Burgee with Johnson have suggested for the Times Tower site: The Tower itself stripped to its frame, painted white.
The Times Square Development Project

by John Burgee Architects with Philip Johnson

The Times Square Development Project consists of four major office towers that face Seventh Avenue and Broadway at 42nd Street. The towers form a "square" that reinforces this active urban space. A pavilion at the center of the "square" provides the focus for a variety of lighting events, preserving the existing vitality of the Times Square area while adding a monumental presence.

Below the street level, a pedestrian thoroughfare will connect the four towers and provide a new transportation hub for subway travel.

The total complex will provide 4.1 million square feet of space including office and retail space. The towers will range from 370 feet to 700 feet in height. The base of each building, up to fifty-six feet, will be red granite. The shaft will be faced with light colored limestone that will be set back at the corners to reveal a glass curtain wall. The towers will be topped with a sloped glass roof to be crowned with a cast iron cresting. Each tower will be lighted at night to reflect and enhance the vitality of this area.
A Board of Estimate hearing October 25 (this Oculus will have gone to press) will likely be one of the most clamorous in memory. It will be the final hearing on the 42nd Street Development Project, and the Board and the Mayor will have the final say. Opposition will come from many directions; the complexity of the controversy threatens to exceed even the one surrounding Westway, and that is saying something.

Supporting businesses in the Theater District fear being driven out, as do residents in Clinton. There are uncertainties about where the 42nd Street sleaze may move. These are matters better reported elsewhere, but the Chapter is also in opposition.

The Chapter Concerns:
Background
The May 1984 Oculus described the Chapter's reaction to the four very large office towers designed by John Burgee Architects with Philip Johnson for Park Tower Realty. As shown in an elaborate model, their designs had been unveiled at a high-powered press conference last December by the Urban Development Corporation and the City. The buildings were grouped around a plot from which the Times Tower had vanished. (It was subsequently made known that a low pavilion was being considered.)

As described by the architects, the total complex will provide 4.1 million square feet of space including office and retail space. The towers will range from 370 to 700 feet in height. The base of each building, up to fifty-six feet, will be red granite. The shaft will be faced with light colored limestone that will be set back at the corners to reveal a glass curtain wall. The towers will be topped with a sloped glass roof to be crowned with a cast-iron cresting. Each tower will be lighted at night to reflect and enhance the vitality of this area.

The Chapter had two principal concerns, that planning on this scale should not have been done without some degree of review by interested parties such as the Chapter, and that the world famous dazzle and glitter of night-time Times Square would be diminished. The 1981 Guidelines for the project, prepared by Cooper, Eckstut Associates, had called for some large signs high up on parts of the new buildings, and for the Times Tower to be modified to dramatize its function "as a night-time civic sculpture and focal point for Times Square/42nd Street."

Several Things Happened Last Spring
A Chapter Committee met with the architects and public officials at the office of the developer, George Klein, President of Park Tower Realty, and in-progress plans were shown that were intended to enliven the buildings at street level. Mr. Klein also agreed that there should be an element on the
Times Tower site, and he had, indeed, retained Robert Venturi as a consultant.

Artkraft Strauss and Van Wagner Advertising, which between them create and operate almost all of the great Times Square signs, joined with the Chapter to stage a half-hour blackout on Saturday night, March 24, 1984, widely covered on TV, as a demonstration of what could be lost. (See Oculus May 1984).

The Municipal Art Society organized a competition to generate ideas and stimulate discussion regarding what might be done at the Times Tower site.

The Presidents’ Council, a loosely allied group of organizations concerned with planning, chaired by Richard Anderson of Regional Plan Association, held meetings and prepared testimony.

The first UDC/City hearing drew many speakers to Town Hall on March 26. Theodore Liebman, then Chapter president, testified, “Our message here today is twofold: Preserve the bright lights, signs, glamor, excitement, and identity of Times Square, and reopen the dialogue with the many civic groups and individuals who feel estranged from the heretofore healthy public process of presentation and comment.”

The UDC Hearing
The second, final, UDC/City hearing occurred on September 6, and UDC has been roundly criticized for how it was scheduled — three days after Labor Day and not many more days after the Final Environmental Impact Statement was issued — and how it was run. It was not properly announced: most people learned about it through mention in a New York Times article, and the person conducting the hearing held everyone to three and one-half minutes in which to comment on the 1,100 page EIS.

Nearly everyone, such as a spokesman for the International Ladies Garment Workers Union who had prepared a detailed and highly pertinent statement on the potential effect of the project on the Garment District, were unceremoniously cut off (but public officials were allowed all the time they wanted).

The Chapter’s Statement
“While the Chapter continues to support the 42nd Street Development Project for the purposes of this hearing, we do want to take this last opportunity to make certain points which we believe can and must be carried out if we are to support the project at the hearing before the Board of Estimate, later this fall. Our concerns center on the visual character of what is being proposed for the south end of Times Square.

“Let us discuss the issue in two parts, obviously closely related: first, the matter of what should be done at the site where No. One Times Tower, the old Times Tower, now stands, and second, the visual effect on Times Square of the four large office buildings as they are now being presented.

“We are very much delighted that the Final Environmental Impact Statement has concentrated so much attention on the Times Tower site. This is a complete turnaround from the Draft EIS, which did not even mention how the 42nd Street Project would look from Times Square.

“The Final EIS states, beginning on page 4-31, ‘The project staff intends to recommend to the decision makers that One Times Square be substantially modified or replaced with another structure.’ Proposals for the design and use of the site, including those selected by the jury of the Municipal Art Society’s Times Tower competition, would be reviewed by the project’s design review committee to determine which ones best meet certain conditions, including incorporating bright lights and supersigns facing north, retaining the capability for use for the New Year’s Eve countdown, and reflecting this historic role the site has played in marking the southern end of Times Square as an exciting visual focus.
there. The EIS states, 'The design review committee would recommend to UDC and the City one or more proposals which it determined best met these standards. The final selection would be made by the City and UDC in consultation with the office developer.' In regard to the review committee, we recommend inclusion of a disinterested architect or urban designer.

"Thus the general intent of the Final EIS is most encouraging, but there nevertheless is no guarantee that what would be best will actually happen (this is most apparent in the last sentence above—that 'the final selection would be made by the City and UDC in consultation with the office developer').

"The Chapter's position has been and remains that there must be on the Times Tower site a construction at least comparable in both size and potential for large kinetic signage as the present building. Of the proposals we have seen, we are intrigued by one which would strip the present building to its steel skeleton, paint it white, and hang signs on it, but the signs on the model which we saw were too small and too discreet. We hold that some construction of this scale and visual effect is absolutely essential to the 42nd Street Development Project, and our support of the project as a whole depends on its being made an intrinsic part thereof.

"Regarding the second, closely related issue of the visual effect of the proposed four office towers, we are less sanguine. Our support for the project as it was originally presented in 1981 rested to a crucial degree on guidelines which were to establish setbacks which would have diminished the effect of the buildings' great bulk, and which called for electric signage to replace what would be lost.

"The present design follows neither recommendation, and we are faced with the distinct possibility that the encircling of Times Square with large, dazzling, kinetic signs may be fatally truncated. To marry four huge commercial office buildings to the exuberance of Times Square is a difficult challenge. When the buildings were unveiled last December, there was mention of the group as being comparable to Rockefeller Center, an utterly incompatible notion. Clearly the developer and his architects now are far more concerned with the buildings' relation to Times Square, and an effort is being made to enliven them at street level. But floodlighting the facades above and embellishing them with areas of static light hardly seems sufficient. We cannot help thinking that a good deal more could be done to enliven the nighttime effect.

"All of which is said in the context of our general enthusiasm for the 42nd Street Development Project as a whole. It will occur right at the very heart of New York, and nothing must be left undone to enhance the uniquely high-spirited nighttime drama of that famous space, Times Square."
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The Premise
The premise of the 42nd Street Development Project is that through permitting construction of four new office towers of density greatly exceeding the maximum 21.6 FAR permitted in the Zoning Resolution—two of the towers would be 44 FAR—funds would be made available to rebuild the Times Square subway station and, very important, to renovate and revitalize nine 42nd Street midblock theaters. It was a clear quid pro quo. At this writing, plans for the buildings are squarely in place, but, as Laurie Beckelman, executive director of the Landmarks Conservancy testified at the above hearing, “How can it be that a $1.6 billion project, proposing over seven million square feet of new development, can claim that ‘funds may not be completely adequate to guarantee initially the renovation of all of the specified theater structures . . . . While much time and debate has ensued over the design of the proposed office towers, no design details for the theaters or retail infill have been established.’”. In other words, the quid pro quo is not in place, and the oversized buildings should not be approved without firm assurance of what is to be provided in return—renovated theaters in a low rise midblock.

The Presidents’ Council, in a letter prepared by Richard Anderson to William Stern, chairman of UDC, and City Planning Commission chairman Herbert Sturz, reported the Council as being “increasingly concerned by the direction the project is taking, most particularly with respect to plans for the design and functioning of Times Square.”

Who Is in Charge
Increasingly, questions are being raised as to the capacity of UDC to carry the project through; a New York magazine October 8, 1984 article by Carter Wiseman severely criticized how the project is being managed, and a New York Times editorial on October 3, 1984, called for some outstanding individual to be appointed to the recently vacated presidency of the UDC subsidiary Times Square Development Corporation. The Chapter has been concerned about the UDC leadership. Edward Logue and Richard Kahan both greatly valued design excellence and retained appropriate staff, but when Governor Cuomo appointed William Stern, formerly his campaign manager, and someone with no apparent experience in real estate development, there was reason for uneasiness.

The Times Tower Site
The competition organized by the Municipal Art Society drew an outstanding 566 entries, a remarkable burst of energy, seriousness, fun, and imagination. The eight winners were announced at a reception on September 17, at the Urban Center. The exhibition ran through October 27. The competition program had called for the announcement to be made in July, and Carter Wiseman published a selection of entries in the August 20 issue of New York. See the report elsewhere in this issue.

What will be done with the Times Tower site is far from settled at this writing. The rendering on the cover of this Oculus shows a proposal, by Burgee/Johnson, which was regarded favorably in the Chapter’s recent testimony (above): the present tower would be stripped down to its steel frame, which, painted white, could support large kinetic signs facing north. There is great appeal in this scheme because the old tower, transformed again, would remain; it would be transparent or seen from the windows of the new buildings, and the New Year’s ball would drop as of old.

There has been a reaction to the Chapter’s dissatisfaction, expressed in its statement at the recent hearing, as to how a decision regarding the Tower site was to be arrived at. A six person committee, has been proposed, including government agency representatives and three public members, among whom the Chapter would be represented; it would be empowered to make a binding recommendation.

At Issue Now
The great remaining issue, as the October 25 hearing approached, concerned, not bright lights on the Tower site, crucial as they were, but the fundamental matter of density control in the 42nd Street midblock. On October 9 Terrance Williams and the writer met with City Planning Commission Chairman Sturz to stress that, whereas the 42nd Street Project as presented made it quite clear that floor area greatly in excess of normal zoning was being assigned to the office towers—two of them were to be 44 FAR (44 times lot size), over twice the maximum normally possible—there was no binding guarantee that the midblock, from which the air rights had in effect been transferred, would remain low. Mr. Sturz unhappily agreed that a binding guarantee must be in place before the October 25 Board of Estimate hearing.

The hearing will be reported in the December issue.
Chapter Reports
by George Lewis

The Dinner Dance October 10 at the Coho Restaurant, South Street Seaport, with cocktails hosted by Benjamin Thompson & Associates, architects of the Market Building and the building under construction on the pier — Ben and Jane Thompson were present — was by every account an exciting success. Heard many times, “We should do this more often.”

The Transportation Committee, with Terry Williams, met for three hours with MTA chairman Robert Kiley and T/A president David Gunn, and it can be said that highly significant changes affecting architect consultants on station modernization are underway in response to the Committee’s detailed reports of dealings with hitherto intractable management. There will be a new T/A vice president in charge of design, putting staff architects on an equal footing with engineers (up to now they have been subordinate). There will be a new standard contract consistent with architects’ liability insurability, with the roles of consultants properly defined; and the processing of payments will be reorganized.

42nd Street/Times Square, Robert Anderson of Regional Plan and the writer met with Roger Starr and John Sme, editorial board members of the Times and News, respectively, and editorial which included some points we had made appeared on October 3.

Headquarters Fund. Contributions have been received from John Nelson Linn; Karplus & Nussbaum, Architects; Douglas F. Korves, Architects; and R.M. Kliment & Frances Halsband, Architects.

Coming Chapter Events

Thursday, November 1, 5:30-7:30 p.m.
Harry N. Abrams Inc. and Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum host a reception honoring Chapter member Walter McQuade, author of “Architecture in the Real World,” a comprehensive view of HOK unedited by the firm, and Paul Grotz, the book’s designer. The Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave.

Monday, November 12, 6:00 p.m.
Negotiating Higher Fees. Panel discussion lead by Barry B. Le Patner. Sponsored by the Practice Committee. The Urban Center.

Thursday, November 15, 6:00 p.m.

Thursday, November 29, 6:00 p.m.
Seminar, Design Recognition. Sponsored by the Interiors Committee. The Urban Center.

Wednesday, December 5, 5-7:00 p.m.
Tour of the ATT Building conducted by the ATT Facilities Management Group. Sponsored by the Corporate Architects Committee. The tour size will be limited: call the Chapter office by December 3.

Thursday, December 13, 6:00 p.m.
Professional Liability for the In-house Architect. Lecture by Joan Schirb, Attorney at law. Sponsored by the Corporate Architects Committee. The Urban Center.
CONTINUING EVENTS

WILL INSLY

EXHIBITION

EXHIBITION
"Projects for the Venetian Town—1926-1981." Columbia Graduate School of Architecture, 100 Level, Avery Hall, 280-3414. Closes Nov. 16.

WILLIAM MORRIS
Exhibition celebrating the 150th anniversary of Morris's birth. The Morgan Library, 29 E. 36 St. 685-0008. Closes Nov. 25.

ALVAR AALTO: FURNITURE AND GLASS

VAN GOGH IN ARLES

EXHIBITION

THE CITY COMES OF AGE

EXHIBITION

MONDAY 5

LECTURE

THE SHAPE OF THE CITY
Michael Graves in lecture series with architects discussing "Their Buildings & Their Visions." 8:15 pm. 92nd Street Y. 831-8603.

LECTURE SERIES

TUESDAY 6

LECTURE SERIES
"Japan in the '80s: Design and Architecture," first of 5 Tuesday lectures. 6:15 pm. Cooper-Hewitt Museum, 2 E. 91 St. 860-6868.

WEDNESDAY 7

LECTURE
Donald L. Stull & M. David Lee in Columbia Graduate School of Architecture series. 6 pm. Wood Auditorium, Avery Hall. 280-3414.

CONSERVING NEW YORK
Daniel Patrick Moynihan on "The politics of conservation," first in 6-Wednesday series co-sponsored by the Met & the N.Y. Landmarks Conservancy. 8 pm. Metropolitan Museum. 879-5500.

THURSDAY 1

NYC/AIA
Harry N. Abrams Inc. and HOK host a reception honoring Walter McQuade, FAIA, on publication of "Architecture in the Real World." The Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave. 265-7100.

MARIO SALVADORI LECTURE

EXHIBITION

FRIDAY 2

BROOKLYN ETHNIC TOUR
ON SAT., NOV. 3
"Atlantic Avenue-Cobble Hill Historic District." Municipal Art Society tour meets at Urban Center 10 am, or at the Atlantic Ave. station of the D or #2, 5, 4, 5 trains (in front of the FIRR station) 11 am. 933-3999.

FRIDAY 9

JACKIE FERRABA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY 12</th>
<th>TUESDAY 13</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY 14</th>
<th>THURSDAY 15</th>
<th>FRIDAY 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE SHAPE OF THE CITY</td>
<td>LECTURE</td>
<td>HELMUT JAHN</td>
<td>NYC/AIA SEMINAR</td>
<td>SYMPOSIUM ON SATURDAY, DEC. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY 19</td>
<td>TUESDAY 20</td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 21</td>
<td>THURSDAY 22</td>
<td>FRIDAY 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXHIBITION</td>
<td>LECTURE</td>
<td>CONSERVING NEW YORK</td>
<td>1984: Thanksgiving</td>
<td>PSMJ FINANCIAL MANAGERS’ ROUNDTABLE (NOV. 25-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY 26</td>
<td>TUESDAY 27</td>
<td>WEDNESDAY 28</td>
<td>THURSDAY 29</td>
<td>FRIDAY 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING THE SHAPE OF THE CITY</td>
<td>LECTURE</td>
<td>LECTURE</td>
<td>LANDMARK PRESERVATION</td>
<td>SYMPOSIUM ON SATURDAY, DEC. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Names and News

Paul Heyer, Der Scutt, and Massimo and Lella Vignelli participated in a September architectural seminar on “The Atrium” in Karuizawa, Japan, sponsored by The Pratt Asian Center and Seibu Corporation. Der Scutt was also a speaker at a September meeting of AIA’s Potomac Valley Chapter of Maryland. M. Paul Friedberg was invited to participate as a juror for the Presidential Design Awards Program established by President Reagan in December 1983 to recognize exemplary achievement in Federal Design. Gerald Hines Interests will sponsor a series of five exhibitions at New York’s Museum of Modern Art; they will focus on current developments in modern architecture and will be shown at approximately one-year intervals; the first is scheduled for next June and will feature work by Spanish architect Ricardo Bofill and London-based architect Leon Krier. Leslie Armstrong and Roger Cumming have formed a partnership. Armstrong Cumming Architects at 32 W. 20th Street. In addition, Leslie Armstrong is the co-author with theater design consultant Roger Morgan of Space for Dance, An Architectural Design Guide, which has been commissioned and published by the National Endowment for the Arts. Barbara Diamonstein is preparing Buildings Reborn: New Uses, Old Places: Part II, an exhibition and book/catalog to document adaptive re-use from the late 1970s to the present. She would like recommendations of projects for inclusion in four categories: Places to live, Places to work in, Places to shop in, and Places to Play in (720 Park Ave., New York 10021, 861-4641). Gillis Associates has announced that Barry Harrison, formerly of Gatje Papachristou Smith and Skidmore Owings & Merrill, has joined the Gillis firm. The New York Society of Architects has announced two publications: a xeroxed bound copy of the 1969 New York Building Laws (Old Code), which is available for $42.89 including NYC sales tax and shipping from: NYSA, 275 Fifth Ave . . . . Diane Carstens, a staff member of Project for Public Spaces, Inc., is coordinating a PPS service to provide technical assistance to architects and developers of housing and community facilities for the elderly . . . James S. Polshek has announced that architect/author Klaus Herdeg has been named chairman of the Division of Architecture in Columbia’s Graduate School of Architecture and Planning. Says Herdeg: “New York is a world capital in many ways, but, in some aspects, particularly architecture, it can appear terribly provincial when viewed from afar. Through travel, especially conscious travel, you might learn something about New York that you couldn’t find out in New York.” . . . Wallace B. Berger and William J. Waffle have been appointed vice presidents and senior project directors at Welton Becket Associates’ New York office . . . . The J.M. Kaplan Fund has bought 3,000 square inches (at $5 an inch) of the Clinton Community Garden to boost the campaign to save the garden plot between 9th and 10th Avenues on 48th Street, which was a vacant rubble-strewn lot before neighborhood residents transformed it into the lush garden it is today. There are still 200,000 square inches to be sold if the gardeners are to purchase the garden through a restricted auction that would limit the use of the parcel to open space. Lisa Cashdan at the Trust for Public Land (663-3939) is the person to contact for information on how to buy square inches . . . . Horace Ginsberg and Associates are architects of a four-story elliptical office building known as “222 Bloomingdale Road” under construction in White Plains . . . The Grad Partnership has promoted eight of its senior staff members to the position of Associate: John Fitzpatrick, Martin Frauwirth, Neshitt Garmendia, James Gilsen, William Jones, William Jordan, Vasant Kshirsagar, and Kenneth Underwood. . . . The design problem of Columbus Coated Fabrics’ second annual Design Competition for Architects—the design of “a wall of a room in a tower” was proposed by the architects who will judge the results: Charles Gwathmey and Susana Torre of New York, Thomas Beeby of Chicago, Robert H. Timme of Houston, William Turnbull of San Francisco, and James A. Murphy of Progressive Architecture as moderator. With a deadline of March 4th, the competition is open to architecture students, and to architects not over 35 as of January 1, 1985. For competition kits: Columbus Coated Fabrics, 1280 N. Grant Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43216 . . . . November 15th is the deadline for entries in the Second Annual Concrete Block Paver Design Competition: National Concrete Masonry Association, P.O. Box 781, 2302 Horse Pen Road, Herndon, Virginia 22070 (703-435-4900).
Jury Procedure
The jury met in the Times Tower for a total of twenty hours on two consecutive days (July 13 and 14, 1984). All nine jurors participated from the beginning to end. The process of judgment began with a review of the 565 competition entries by each juror individually. During the afternoon of the first day, 56 entries in which three or more jurors had expressed interest during this first round review were discussed by the jury as a group. On the morning of the second day individual jurors again reviewed all the entries, and as a result of this second review a few were added for the next round of discussions. An alternating series of exclusionary votes and further discussions then ensued, with the field being progressively narrowed until thirteen entries remained in the running. After extensive discussion of these “finalists” it became apparent that no three entries enjoyed sufficient support to justify the distinction between “prize” and “commendation” as set forth in the competition guidelines. The jury thereupon determined by majority vote to award eight equal prizes of $2,250 each. After further discussion the eight winners were selected from among the thirteen finalists by vote of the Jury.

Jury Comments
The jury was impressed by the diversity as well as the number of entries, and in making its awards sought to acknowledge this diversity by selecting exemplary representatives of several different types of proposal for the Times Tower Site. Thus, awards were given both to new building proposals and to proposals for restoration of the Times Tower to a simulacrum of its original state. In both cases, the jury generally favored schemes that promised active use as well as vivid imagery.

Appropriately, many entries exploited the opportunity for spectacular transformations through the use of light, and several of these were included among the winners. A prize was awarded to one entry that took the form of a poem wonderfully evoking the dual nature—at once sacred and profane—of the life that flows day and night through Times Square.

As was to be expected, the jury deliberations included much discussion not only about the merits of specific proposals but also about the qualities which should be sought in planning the future of the Times Tower Site. It became apparent that the jurors, for all their diversity of background and outlook, share certain convictions about this site which in the end are more strongly felt than is their enthusiasm for any single entry in the competition. The jury therefore wishes to conclude its report with the following unanimously agreed observations and recommendations:

The Times Tower Site stands at a unique point of confluence; its essential qualities are activity, diversity and accessibility. In planning the future of this site the primary goal should be to reinforce these qualities—or at the very least not diminish them. To achieve this, it is our considered and unanimous judgement that:

1. Times Tower Site should be occupied by a building. It is not an appropriate site for an open plaza or monument.

2. The building on this site should respect and reinforce the street walls of Seventh Avenue and Broadway. In this respect it would be difficult to improve on the wedge-shaped form of the present building.

3. The building site should be multi-use, and at least in part accessible to the public. It should include space devoted to those entertainment and communication functions whose continued presence is crucial to the life of the district of which Times Square is the vital center.

Respectively submitted.

Times Tower Competition Jury:
Jonathan Barnett, Architect; Henry Cobb, Jury Chairman; Vartan Gregorian, historian, President, New York Public Library; John Hejduk, Architect; Ming Cho Lee, international stage designer; Adele Naude Santos, Architect, Chairman, Department of Architecture, University of Pennsylvania; Hideo Sasaki, Landscape Architect; Carl E. Schorske, cultural historian; Richard Sennett, writer.
Monuments
1. Reed A. Morrison
2. James Stickley and Tony Leung
3. William Prevattel and Gayaturi Menikdiwela
4. Tim Prentice
5. Michael Monsky
6. David Suter
7. William H. Sloan
8. A Team from Jeffrey Aronin Associates
9. Winner: Paul Bentel and Carol A. Rusche

Non-Monuments
10. John Kormeling
11. Harold Guadette, Bethany Christenson, Doria Cole, Robert Ellsworth, and Hitomi Machidome
12. Tobias Mostel and Eileen Winter
13. Jan Gould, Evan Kingsley, Michele Lewis & Peter Locasio
14. Detail, Michael Joyce
15. Stephen Charles Salomon and Ken Bond
16. Winner: William F. Schacht for Lockwood Greene, Architects and Engineers, with Cassandra McGowen
17. Winner: David Stein
Buildings
1. Michael Mein
2. Winner: Lee Alan Dunnette
3. Gilbert Gorski
4. Cheryl E. Morgan, Karl Blette, James Clark, John Edgar, Gerard Fuska, Kathy Hamlet, Imad Kattan, Sterling Little, John Reese, Katherine Pirie, Jerry Slivens, Khodor Taha, David Tobin, and Douglas Young
5. Barry Harrison and Pascal Quintard-Hoffstein
6. Richard Haas, Judith Dimaio, and William Palmore
7. Winner: Frank Lupo and Daniel Rowen with Karen Maloof
8. Winner: Detail, Christopher Genik and Peter Waldman
9. Winner: Raimund Abraham, Kevin Bong, and Shane Chow
10. Winner: Tōeg Yoshinobu Nishimoto
General Contractors
Specializing in the construction of institutional, commercial, and industrial buildings since 1945