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A Change of Emphasis

This issue of OCULUS is devoted to two subjects—looking at beautiful buildings all designed by local boys, and architects' business—they fees, their contracts, their compensation. I am sure we all prefer to focus on the awards. The business end of architecture is not romantic, not the stuff to stir men's souls. One even feels embarrassed having to concern oneself with these uncomfortable details of practice. After all, none of us entered this profession with business concerns uppermost in our minds.

But as we have all learned, many of us painfully, we are engaged in a business/profession, in which the remuneration is unacceptably low, and the business is highly subject to the adjustments of the economic cycle. In accountant's terms, we are a FITLOT business—First in Trouble, Last out of Trouble.

Some of our greatest troubles come from our fellow professionals, who simply underprice the services we render often performing front end services at little or no cost.

I trust that we will begin to raise our consciousness on many professional issues; that we, ourselves, will develop a greater respect for the services we render; and that we will begin to charge for them accordingly, realizing that it is impossible to perform a responsible professional service without adequate compensation.

If we render a top professional service, our clients will certainly recognize the difference; many clients—among them developer clients notorious for paying low fees—are demanding top quality service, imaginatively and reliably delivered.

It is my hope that the New York Chapter/AIA will provide information and leadership over the coming years in the many areas of changing and developing practice.

Ours is a wonderful town to live in. Let's make it a great and rewarding place to practice architecture.

The NYC/AIA has completed a survey of Architects compensation. The last such survey was conducted ten years ago.

We are gratified with the participation: 109 out of 310 firms returned the questionnaire, a rather high percentage. In fact, the survey accounts for nearly all the architectural personnel covered by member firms' sustaining dues—2972 owners and employees in all, of which 2496 are architecturally trained.

The results are predictable. They indicate that architectural professionals are woefully compensated at virtually all levels:

Starting salaries vary from $10,500 per year in firms of 3-5 persons to $14,472 per year in offices of 41-100 persons.

Only 20% of the architecturally trained personnel earn over $35,000 per year, only 7% over $50,000, and less than 2%, perhaps considerably less, earn more than $100,000 per year.

The 178 principals surveyed (7% of the total architectural personnel) earn total average compensations of $66,000 per year; the median compensation is only $60,000.

The survey is quite fascinating: there are probably endless informative statistics that can be derived from the mass of data we have gathered. But they will say the same thing; it's past time to put our practices and our lives on a more sound financial basis.

Brunner Grant to John Gallery

1982 Brunner Grant of $10,000 has been awarded to John Gallery of Philadelphia for research in writing a monograph on the life and work of Clarence Stein. Peter Kastl, chairman of the Brunner jury, reports that there were 23 submissions covering a wide range of projects.

Chapter HQ Fund Drive

As of Friday, May 21—press time for this issue of OCULUS—we are pleased to report that we have secured pledges from 20 firms and individuals totaling $130,000.

The results, to date, are very encouraging; about 60% of the funds needed are now pledged. The average pledge is approximately $6500. But most of these pledges have come in from the larger firms. The cream has been taken. It's time now for all of us to dig into our pockets and make as generous a contribution as possible. We need the pledges now. We can wait a few months for the actual gift. Please call or write the Chapter and tell us what you are able to pledge.
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The Compensation Committee is pleased to submit this initial report on the work of the Committee. The conclusions of the Committee, reached after extensive analysis and discussion, are serious, and, in some ways, revolutionary. Our initial reactions from the Compensation Survey are simple:

1. Professional compensation in our field is woefully inadequate, particularly at the starting levels, but in fact at all positions — except for a very small group of principals who are, perhaps, fairly compensated.

2. The general lack of profitability, firms and principals alike, appears effectively to preclude any realistic adjustment of employee compensation without throwing virtually every prudenty managed firm into financial chaos.

Annual salaries for starting level professionals range from $10,500 per year in an office of 3-5 persons (23 firms reporting), to $14,472 in offices of 41-100 persons (6 firms reporting).

How is a young professional able to keep body and soul together at that level of compensation? How can we expect a person to work in an organized and devoted fashion toward becoming a seasoned professional when that work is undertaken under such an extraordinary economic disadvantage? Is it any wonder that many of the more together individuals quickly despair of ever being able to earn a respectable wage and therefore drift off into other associated areas where the rewards are more reasonable? It is practically impossible to evaluate the cost of this personnel loss, but we sense that many of the most talented young people are obliged to seek alternate ways and quickly become lost to the architectural profession.

Among those who stay, a syndrome develops that is destructive. If a person is paid poorly, he is often not highly valued, and his time is not used effectively; the young person necessarily develops an amateurish attitude toward his job and this is often reflected in low productivity. Since we don’t “invest” much in our new employees, we tend not to value their contributions. We don’t attach or require much loyalty from those employees and we certainly do not offer much job security.

There is a high turnover among younger employees, but, in fact, turnover is damagingly high at all levels of practice. Surveys in other professions indicate that losing an employee whose time is billable can cost 2-3 times the employee’s annual salary in terms of lost time and retraining costs.

What does the Committee recommend? We recommend primarily that a financial program be implemented which will enable starting salaries for qualified architectural school graduates to be increased by approximately 20% each year for the next three years from the present average starting wage in larger firms of $15,000 per year to approximately $25,590 by January 1, 1985. This adjustment should be exclusive of any further adjustments for inflation. The effect of this increase will bring architects’ starting wages to approximately the same level as the neophyte mechanical and structural engineers who are working on our projects.

Given the limited profitability of our firms, how could we possibly contemplate a 60% increase in initial professional salaries over a three year period? Our Committee, made up of some of the best and toughest professionals in New York — representing large, medium size, and small offices — has met often and grappled with this problem, and has unanimously concluded that this recommendation can in fact be realistically and profitably implemented.

We believe the time to implement these recommendations is now, even in the face of a persistent recession. The first requirement is to win your interest and support, and to raise your consciousness to the point where the elementary facts simply require that we pledge our fullest energies to making this recommendation a reality.

A substantial increase in salary will almost certainly stimulate greater interest among junior employees. Firms will hire and financially reward only those who contribute to productivity and profitability. Firms will have a much greater incentive to make use of time and labor-saving practices. Architectural schools will be obliged to train young professionals with marketable skills. There will be a weeding out process, long overdue, but at least those that remain in practice and find jobs, will be assured of a future with reasonable economic growth potential.

By stabilizing firm personnel, we will, more and more, be selling the collective experience and ability of our firms with much more commitment to quality of product and service. At present, many firms are so busy surviving that mastering the architectural process takes a subsidiary role to meeting the payroll.

What will it cost? The “cost” of restructuring our levels of compensation is high, though not so nearly high as we might expect. A 60% increase in base wages over a three-year period of a starting professional and suitable adjustments at all levels (see accompanying table for a hypothetical scenario for a typical 10-man firm), would result in an overall increase in salaries of 35%, including an increase in partner draw of 15%.

Overhead attributed to payroll taxes and vacations would go up 5% for a total increase of 40%. If a typical firm figures it breaks even at 2.5 x payroll, the salary increase will have the effect of increasing break-even to 2.5 times the original wage + .40 x original wage equals 2.90 x original hourly payroll, an increase of 16%.

If the same firm aims to make a profit of 50% of direct hourly payroll, i.e. an overall factor of 3 x payroll — to
Compensation Committee Open Forum

On Thursday, May 13, a membership meeting was held to present the findings of the Compensation Committee — see the "Report" in this issue — and to elicit membership reaction to the Committee's findings and proposals.

Isn't it time to come into the 20th century, to take advantage of the tools that are here now for us to use, and to free ourselves from the numerous meaningless tasks we face in the ordinary office? One member of our committee said: "We've seen the enemy and they are us. What we need to do is work smarter, not harder." Another member simply reminded us that "we must define who we are," and what we want to do.

The Committee believes we will find that by making investments in personnel and greatly improving contractual and office procedures we will be able to produce work infinitely more effectively than we do at present. The result will be that those offices that select personnel most carefully and offer them adequate self-respecting compensation will turn out work of better, more dependable quality than that of "cheaper" competitors. Our clients will see the difference quickly and will be willing, maybe even happy, to pay the difference if that is what is required.

It is the intention of the Compensation Committee to continue to update this report, on an annual basis, with respect to wages and benefits and principal compensation of Chapter firms. The Committee intends to hold discussions and workshops on better ways to manage our practices — focusing on marketing, contract negotiations, and better utilization of human resources. The Committee also intends to initiate a dialogue with the architectural schools to see if we can encourage curriculum adjustments so that the young graduate will enter an office environment with greater skills.

We urge your support and implementation of these goals.

Profile of a hypothetical 10-man office
Assumptions: 1. "Break even" multiple is 2.5 x wages which covers all expenses, including a draw of $60,000 for a single partner/owner. 2. Consultants are paid 30% of gross fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>&quot;Typical&quot; present wages</th>
<th>&quot;New&quot; present wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$51,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$291,000</td>
<td>$393,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Prospective wages by 1/1/85</th>
<th>Overall wage increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>$51,590</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$392,680</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reaction to the proposals involving adjustment of starting professional salaries was uniformly positive. Several principals of firms volunteered that they would be pleased to increase employee salaries in the manner suggested and agreed wholeheartedly that such an adjustment is long overdue.

Example of an office with a professional staff of 16, including one principal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>&quot;Typical&quot; present wages</th>
<th>&quot;New&quot; present wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$25,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal draw</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$291,000</td>
<td>$393,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payroll & partner draw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$291,000</td>
<td>$393,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall wage increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall required increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple of "old" payroll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple of "new" payroll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross Fees

Including Consultant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,039,000</td>
<td>$1,206,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee per man/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee per man/hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Fees

After 30% Consultant Payment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$727,500</td>
<td>$844,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee per man/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fee per man/hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>145,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average wage or draw

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before Adjustment</th>
<th>After Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$29,100</td>
<td>$39,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City Fees Update

by Martin D. Raab

The following report was sent to the Executive Committee by the chairman of the City Agencies Committee, following many meetings with Charles Smith, Director of the Mayor’s Office of Construction. This report outlines the final negotiations with the City regarding architects’ fees for City work:

The final copy of the new Fee Schedule CS29c, which supersedes CS29B of 8/31/78, has been published as of February 18, 1982. This was a result of the efforts of the City and members of the Chapter to deal with the shortcomings of the existing Schedule. It is desirable to inform the membership of the revisions to the Schedule and interpretations that we have gleaned during our periods of negotiations so that members contemplating entering into City contracts can be as well informed in their negotiations as possible and that contracts can consequently reflect the best available contract terms. To this purpose I have put together the following commentary on CS29 for review:

1. Fee Schedule

The most significant change in the new Schedule has been an increase in the fee percentages of from 3.5% to 8% of the old fee values. This has been done to reflect the bracket creep resulting from escalation in construction cost. We sought fee changes of 20% to 25%. We obviously were not successful to the degree hoped for. Unfortunately, the Fee Schedule still is among the lowest in the country and does not reflect the scope of work that those of us who took part in the negotiations believe necessary to provide the quality of construction and scope of services needed and/or mandated by the City. The City still believes in paying Chevrolet fees for Cadillac services and anyone taking contracts should be aware that the fee curves in no way cover the scope of services that warrant design services above a minimum level of professional performance.

2. Cost of Construction

It has become apparent in negotiations and from previous experience of many members that the contract stipulated cost of construction for City work has historically been woefully underestimated. This is due to the fact that costs established for projects are not escalated to the completion of construction. Therefore, the cost of construction set forth in the architectural contract is not the cost the City ultimately expects to spend. This further reduces the professional fee and should be of concern to anyone negotiating with the City based upon a City-established cost of construction. At the best, the cost of construction amounts are based upon estimated costs at time of signing rather than at time of construction, and every negotiator should demand the manner and point at which the estimate was established. Consultants should assure themselves of the escalated adequacy of the estimate to the time of construction. This should be the basis of the contract to compensate the Consultant fully for all stages of work. Even though the Schedule allows for escalation during the Working Drawing and Construction Phases of from 25% to 50% respectively, Consultants can never recapture the value of work performed during the preliminary phase of the drawings unless covered in the original contract. Since later stages are ultimately eroded by salary and overhead escalation, Consultants should assure themselves that the construction cost limitation established by their contract is adequate to cover the cost of construction and has been estimated and escalated to reflect that fact. You cannot depend on the City for that judgment.

3. Changes

The discretionary amount available to the Commissioner has been raised to $10,000 or 15% of the contract, whichever is less, without Board of Estimate approval. Changes above these amounts require Board of Estimate approval. Consultants should be forewarned that no work should be undertaken on what they regard as extra services without prior Board of Estimate approval. A hard position should be taken on changes since the historical ability of contract changes to move through the Board of Estimate in a timely manner is highly questionable.

4. Complexity Factors and Fee Adjustment

The Consultant should be fully aware of the ability to obtain complexity factors and fee adjustments and should negotiate strongly, demanding these adjustments to obtain adequate fees. These adjustments are still available within CS29 and can substantially improve the fee.

5. Principals’ Salaries

Principals’ salaries under the new Schedule have been raised to allow for $35 minimum and a negotiable $50 per hour maximum. Principals should know that this is a negotiable amount and though the present schedule is written based upon the draw of the principal this is not, in fact, the final position of the administration and is subject to negotiation based upon the normal billing rate for government contracts or most favored client, whichever is lower. Principals should insist that the highest billing rate supportable, based on these conditions, should be written into their contracts.

6. Fee Multiple

The allowable fee multiple has been raised from 2.2 to 2.3. This is based upon a 10% profit on a 1.09 overhead. This also is not a sacred number and is subject to negotiation where higher overhead can be justified on audit. There appears to be a more realistic view of what overhead actually entails today and, whereas no guarantees are inherent in the audit process, Consultants should not hesitate to attempt to negotiate higher multiples where they can be supported by actual documentation. One caution is in order, since post audits are based primarily on wage rate and actual hours spent: Wage rates under the Schedule are based on a five-day, forty-hour week so that total annual cont’d. p. 16, col. 1
CONTINUING EVENTS

MOSHE SAFDIE
Exhibition of his recent work, Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion, Brookdale Center, 1 W. 44th St. 299-2874. Closes June 7.

MANHATTAN SUITE
Exhibition of contemporary prints celebrating eight of Manhattan's architectural wonders. Museum of the City of New York, Fifth Ave. at 103 St. 334-1672. Closes June 10.

THE RIGHT LIGHT
Architectural photographs by Roberto Schezen of works by Adalberto Libera, Adolf Loos, Josef Hoffmann, and Aldo Rossi. The Lobby, 369 Lexington Ave. at 41 St. 335-6045.

ADA LOUISE HUXTABLE

GOETHEANUM

MIES VAN DER ROHE: BARCELONA PAVILION AND FURNITURE DESIGNS

ARCHITECTURAL NEW YORK

GRAND CENTRAL TERMINAL

PRESCRIPTION IN PROGRESS: THE SEAPORT DISTRICT

AROUND THE SQUARE
1830-1890s
Architectural exhibition exploring the historical and cultural life of Washington Square by the Grey Art Gallery and Study Center; shown outdoors around the Square in the windows of NYU. 598-2320. Closes Sept. 4.

TUESDAY 1

NEW TIMES FOR TIMES SQUARE
Panel discussion moderated by Frederic Papert, president 42nd Street Redevelopment Corp., with Herbert Sturz, chairman City Planning Commission; Alexander Cooper, Cooper Eckstut Associates. 6:30 pm, Municipal Art Society at the Urban Center, 457 Madison. 935-3960.

1982 MAS AWARDS
Exhibition of people, places, projects honored by the Municipal Art Society, “Upstairs at the Urban Center,” 457 Madison. 935-3960.

FRANK GEHRY

TUESDAY 8

THE COLUMN: STRUCTURE AND ORNAMENT

GRAND CENTRAL TERMINAL
Municipal Art Society tour of the multi-block "terminal city" guided by Barry Lewis, 5:30-7pm. Meet in foyer of the Urban Center, 457 Madison. 935-3960 for reservations. Nonmembers $5.

MUSEUM MILE
Museum Mile's fourth annual festival. 6-9pm, Fifth Ave. between 86th and 104th St. 722-1313.

WEDNESDAY 9

TALK OF THE TOUR
An illustrated preview by Barry Lewis of the Municipal Art Society's monthly Discover New York tour—"Explore the City on the River," the area from City Hall to South Street Seaport. 6pm. The Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave. 935-3960. Nonmembers $3. Tours will be conducted on Saturday and Sunday, June 12 and 13; and Saturday and Sunday, June 19 and 20. Meet in front of City Hall. 935-3960. Members $3, nonmembers $5.

THURSDAY 3

FRANK GEHRY

WEDNESDAY 10

NATIONAL BUILDING MUSEUM
Discussion and short film of this new museum of the building arts, located in the old Pension Building in Washington. Bates Lowry, Director, and W. Boulton Kelly, Assistant Director, will describe the Museum's potential importance to the architectural profession. 6 pm. NYC/AIA, 457 Madison. 838-9670.

SYSTEMS '82

FRIDAY 4

AIA NATIONAL CONVENTION
JUNE 6
125th Anniversary Year. Honolulu, Hawaii.

WALKING TOUR ON SUNDAY
JUNE 6

FRIDAY 11

WALKING TOUR ON SUNDAY
JUNE 13

WALKING TOUR ON SUNDAY
JUNE 13
MONDAY 14
INTERNATIONAL DESIGN CONFERENCE AT ASPEN
JUNE 13-18
IDCA, Box 664 Aspen, CO 81612. 303-925-2257.

TUESDAY 15
NEOCON 14
International contract furnishings market and international congress on environmental planning. The Merchandise Mart, Chicago. 312-527-4141 (June 15-18).

WEDNESDAY 16
A TRIBUTE TO ALVAR AALTO
Talk by Elissa Makineni Aalto at NEOCON 14. 4:30 pm. The Merchandise Mart, Chicago. 312-527-4141.
MUSIC FOR LANDMARKS
"Concert of Parlour Music," part of the celebration of Washington Square's 150th anniversary. Salmagundi Club, 47 Fifth Ave. 6:30pm. 598-2320.

THURSDAY 17
AIA WINNERS
NEW YORK'S HIDDEN DESIGNERS: THE LAWYERS

FRIDAY 18
TWO WALKING TOURS ON SUNDAY JUNE 20

MONDAY 21
NEOCON 14
International contract furnishings market and international congress on environmental planning. The Merchandise Mart, Chicago. 312-527-4141 (June 15-18).

TUESDAY 22
NYC/AIA ANNUAL MEETING
The Asia Society, 725 Park Ave. Tours 5:30pm. Meeting 6pm. 838-9670.
NEW YORK'S HIDDEN DESIGNERS: THE FINANCIERS
LUMEN AWARDS DINNER
University Club, 1 W. 54 St. 644-7926.

WEDNESDAY 23
MUSIC FOR LANDMARKS
SAVERS OF THE LOST ARCH
Exhibition. New York's new architectural salvage program and a sampling of the materials being recycled, presented by the Landmarks Preservation Commission and the Municipal Art Society. 457 Madison Ave. 935-3960.

FRIDAY 25
GRACE CHURCH SYMPOSIUM ON SATURDAY JUNE 26
"Gothic Revival in the City: Grace Church, 1840s," part of the celebration of Washington Square's 150th anniversary. 10am 1pm, Grace Church, Broadway & 10th St. 598-2320.
WALKING TOUR ON SUNDAY JUNE 27
The Distinguished Architecture Awards Program was initiated as a general, non-categorical awards program to celebrate New York City architects. The jurors—Kenneth Frampton, Professor, Columbia University; George Hartman, Architect, Hartman Cox, Washington, D.C.; and Hugh Newell Jacobsen, Architect, Washington D.C.—met on two successive days in April to evaluate over 130 submissions. The final results—six Distinguished Architecture Awards—are presented on the following pages.

Stallion Complex

Project: Gainsway Farm, Lexington, Kentucky
Architect: Theodore M. Ceraldi, AIA
Owner: John R. Gaines
Contractors: C.E. Pennington Co., and The Wagner Co., both of Lexington, Kentucky

Program: To design eight four-stall barns, renovate existing structures, and add new breeding shed and new lunging ring pavilion—all to be organized into the safest stallion complex feasible. Maximize managerial programs, security, flexibility, fire prevention, and isolation of valuable animals...

Solution: Barns are constructed of masonry, laminated timber and steel. Sited by farm traffic patterns, which allow full use of existing facilities, animal housing was doubled.

Jury comment: An appropriate functional and esthetic response. It is simple, direct, and appealing. The solution not only creates an attractive complex but also relates well to existing buildings. Beautifully detailed.
Project: Sointu, 69th Street and Madison Avenue
Architect: Tod Williams & Associates
Owner: Kip Trafton
Contractor: Albert Disser

Solution: A previous store had left a gaping diagonal hole in the base of a modest building. We chose to replace the wall and to reinforce the integrity of the structure, to embrace its solidity—green painted stucco and all. A scale in keeping with 69th Street was reintroduced. Beyond the facade is a single room, obviously internal, but suggesting the external. Forced within the central space is an object of considerable size. It is alternately furniture, a building, a vessel, a chair. It is an object which forces movement and observation . . .

Jury comment: Taking its simple geometric syntax from the recent Italian-Rationalist school of architecture, this small shopfront and interior make a paradigmatic and exemplary use of form, fenestration, and color. The lucidity and precision of the front, finished in viridian, also extends to the interior, which is equally symmetrical and in its organization.
Residence

Project: Viereck Residence, Amagansett, New York
Architect: Gwathmey Siegel & Associates
Owner: Mr. and Mrs. Gabriel Viereck
Contractor: Caramagna & Murphy

Program: A small year-round residence for a French fashion photographer and his wife to incorporate living and studio space plus two guest bedrooms on a sloping six-acre site with a view of Gardners Bay and the eastern end of Long Island.

Solution: A vertical composite, volumetric organization, exploiting the knoll, extended views, and sense of total privacy. An attempt to incorporate a programatically consistent hierarchal spatial sequence with integral cabinetwork and furniture system.

Jury comment: The Jury found this latest evolution in the ongoing series of Gwathmey-Siegel houses to be clearly superior to its several imitators. The small year-round house is consistently well sized, designed, detailed, and furnished.
Residence and Pool House

Project: Lewellyn Park, New Jersey
Architect: Robert A.M. Stern Architects
Contractor: Lenvan Builders

Program: A project consisting of two components: the renovation of a house designed in 1929 and alterations to terrace and garden to accommodate a new structure housing a swimming pool.

Solution: In reordering the interiors, a counterpoint emerges between what appears to be, though is not necessarily, old and new. The poolhouse is cloaked in an envelope that responds to the character of the original house while at the same time taking on the character of a landscape feature—a kind of grotto that marks the transition from house to garden.

Jury comment: The humane and sophisticated manipulation of light and scale of both the existing interior spaces and the highly stylistic addition have strengthened this intelligently designed existing house.
Project: The Hartford Seminary  
Architect: Richard Meier & Partners  
Owner: The Hartford Seminary  
Contractor: The Charles Jewett Corporation, Glastonbury, Connecticut  

Program: When The Hartford Seminary gave up its role as a traditional residential college and reestablished itself as an interdenominational graduate center, it needed a single structure to house all functions: chapel, meeting room, library, bookstore, classrooms and faculty areas. Having dual public/private roles, devoted to encouraging both scholarship and understanding, the Seminary was to be both a partly cloistered, inward-looking organization of spaces and the center of a larger domain.  

Solution: The parti is an L-shaped structure set back from the street. Public spaces are at extremities of the L; private areas—faculty offices and classrooms—fill the interstices.  

Jury comment: This seminary is certainly one of the finest medium-scale institutional buildings produced in recent years. At once modest, formal, inviting, and yet distanced, the building maintains an appropriate sense of exclusivity without being forbidding.
Pilgrimage Airport

Photos except as noted: Jay Langlois
Project: Haj Terminal/King Abdul Aziz International Airport, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia
Architect: Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, New York and Chicago
Owner: International Airport Projects, Ministry of Defense and Aviation, The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Contractor: Hochtief, AG, Essen, West Germany

Program: Master plan and design for an international airport.

Solution: In addition to an administration building, quarantine facility, air force base, and support facilities, the airport includes a tent-like terminal covering 3,000,000 sq. ft. The terminal is designed to accommodate, for up to 36 hours, as many as 80,000 Muslims making the annual holy pilgrimage to Mecca. The ten-module terminal is divided by a central boulevard and contains a total of 210 roof units. The structural system of 150-ft. pylons supports a tension-membrane roof of steel cables and Teflon-coated Fiberglas. Clusters of small buildings and souks under the translucent fabric roof are the setting for a traditional Arab marketplace.

Jury comments: The simple elegance of this immense structure, that flowers like a desert perennial to meet its program requirements, is equaled only by its beauty and innate sense of scale.
City Fees Update

cont’d from p. 5

salary is divided by 260 to obtain daily wage rates of employees. All offices not working a five-day, forty-hour week should have separate negotiations over the actual daily wage so that their reimbursements are not reduced by the application of this rule, which would lower the hourly and daily rate in offices not working a five-day week.

7. Borings, Testing, and Topographic Services

Those services have been added to the Fee Schedule as a reimbursable at cost item. Having these services included in the contract on that basis should be resisted since the specifying, bidding, and supervision of these contracts involve costs to the Consultant for which the Fee Schedule makes no allowance. The inclusion of these services within the contract, and not as items provided by the City, should be resisted.

8. Interim Payments

The Schedule now allows for the billing of fees on a monthly basis rather than by phases. This will save carrying charges on City jobs. Unfortunately, the City will require a retainage on those contract payments. This will tend to reduce the carrying charges on City work and improve Consultant cash flows.

Since implementation of guidelines may vary from agency to agency, assistance in resolving questions during negotiations may be obtained from Arthur Wrubel, Deputy Director of Construction, Mayor’s Office of Construction, 566-1380.

Architects for Disarmament

Sidney Starkman, M.D. neurologist at Columbia Presbyterian Medical Center and Executive Director of “Physicians for Social Responsibility,” presented the film “The Final Epidemic,” to a crowd of about 80 members attending a meeting on nuclear disarmament. The film is based on a 1980 conference in San Francisco stressing the realities of the aftermath of nuclear war. The meeting was called by James S. Polshek following a letter on this subject circulated by Sidney F. Gilbert.

It was decided to form a group that will pursue the matter of nuclear disarmament. The group will be called “Architects for Social Responsibility.” The group will meet on June 7, at 6:00 pm in The Urban Center to press the governments of the United States and the Soviet Union toward nuclear disarmament.

Names and News

Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer are the designers of the Grand Central Terminal exhibition at the New York Historical Society (see calendar) . . .

Kevin Roche is the architect of the Central Park Zoo renovation . . .

Photographs and renderings of 20 projects by Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum were the subject of a recent exhibition at The Royal Institute of British Architects in London . . .

Rolf Ohlhausen was the recipient of Cooper Union’s Augustus St. Gaudens Medal last month . . .

Angela Giral, chief librarian of Harvard’s Graduate School of Design, has been named to head Columbia’s Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library. She will assume her duties at Columbia September 1 . . .

The Eggers Group has announced the following advancements: David L. Finci and Peter B. Halfon from senior vice president to executive vice president; C. William Ellers, Jr. and Jan J. Kalas from vice president to senior vice president; and John W. Jappen from associate vice president to vice president . . .

Kristie Williams/ Lee Manners & Associates donated the design of the folder and application form for the Allwork Scholarship Grants, NYC/AIA . . .

The Landmarks Preservation Commission has designated the Weir Greenhouse (now Greenwood Cemetery) in Brooklyn as a New York City Landmark . . .

The Eggers Group has been commissioned for a major expansion of Huntington Hospital, New York . . .

The Rockland County, New York, Legislature is looking for an architect and construction manager for a new 300-cell County jail. Contact William Chase, 914-425-5473 . . .

Robert Gray, formerly an associate at Davis, Brody & Associates, has been named associate and director of design at Emery Roth & Sons.

Lectures

Architecture

The State of the Art

A series, co-sponsored by the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and the Metropolitan Museum, offers an unprecedented discussion and presentation of the major themes, movements, and controversies in architecture, both in America and overseas. Distinguished architects, critics, and historians will review historically, appreciatively, and critically, the architectural developments of the past and present. The lectures will be introduced by Arthur Rosenblatt.


Oct. 20 Housing, architecture, and the city, by Lewis Davis.

Oct. 27 Architecture and energy crisis in perspective, by Richard Stein.

Nov. 3 The architecture of New York, by Paul Goldberger.

Nov. 10 The preservation of our architectural heritage, by Brendan Gill.

Nov. 17 The American dream — the garden city, by James Marston Fitch.

Nov. 24 An overseas view of architecture, by Norman Foster.


Dec. 15 After Post-Modernism, by Charles Gwathmey.

9 Wednesdays at 8:00 pm: $43