportunities for contributing to the facility needs of the 1,200,000 children in the public school system. In our discussion with workshop participants, we emphasized that if we are going to meet worthwhile challenges-as educators, as architects, as engineers, as landscape architects, as supervisors of maintenance or transportation, as board members—we cannot drift. We are moving so rapidly into a period of chaos that unless the total component of what we would call the school facilities planning-constructing community focuses its collective mind, energy, and effort on solving some of the problems which have accompanied recent change, we may be in trouble. In fact, we may already be there.

Within the past five to ten years, developments in the broad area of liability have to a great extent created chaos. One illustration is the medical profession which, as you know, has been in turmoil for five, six or seven years. Its problems are spilling over into the legal profession and knowledgeable people predict that the next professional group to be affected will be accountants. People in the facilities planning-constructing community could be next. All those involved in providing school facilities

are already experiencing the impact of recent developments which complicate an existing situation which is confused. New laws, influential legal opinions, court decisions, policies, rules and regulations by the bucketful are now part of school planning. When the Division of School Planning was reorganized in 1949, it was necessary for those planning public school facilities to deal with three agencies in Raleigh: the Division of School Planning, the fire marshal's office in the Department of Insurance, and the Sanitary Engineering Division of the State Board of Health. In addition, we now have to deal with the federal standards for environmental protection, sedimentation control, water and air resources, the handicapped code, OSHA, and other standards, guidelines, etc.

One of the major problems that we have today, outside of leaking roofs and money, is the disposition of on-site sewage effluent. If water carried sewers are not available, the on-site system generates the effluent which has to be turned into a stream or pond somewhere. It used to be a simple matter of running it into a stream or ditch, but this cannot be done today. Strict limitations prevent it. It is high time that all of our boards of county commissioners look realistically at the total problem of sanitation for our communities-and not go at it piecemeal. A broad community plan must be developed for provision of public water and public sewage systems, all coordinated by the principle tax leveling authority, the county commissioners. The process by which we plan and construct public school facilities today is no longer the simple process by which the schools of the 1930's, 1940's and even the 1950's were planned and constructed.

We are in a situation that calls for maximum utilization of our resources and this, of course, requires the best possible communication among all concerned. In the process of our preparation for the workshops in the fall of 1976, we discovered that the best possible communication does not always exist. We first had conversations among our own staff in the Division of School Planning and were able, to some degree, to identify our major problems. We then conversed with superintendents, architects, engineers, landscape architects, and others with whom we primarily deal.

Before mentioning some of the things we heard during the discussions, it might be pointed out that as long as everybody is making plenty of money, a friendly atmosphere prevails and we don't fuss. However, when things get tight economically, the worst in us seems to come out, and believe you me, there has been plenty of cost cutting in the last 24 months. Here are some things we heard which revealed poor communication and relations among the various individual and group members of the facility planningconstructing community. We have heard architects criticize other architects, perhaps more than we have heard in many years. We have learned there is not a unanimous opinion on everything between architects and engineers. Believe it or not, we have had engineers to tell us that they never inspect a project, that they only get paid for designing it. We quote from such a conversation: "No sir, if you want to pay me, sure I'll inspect it: that service is available." We in the Division of School Planning thought that the law required that whoever designed the mechanical/electrical system had to certify that it was done according to plans and specifications.



North Rowan Primary School, Rowan County Robert F. Stone, AIA, Architect



South Caldwell High School, Caldwell County Architects: Harrell & Clark Biggs & Abernathy



North Edgecombe High School, Edgecombe County Edwards, Dove, Knight & Associates, Architects

We have noted conflicting opinions between architects and landscape architects. Conversations with landscape architects produced some interesting suggestions. For example, they suggested that the architect and mechanical/electrical/structural engineer design, locate and put the facade on a building and the six feet immediately surrounding it. Phase 2, they suggested would consist of site development, the planning and construction of parking areas, sewage systems, etc. For this, knowledgeable, talented, and licensed civil engineers. landscape architects, land planners, etc. would be responsible. When these suggestions were presented to a group of architects we thought they were going to have apoplexy.

Perhaps the thing that shook us up most in our conversations was the recollection that several years ago we had total architectural engineering service fee schedules recommended by the respective professional associations. Then along came the consent decision or decree which eliminated these fee schedules. Now the architects and engineers are saying the present system is not working and are suggesting that the Division of School Planning set a recommended fee schedule. This, in our opinion, is not the solution to this particular problem. We believe the problem should be addressed by all who are concerned so that a mutually acceptable decision as to how we should proceed might be reached. How we determine what services we need, where they might be acquired and what compensation should be paid for these professional services are some of the most critical questions facing all of us today.

In addition to the problem of determining the value of various services, there are other concerns of equal importance. In our opinion the following questions need to be answered so that problems relating to them can be solved: (1) Who is responsible for what? (2) Who can provide or deliver what kinds of services? (3) What should contracts between parties cover or what do they provide for? (4) What kind and quantity of supervision and/or inspection will be provided by each party involved?

First, let's look at the question of responsibility—who is responsible to whom and for what? Above everything else, boards of education, superintendents, architects, engineers, and contractors are ultimately responsible to the 1,200,000 children who I hope will live in a better world than we live in today. If we, as professional people, are to meet the challenge of providing our children with the best possible school facilities, we must clearly understand our responsibilities to the total operation.

In this broad area of responsibilities, boards of education have a responsibility-a legal responsibility-to plan, to organize and to administer the public school system. In turn, their chief administrative or executive officer, the superintendent, has a responsibility to the board of education and to the public to carry out their decisions. We are as much concerned about the relationships between superintendents and boards of education as we are about the relationships between architects and engineers, contractors and architects, superintendents and contractors. architects and governmental agencies. We need to devise means by which we can improve the relationships, particularly the communications, so that each understands what his responsibility and role

is in this total process. We don't know now. Boards of education are acting like superintendents; superintendents are acting like milktoasts, in some instance, or dictators in other instances. We have architects going directly to members of the board of education to acquire commissions for a school building, but it is the superintendent they are going to have to deal with and work with. Such action often causes bad relationships. We think we need to do something positive about it. We recognize that the Division of School Planning has its responsibilities. We are all in the box together and we urge that we martial our resources and sit down together and plan constructively to strengthen the relationships and to improve communications in order to get the job done.

Next let's look at the question of who can deliver what. The average superintendent or board member doesn't really understand the total complexity of planning and constructing facilities, and we must improve the situation. Neither does the architect or contractor understand the problems of the board of education or the superintendent. We need conversations, communications and directions, so that the board of education understands its responsibility, the superintendent understands his, and the contractor understands his. This important facet of a relationship, the improvement of communication, can only come when all groups recognize that we have problems and that we must sit down together to develop techniques, means and devices by which we can better understand the situation and our individual responsibilities to the total process. Then we can best determine effective ways of meeting these responsibilities.

The professional designer must make clear to all what kind of services he can provide and for what compensation. Boards of education and superintendents must decide what kind of services their staff can provide and what kind of services they must buy from design professionals. We must determine more precisely what the responsibility of the contractor is to the board of education, what the relationship is between the board, the superintendent, the architect, the engineer, and the contractor. At this point, the third question previously mentioned must be dealt with-the question of what contracts should cover.

When service roles are well defined, they must be put into a written contract which precisely outlines what each party will contribute, describing in as much as possible the responsibility of each party to the contract. No longer can we assume that the architect will provide all the necessary sets of plans for a major project. Boards of education no longer can accept additional bills for extra plans, unless the contract so specifies. The contract between the board of education and the architect must define more precisely what will be delivered and whose responsibility it is to determine if the party is carrying out his responsibility under the contract. The architect and the engineer must determine who will be responsible for each aspect of the planning and the supervision.

We can no longer assume that the other fellow has a certain responsibility and will carry out this responsibility. Likewise, we must look realistically at the question of compensation. A contractor or a design professional can't be expected to deliver and carry out his responsibilities unless he is





Mount Heritage High School, Yancey County Padgett & Freeman, Architects

adequately compensated for these services. Boards of education should be more concerned with the contractual arrangements. Knowledgeable attorneys should be available to review and approve, consult with the board, with architects, and with contractors regarding contractual arrangements. Boards of education must be realistic in determining the compensation for various services, particularly those of architects and engineers.

Perhaps the time has come when new arrangements-different arrangements-must be made. Perhaps the time has come when boards need to employ or add a person to the staff who can guide them and advise them with regard to each step in the total process of design, construction, supervision, etc. Perhaps the time has come when boards of education might have contractual arrangements with a number of design professionals. In the past, generally, one contract has been provided to the architect who, in turn, has been expected to provide all design, supervision and administrative services for the project. We must be more precise and delineate in more detail the contractual arrangements with the various design professionals. If competent services are to be provided, we must be sure that those offering the services have the capabilities of providing these services. Then we must agree on a mutually satisfactory compensatory arrangement.

We are inclined to think the time has come when we no longer can utilize the traditional percentage fee schedule. There are too many variables, too many situations that cannot be determined in advance for this kind of arrangement. Perhaps a flat fee for given services, described in detail, should be used in those circumstances where the variables are so great.

The final major question to be answered is what kind and quantity of supervision and/or inspection will be provided by each party involved in the planning and construction of facilities? Perhaps the major problem to be faced immediately is the question of whether or not the architect and engineer employed by the board will provide, in addition to the design of the plans and the specifications, the administration of the bidding process and supervision of the ongoing project. The responsibility and degree of inspection or supervision must be spelled out.

It is our opinion that a board or a superintendent cannot accept as sufficient what is termed by some as "observation" of a project. The board should depend upon professionals, whether staff people or privately employed personnel. They must depend on professionals to determine the adequacy, first of the planning, second of the bidding and preparation of contractual arrangements, and finally the actual construction itself. At any given time, the superintendent and board of education must have someone who is in a position to tell them that the project is progressing satisfactorily or that it is not progressing satisfactorilyand in what areas and to what degree it is not progressing satisfactorily. To us, this is a minimum level of supervision and inspection a board of education should expect and require.

It is our opinion that the contract between the architect and engineer and the board of education should provide a clear understanding of what responsibilities the board has to the design professionals and what

services the design professionals can be expected to deliver to the board. If the architect, engineer, and landscape architect are not willing to be specific, we are inclined to think that there will be changes-the board of education will be contracting with architects and engineers for design services and with someone else for the kind of supervision and inspection they must have to insure that the project is being carried out in accordance with their wishes. Unless this major problem concerning supervision and inspection is dealt with, we are inclined to think that the major school systems will be adding to their staff persons who can provide competent supervision services to them on a continuing basis, or else they will go outside and purchase this kind of service from management firms who offer it.

The problems we've been discussing are not theoretical problems—they are problems we are faced with today. It is our hope that all who are concerned and involved and a party to the total process of planning and constructing facilities for public schools will understand the gravity of the situation. We hope that we can all sit down together, agree on the complexity of our problems and their elements and that we can proceed to resolve these problems. We further hope that the joint resolution of these problems will result in improved communication, a better understanding of our interrelationships, a stronger sense of responsibility to each other, and the best possible school facilities for our 1.200,000 children—facilities that contribute to the progress of the total educational operation of North Carolina's public school system. The time is late and we urge that all of us put our minds and energies to this task.

PROFESSIONAL DIRECTORY



SZOSTAK & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Consulting Structural Engineers

720 Summit Avenue — Greensboro, N. C. 27405 B. Szostak, P.E.

Reg. in N. C., Va., S. C., Ga., Ky., Fla., Tenn., Ind. Telephone Nr. 919-273-3056

CONSULTING ENGINEERS, INC.

GEOTECHNICAL, STRUCTURAL and ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING ; CONSTRUCTION CONTROL ; SOILS and CONCRETE TESTING Ronald E. Langston, P.E.

Manager : Southeast Branch Office

3909C Oleander Dr., Wilmington, N. C. 28401

MECHANICAL ENGINEERS, INC.

Heating — Air Conditioning — Plumbing

700 S. College St

CHARLOTTE, N. C. 28202 704-376-4754



BASS, NIXON & KENNEDY INC. CONSULTING ENGINEERS 7416 CHAPEL HILL ROAD RALEIGH NORTH CAROLINA 27607

MCNEARY CONSULTING

Fire Protection — Life Safety Engineering S.F.P.E. Members

Neil Allen, P.E. Neal Broome, P.E.

W.J.L. McNeary, P.E. One Woodlawn Green Charlotte, N. C. 28210 704-525-8481

Phone: (919) 799 - 7500



A STANDARD SPECIFICATION

Scope of Work:

Furnish all labour and materials required to erect building on the site chosen. Building is to extend to building lines on all sides, and is to be carried up to a height consistent with the load bearing capacity of the soil.

Interpretation:

The plans and specifications are to be taken together and in the case of similarity the Architect is to be congratulated. Anything shown on the plans and not mentioned in the specifications, and vice versa, is to be considered as both shown and specified. Anything required by the Engineer or Architect or any of his friends, except the Contractor, shall be considered as shown, specified, implied and required, and shall be provided by the Contractor without expense to anybody but himself. If the work has been done without expense to the Contractor, the work shall be torn down and done over again, until the expense is satisfactory to the Architect or Engineer.

Extras:

Extras shall consist of the making good of inadvertent omissions on plans. In order to avoid embarrassing discussions with the owner, no applications for financial reimbursement will be considered.

Job Meetings:

Rotating chairmanship, with not more than six cross conversations taking place at once. In the case of dispute arising as to the nature or character of the work done, specified or implied, the matter shall be decided by referendum and recall, after which the Architect or Engineer may reverse any decision. The Architect's or Engineer's decision shall be final.

Progress Chart:

After the job is completed, the Contractor may submit his progress charts, along with properly dimensioned plans.

Excavation:

A hole shall be dug to accommodate the building. It shall be slightly on the small side to guarantee a snug fit, and minimize vibration. If water, rock or any other hinderance be encountered, another site shall be considered.

Foundations:

Concrete footings of aesthetic proportions shall be poured prior to the commencement of the super-structure. If the footings should overlap, the columns shall be moved further apart. Concrete shall be three weeks older at 28 days than at 7 days. Tests shall be made to ensure this.

Formwork:

The formwork shall not be stripped until the concete has been poured.

Reinforcing:

Reinforcing steel is to be dumped off the trucks onto the formwork, levelled approximately and carefully coated with form oil, to ensure their easy withdrawal and reuse at a later date.

Structural Steel:

Structural steelwork shall conform to architectural requirements. Columns are to be located on corners, but where this is not possible, use cantilevers. Beams are to be notched as required by other trades so as to facilitate the cheapest erection. Bolted connections shall be riveted and welded as a precaution. Floors and ceilings shall be kept clear of all structural members so as to avoid the possibility of deflection.

Masonry:

Bricks are to be laid with careful deliberation. Joints are to be filled thoroughly, when in the presence of the owner or his representative. After the walls have been erected, apply generous coating of pitch to exterior surfaces, so that the splashing and pitch stains of the roofer will not be noticed.

Mechanical:

Building is to be heated (with the heat losses kept to a minimum), by equalizing inside and outside air temperatures. Lighting fixtures are to be centered on sprinkler heads. Reduce heating and ventilation ducts so that crawl space is available below them. Interference with other trades is to be expected, and the Contractor is to bear the cost of moving and reinstating any work of this nature.

Cleaning Up:

The Contractor is to leave the site as he found it. All rubbish, scrap, waste, form oil, and office accounts are to be burned in close proximity to the building to test the sprinkler system.

Tenders:

Tenders are to be in the hands of the Architect not later than 2 p.m. next month. In the case of duplicate tenders, two buildings will be erected.

At the signing of the contract, the Contractor shall accept the conditions thereinafter stated, for himself, his heirs and assigns and successors, his ancestors, his family, his ox and his ass, and the stranger that is within his gates.

Reprinted from the "Canadian Architect"

YO-YO, SCULPTURE OR ART?

The Charlotte Section, NCAIA, was asked by the Arts and Science Council to contribute some direction to coming up with an obelisk or logo - or something that would create interest in their 2nd Annual Festival. A committee was formed and as they pondered blueprints of balloon displays, architect Murray Whisnant doodled absently on a piece of paper. His doodle showed a two-story hand perched atop the NCNB Plaza with a 40-story yo-yo string attached to the circular Grande Disco sculpture that stands at the base of the building.

It began as a joke. Whisnant protested that he was only kidding, but his colleagues liked the somewhat flippant idea and went to work. Sure enough, soon thereafter a giant inflatable hand arrived in Charlotte — bright yellow, 40-feet long and two stories high.

But then the problems began. It was a cold, blustery February day the huge hand was inflated, moved by guy-wires to the plaza and installed at the top of the 40-story building. But, alas, those strong winds quickly ripped the balloon apart and down it came to finally rest at the second-floor balcony of the Radisson Plaza Hotel.

The project did, however, create a sense of fun and enjoyment for Charlotte citizens and enhanced the success of the festival.





AIA DOCUMENTS



ORDER FORM

EFFECTIVE 8/77

North Carolina Chapter The American Institute of Architects

The AIA Tower, 115 West Morgan Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27601 919/833-6656

A SERI	ES/Owner-Contractor Documents	Non- Member Price	Member Price	Qty.	Amt.	C SE
A101	Owner-Contractor Agreement Form—	¢ 60	¢ 40			C14
A101	Owner-Contractor Agreement Form—	\$.60	\$.40	• • •		C431
/CM	Stipulated Sum—Construction					
A107	Management Edition (5/75)	.60	.40			0001
AIU/	Contracts—Stipulated Sum (1/74)	60	40			080
A111	Owner-Contractor Agreement Form—	.00	.40			D SE
	Cost Plus Fee (1/74)	.60	.40			D101
A201	General Conditions of the Contract	1.50	1.00			
A201	General Conditions of the Contract	1.50	1.00			D200
/CM	for Construction—Construction					E 65
4001	Management Edition (1/75)	1.50	1.00			E 3E
A201 /SC	General Conditions of the Contract for					CIUI
/ 50	Conditions of the Contract for Construction					
	(70/72)	2.10	1.40			F SE
A305	Contractor's Qualification Statement (9/69) .	.60	.40			Manı
A310 A311	Bid Bond (2/70)	.25	.17			
AJII	Material Payment Bond (2/70)	35	23			F101
A331	Guaranty for Bituminous Roofing (1/66)	.30	.20			F102
A401	Contractor-Subcontractor Agreement					F104
4501	Form (1/72)	.40	.27	• • •		F105
ASUI	and Contract Awards (11/69)	1 00	1.20			F106
A511	Guide for Supplementary Conditions (1/73)	1.80	1.20			F201
A701	Instructions to Bidders (1/74)	.60	.40			F202
						F203
D SERIE	Stendard Form of American Link					F301
D141	Owner and Architect (1/74)	1.00	00			1401
B141A	Instruction Sheet	N/C	.00 N/C			F SEF
B141	Standard Form of Agreement Between					Manu
/CM	Owner and Architect—Construction	1.00				F402
B142	Amendment to Standard Form of Agreement	1.00	.80		•••••	F403
DIT	between Owner and Architect (3/77)	.75	60			F404
B142A	Instruction Sheet	N/C	N/C			F501
B151	Owner-Architect Abbreviated Form of					F502
B352	Duties Responsibilities and Limitations of	1.00	.80	· · ·	• • • • • •	F503
	Authority of Full-Time Project					F504 F601
	Representative (4/70)	.75	.60			F603
B SERIE	S/Owner-Contractor Documents					F605
B431	Standard Form of Questionnaire for the					F701
- 101	Selection of Architects for Educational					F703
0	Facilities (1/72)	.75	.60			F714
B551 B707	Statement of Architect's Services (8/71)	1.25	1.00			F716
D707	and Architect for Interior Design Services					F721
	(3/72)	1 00	80			F723
B727	Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner	1.00	.00		• • • • • •	F725
R801	and Architect for Special Services (10/72)	1.00	.80			
1000	and Construction Manager (12/72)	1.00	00			F SER
	12//J/	1.00	.00			F800

SERI	ES/Architect-Consultant Documents	Non- Member Price	Member Price	Qty.	Amt.
2141	Standard Form of Agreement Between				
	Architect and Engineer (1/74)	.60	.40		
431	Standard Form of Agreement Between				
	Architect and Consultant for other than				
	Normal Engineering Services (3/72)	.60	.40		
801	Joint Venture Agreement (3/72)	60	40		
	(e, . <u>e</u>)	.00	.10		
) SERI	FS/Architect-Industry Documents				
101	Architectural Area and Valuma of				
101	Puildings (6 (74)	20	20		
200	Project Checklist (5/72)	.30	.20		
200	110ject offeckilst (5775)	1.00	1.20		
CEDI	C / Analaite at Dua duran Danuar la				
SERIE	25/ Architect-Producer Documents				
101	Technical Literature for the				
	Construction Industry (7/72)	.60	.40		
SERIE	S/Architect's Accounting Forms—				
anual	System				
	25 SHEETS PER UNIT				
101	Cash Journal—1949	2.40	1.60		
102	Cash Journal—1949	2.40	1.60		
103	Cash Journal—1949	2.40	1.60		
104	Cash Journal—1953	2.40	1.60		
105	Cash Journal—1949	2.40	1.60		
106	Cash Journal—1949	2.40	1.60		
107	Journal Form—1949	2.40	1.60		
201	Payroll Journal—1953	2.40	1.60		
202	Payroll Journal—1949	2.40	1.60		
203	Payroll Journal—1949	2.40	1.60		
301	Ledger Account Form—1949	2.40	1.60		
101	Job Expense Record Form—1953	2.40	1.60		
SERIE	S/Architect's Accounting Forms—				
anual	System				
02	Employee Record Form—1953	2 40	1 60		
03	Fixed Assets Record—1949	2.40	1.60		
04	Note and Investment Record—1949	2.40	1.60		
	50 SHEETS PER UNIT	2.40	1.00		
01	Trial Balance—1953	3 60	2 40		
02	Balance Sheet—1953	3.60	2 40		
03	Profit and Loss Statement—1949	3 60	2 40		
04	Indirect Expense Factor—1953	3 60	2 40		
01	Time Record Sheet—1971	4 80	3.20		
03	Expense Voucher nonpersonnel—1953	2 10	1 40		
05	Expense Record—1953	2.10	1 40		
01	Billing Extract—1972	4 50	3.00		
03	Aged Accounts Receivable—1972	4 50	3.00	•••	
12	Project Payroll Cost Worksheet—1972	4.50	3.00		
14	Detail of Expenses—1972	4.50	3.00		
16	Time Distribution Summary—1972	4.50	3.00		
21	Project Estimating and Budget		5.00		
	Worksheet—1972	4.50	3.00		
23	Project Progress Report—1972	4.50	3.00		
25	Project Summary Report—1972	4.50	3.00		
		-		4.4.4	

IES/Compensation Management Guidelines Forms

Complete set of 23 forms needed-1975 ... 3.00 2.00

G SERIES Project F	Architect's Office and	NON- MEMBER PRICE	MEMBER PRICE	QTY.	AMT.			NON- MEMBER PRICE	MEMBER PRICE	QTY.	AMT.
0000	25 SHEETS PER UNIT					G810	Transmittal Letter (4/70)	4.50	3.00		
G602	Soli Investigation and Engineering	4 50	2.00			G811	Employment Record (11/73)	4.50	3.00		
0010	Services Agreement (1/74)	4.50	5.00			G813	Temporary Placement (1/74)	4.50	3.00		
G610	Uwner's Instructions for Bonds and	1 50	2 00			0010	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		4.50	5.00			Architec	t's Handbook of Professional Practice—Chap	ters			
0001	50 SHEETS PER UNIT	1 50	2 00			HBC1	The AIA Handbook—1973	90	60		
G601	Land Survey Requisition $(10/72)$	4.50	3.00			HBC2	The Construction Industry—1969	.90	.60		
G/01	Change Order (4/70)	4.30	5.00			HBC3	AlA and Related Organizations—1972	1 80	1 20		
G/02	Application and certification for	1 00	2 20			HBCA	Careers in Architecture—1972	1.80	1.20		
07004	Payment (3/71)	4.00	2.20			HBC5	The Architect and Client—1975	90	.60		
G/UZA	Continuation Sheets for G/UZ (5/71)	4.00	3.20			HBCG	The Architect's Office—1971	1 80	1.20		
G704		1 50	3 00			HBC7	Insurance and Bonds of Suretyshin—1969	1.80	1.20		
0705	(4/70)	4.50	3.00			HBCS	The Architect and Public Relations—1971	.90	.60		
G705	Centinicate of Insurance (2775)	4.50	5.00			HBCQ	Owner-Architect Agreements—1970	1.80	1.20		
G/06	Contractor's Annuavit of Payment of	1 50	3.00			HBC10	Interprofessional Agreements—1975	.90	.60		
07064	Centrester's Affidavit of Palassa of	4.30	5.00			HBC11	Project Procedures—1969	1.80	1.20		
G706A	Liona (4/70)	1 50	3 00			HBC12	Construction Documents—Drawings—1970	.90	.60		
0707	Liens $(4/70)$	4.50	2.00			HBC13	General Conditions of the Contracts				
G/U/	Consent of Surety to Final Payment (4/70) .	4.30	3.00			HD010	for Construction—1970	1.80	1.20		
G/0/A	Consent of Surety to Reduction in of	1 50	3.00			HBC14	Construction Documents—				
0700	Partial Releases of Relatinge (0/71)	4.50	3.00			110014	Specifications—1972	1.80	1.20		
G708	Architect's Field Urder $(4/70)$	4.50	3.00			HBC15	Construction Cost Analysis—1970	.90	.60		
G709	Proposal Request (4/70)	4.50	3.00			HBC16	Selection of Contractors—1971	.90	.60		
G/11	Architect's Field Report (10/72)	4.50	3.00			HBC17	Owner-Contractor and Contractor-				
G/12	Shop Drawing and Sample Record (10/12) .	4.50	3.00			110017	Sub-contractor Agreements—1973	1.80	1.20		
6801	Application for Employment (5774)	4.50	3.00			HBC18	Construction Contract				
G802	Provide for Architectural Service (4/70)	4.50	3.00			HEOTO	Administration—1973	1.80	1.20		
0004	Register of Diu Documents $(4/70)$	4.50	3.00			HBC19	Legal Concerns—1969	1.80	1.20		
6805	List of Subcontractors $(4/70)$	4.50	3.00			HBC20	Marketing Architectural Services—1975	1.80	1.20		
6807	Project Directory (4/70)	4.50	3.00			HBC21	The Architect as Preservationist—1971	.90	.60		
6809	Project Data (4/70)	4.50	5.00			110021					

DOCUMENTS ORDER FORM

August 1977 (replaces all previous order forms)	
NAME	🗆 AIA MEMBER
FIRM NAME	PHONE
ADDRESS	
CITY STATE	ZIP
Date of Order	Bill D Check enclosed
TOTAL OF ORDER	\$
2% CASH WITH ORDER DISCOUNT ALLOWED	\$
TOTAL AMOUNT OF ORDER	\$
North Carolina sales tax and shipping charges are included Please make check payable to <i>N. C. Chapter AIA</i> and mail	l in order. order form to NCAIA 115 W. Morgan Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27601
FOR CHAPTER USE: Date order received	Date Mailed
Amount received	Amount billed

STAGVILLE: A UNIQUE PRESERVATION CENTER

In the summer of 1976, the Liggett Group, Inc. of Durham donated the heart of the old Stagville Plantation near Durham to the State of North Carolina. Historic structures on the 71-acre tract and the discovery of ancient Indian artifacts made this property ideal for a teaching and learning center in preservation. So, the Stagville Center for Preservation Technology was established with initial funding also by the Liggett Group, Inc. Located on the property are a well-built Federal style house, four half-timbered slave quarters, a massive midnineteenth century barn and a cemetery. A large collection of private papers and a fascinating historical record of the property and its owners are in the Southern Historical Collections at UNC-CH.

The 1799 house, called Bennehan House for its builder-owner, Richard Bennehan, has been minimally repaired and restored to be used for a classroom for teaching preservation techniques. The property itself serves as a study laboratory where people may learn from experience the problems involved in restoration and preservation. The Stagville Center's program is integrally connected with the North Carolina Institute of Applied History, a program established between the Division of Archives and History and twenty-seven North Carolina colleges and universities.

Since the opening of Stagville Center — our nation's first statewide preservation center — a course titled "An Architectural Survey of North

Carolina from 1700-1939" was conducted by the Center's Executive Director, John B. Flowers III. Another was a workshop on the history of the Bennehan and Cameron families, original owners of the plantation. "Planning for Preservation", under the direction of Professor Robert E. Stipe, former head of the Division of Archives and History, will be held in November in cooperation with Stagville Center. The Stagville Archaeological Field School was conducted for six weeks this summer. Each workshop and course has been over-subscribed and some will be repeated in the fall.

This remarkable and unique historical complex is sure to enhance the public's interest in preservation of our state's fine heritage.





INDEX TO ADVERTISERS

Accoustics Inc.	18
Andco Industries	18
Associated Insurers	3
Borden Brick Co.	19
Brick Association of NC	4
W. A. Brown	6
Carolina Builders Corp	18
Directory	12
Giant Portland Cement Co	12
Martin Marietta Aggregates	6
Ezra Meir	18
Mid-State Tile Co.	2
Moland-Drysdale Corp	18







BUILDING SPECIALTY CONTRACTORS

- ACOUSTICAL PRODUCTS.
- MOVABLE & DEMOUNTABLE PARTITION SYSTEMS.
- RAISED ACCESS FLOORS & ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL PRODUCTS FOR COMPUTER ROOMS.
- MAPLE FLOORS & WALL SYSTEMS FOR GYM-NASIUMS & INDUSTRY.
- OTHER BUILDING SPECIALTY PRODUCTS.

3324 PELTON STREET CHARLOTTE, N. C. 28203 TELEPHONE 704-523-4316



"When people ask about the brick, we tell them it's Handtique"."

X hen Trader Construction Company costs like machine-made brick. It is different. built their new offices they used Handtique Brick from Borden. They bought graceful and distinctive. it for its looks.

They didn't know that they were actually getting a conversation piece.

People actually stop in to ask about the brick. Several times a month.



But more than that, it's beautiful. It's

And as Trader Construction Company discovered, it makes people stop and look.

So if your idea calls for a distinctive brick, one that recalls the style and feel of a century

Borden's Charleston Handtique®Brick. ago, your idea calls for

That's unusual. But Handtique is an unusual Handtique by Borden. Would brick. It looks like handmade brick, but it you give it any less?



"Handtique" is a registered trademark of Borden Brick & Tile Co.





PUBLISHED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA CHAPTER AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS. 115 WEST MORGAN ST., RALEIGH, N. C. 27601 BULK RATE U. S. POSTAGE P A I D RALEIGH, N. C. Permit No. 455

RETURN REQUESTED

28204 SCHENCK JR 0 2 14 BOX 4203 CMARLOTTE T GORDON