For seven months, beginning in May 1986, Carnegie Hall will be closed for a major renovation of its interior. Restoration of the exterior, now underway, has been going on for some months. Both phases are under the direction of James Stewart Polshek & Partners.

Officials of Carnegie Hall have decided to save, as a surprise until it opens, the details of what will be done to the main auditorium. The restoration of Carnegie Recital Hall and its lobby have been reported on, and in fact the latter is impressively visible from the street.

One of the major renovations to be accomplished during the close-down period this summer will be a redesign of the main lobby. It will incorporate a new entryway and a new traffic pattern and circulation flow into the main auditorium. Some precedents exist in previous changes to the lobby entryway. The changes that the Polshek office plans to make will speak clearly for today's habits of pedestrian circulation.
Carnegie Hall's New Lobby

A New Section
Most radical of the changes will be the lowering of the lobby floor level—down to the grade of the sidewalk. The few steps outside the glass doors will be removed, and the awkward steps inside that rise up to the present lobby level will be swept away.

Instead of mounting in an impressive and authoritative manner as previous generations were wont to do, we will, next year, be able to stroll in directly from the street with no change in level. It is a gesture to today's easy and direct routing, as expected from its escalator and movable walkway society.
New Ticket Windows

To avoid the intersection of pedestrian traffic that now occurs when concertgoers must cross the line of ticket purchasers and those who are picking up reserved tickets, the two ticket box offices will be relocated. Presently those ticket windows are at the East end of the lobby, and the result is that, as lines to the windows build up, they form a direct barrier parallel to the path of concertgoers from the street to the auditorium entry.

In the new scheme, six ticket windows will be located in the rear wall or South wall of the lobby directly opposite the entry doors. The lines that build up from them in the future will, at the least, be lines in the same direction as the incoming traffic flow into the lobby.

At the ends of the ticket window wall will be new elevator lobbies and elevators. They will materially change the stair-climbing patterns in the newly restored lobby.
New Circulation
Because of the new section—the lowered floor of the new lobby—the circulation pattern into the auditorium will be revised. At present, one enters the auditorium up more ranks of steps that rise from the lobby level. Since that lobby level will no longer be there, circulation into the main auditorium will be re-routed. Concertgoers will, in the Polshek office’s new scheme, enter the lobby from the street, and then turn either to the right or the left, walking along the lobby toward stairs at both of the short ends. Balconygoers have been accustomed to this route, since the principal stair to the balcony has, for some years, been at the West end of the lobby. And that stair will remain as a Balcony entrance. About six steps up, however, that stair will also take a turn to the left, and there, another ten steps will lead to the main auditorium. This route will be mirrored at the other end of the lobby, where the present ticket windows are located. The circulation pattern, will have a symmetrical form.
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Chapter Reports

by George Lewis

• 1988 New York AIA Convention. A Chapter committee is being formed to define goals and initiate preliminary plans. The Chapter would like to hear from members interested in participating in what might be the greatest architectural assemblage ever.

• Many hundreds of people crowded the National Academy of Design on January 22 for the Unbuilt Project Awards ceremony and the opening of the Exhibition. Paul Goldberger, in a comprehensive review in the February 2 Sunday Times, called the awards competition "an event that actually manages to give all of us some insight into where the art of architecture is at this moment." A concurrent exhibition of panels was on view at the Urban Center.

• "CAD Workshop: Learning How to Use Computer Aided Design" drew 40-odd people to an all-morning seminar Saturday, February 8 conducted by E. Lee Kennedy, who explored in great detail how to consider what CAD system to buy, how to manage the system and be competitive with it. An exhibition of some remarkable design presentations and working drawings provided by several firms accompanied the event.

• An Institute-sponsored round table met at the Chapter January 22 to sound out local sentiment regarding the possibilities in a captive liability insurance program. The outcome was inconclusive, but several points were made, such as the question of whether the participating firms could be limited to exclude high-risks (read inefficient), to which it was rejoined that some much admired firms at the cutting edge of technological innovation are themselves high-risk. There were questions as to why Schinnerer/CNA is the AIA-recommended program, which apparently is the case because it is the only insurance available in all 50 states.

Letters to the Editor

Dear Editor:

You and the Oculus staff are to be commended for the Oculus of today. The thorough articles on interesting topics in recent months have been excellent, as are the calendar, the format, etc. It has developed into a publication of which you can be proud — a tremendous improvement over what I know and worked on some decades ago.

However, as one with decades of experience in architectural design, I despair of the current tendency of some to use language which is largely undecipherable to me and must certainly be to clients. Why not return to plain good English — not necessarily to the term "swell" which was usual among students in college when I was studying.

Keep up the good work.

Charles K. Hirzel, AIA

Coming Chapter Events

• Monday, March 3, 6 pm. The Urban Center. The Public Architects Committee is sponsoring a "presentation, discussion, and reception" about the NEA grant for "Architects and Designers in Public Service," with a blue ribbon panel.

• Tuesday, March 11, 6 pm. The Urban Center. "Ownership, Use, and Copyright of Design Documents," last in the 4-part seminar series that Barry B. LePatner is conducting for the Chapter.

• Thursday, March 13, 5-7 pm. The Urban Center. The Energy and Environment Committee is sponsoring a public meeting on Asbestos inspection, testing, removal, and management, with Gordon Goldman, President, Asbestos Environmental Controls, Inc.

• Monday, March 24, 6 pm. The Urban Center. Opening of the Chapter exhibition of work by Carlo Scarpa.

• Wednesday, April 15, 5:30 pm. The Urban Center. The Health Facilities Committee is sponsoring a seminar on Positron Emission Tomography (PET) with Donald Perrine, Director of Marketing and Sales of Computer Technology and Imagery, Inc., of Knoxville Tennessee.
CONTINUING EVENTS

EXHIBITION

EXHIBITION

EXHIBITION

DRAWINGS & MODELS

MONDAY 3

DEADLINE
For entries in the Chapter’s Distinguished Architecture Awards Program. NYC/AIA, 457 Madison Ave. 838-9670.

NYC/AIA PANEL
Presentation and discussion sponsored by the Public Architects Committee on NEA grant for “Architects & Designers in Public Service.” 6 pm. The Urban Center. 838-9670.

MONDAY 10

EXHIBITION

EXHIBITION

TUESDAY 4

1801: Architect Thomas Jefferson inaugurated as President of the United States

TUESDAY 11

NYC/AIA SEMINAR
Discussion of “Ownership, Use, and Copyright of Design Documents” last in the 4-part Barry LePatner series for the AIA. 6 pm. The Urban Center, 838-9670.

WEDNESDAY 5

EXHIBITION

LECTURE
Carroll William Westfall, Univ. of Virginia on “The Essential Palace Type as Urban Building Block” in Columbia’s Graduate School of Architecture & Planning series. 6 pm. Wood Auditorium. 280-3473.

WEDNESDAY 12

TOUR OF IDCNY’S CENTER TWO
Including discussion with Charles Gwathmey and Massimo Vignelli. 10 am-3 pm. Cooper-Hewitt Museum. 860-6868.

GREAT AMERICAN CITIES
Beth Dunlop, architecture critic of Miami Herald, will discuss Miami in 5-Wednesday series. 6:15 pm. Cooper-Hewitt Museum. 860-6868.

THURSDAY 6

THE FIFTIES
Architecture, industrial design, graphic design, furniture and furnishings, television—first in 5-lecture series. 6:15 pm. Cooper-Hewitt Museum. 860-6868.

THURSDAY 13

NYC/AIA OFFICE VISIT
The Computer Application Committee will sponsor a visit to the Johnson Burgee office (McAuto System). 5-7 pm.

FRIDAY 7

TOUR ON SAT. MARCH 8
Historic Harlem. Architectural historian Michael George will guide tour through The Grange, Alexander Hamilton’s residence; the Morris Jumel Mansion, etc. 10-4 pm. Cooper-Hewitt Museum. 860-6868.

FRIDAY 14

WORKSHOP, MARCH 16-20
MONDAY 17
CONFERENCE
Multi-Housing World Conference,
March 17-20, Cervantes Convention
Center, St. Louis.

TUESDAY 18
NYC/AIA PUBLIC MEETING
The Energy and Environment
Committee is sponsoring a meeting on
Asbestos—inspection, testing, removal, and management with
Gordon Goldman, President, Asbestos
Environmental Controls, Inc. 6 pm.
The Urban Center. 838-9670.

WEDNESDAY 19
WEST WEEK
Pacific Design Center's annual design
conference (March 19-21) with Art,
Technology & Design as its theme.
213-657-0800.

THURSDAY 20
RICHARD MORRIS HUNT
Exhibition of the 19th-century
architect's drawings. The
Metropolitan Museum of Art.

FRIDAY 21
BUELL TALKS IN AMERICAN
ARCHITECTURE, MARCH 21-22
Second annual series of scholarly
meetings presented by the Temple
Hoyne Buell Center for the Study of
American Architecture at Columbia.
For more information: Ann folliott, 280-8205.

MONDAY 24
SCARPA EXHIBITION
Opening of the Chapter exhibition of
work by Carlo Scarpa. 6 pm. The
Urban Center. 838-9670.

TUESDAY 25
SEMINAR
"Conversations on the Period Room"
will discuss the differences in the
design process involved in recreating
an authentic period room and in
creating the "look" of a period room.
Sponsored by ASID Museum Liaison
Committee and FIT's Graduate
Museum Studies Dept. 6 pm. The
Fashion Institute of Technology. 685-3480.

MIES CENTENNIAL
Opening of the Illinois Institute of
Technology's observance of the 100th
birthday of Mies van der Rohe. It
will include a major exhibition opening in
early summer on the architect as
educator.

LECTURE
Gae Aulenti in Columbia's Graduate
School of Architecture & Planning series.
6 pm. Wood Auditorium. 280-3473.

WEDNESDAY 26
GREAT AMERICAN CITIES
Architectural writer Barbara
Flanagan will discuss Los Angeles.
280-6868.

THURSDAY 27
1886: Ludwig Mies van der Rohe
born.

LECTURE
The Interdependence of Art and
Technology in series by Mario G.
Salvadori, Professor Emeritus of
Architecture, Columbia University.
6 pm. Wood Auditorium. 280-3473.

FRIDAY 28
1828: William Thornton, architect of
U.S. Capitol, died.

TUESDAY 1 APRIL
MINI-COURSE ON HUNT
First of 4 Tuesday evening lectures
and two Saturday afternoon tours
(April 1, 8, 15, 19, 22, 26) on Richard
Morris Hunt. 8 pm. The Municipal
Art Society. 935-3960.

WEDNESDAY 2 APRIL
LECTURE
Stanley Saitowitz, professor of
architecture, University of
California, Berkeley, on Geological
6 pm. Wood Auditorium. 280-3473.

THURSDAY 3 APRIL
LECTURE
High versus Popular Culture in
series by Mario G. Salvadori,
Professor Emeritus of Architecture,
Columbia University. 6 pm. Wood Auditorium. 280-3473.

FRIDAY 4 APRIL
WORKSHOP
"Light and Color for Human
Performance," the Fashion Institute
of Technology's 2-day workshop
(April 4 & 5). FIT's Design Research
Lighting Laboratory. To enroll: The
Seminar Dept., Fashion Institute of
Technology, 227 W. 27 St. 760-7715.
“There is no country in the world in which architecture does not somehow bear his mark,” said Arthur Drexler in reference to the Mies Centennial Exhibition, at MOMA through April 15. Robert Venturi was named architect for the extension of the National Gallery in London. One of the original stipulations of the gallery trustees was that “the new building should relate sympathetically to the present building and be complementary to Trafalgar Square.” “Making a Bundle in Today’s Liability Environment” is to be the subject of the Professional Services Management Journal’s first Annual Management Conference in Chicago, April 10-11. For more information: Betsy Miller, PSMJ Seminars, 10 Midland Ave., Newton, MA 02158, 617-965-0055. William A. Hall, FAIA, has been installed as the 1986 president of the New York State Association of Architects. Rayner Banham, Sir Hugh Casson, James Stirling, and architectural historian Dr. Patrick Nuttgens will be among the speakers to explore “the eccentricities of tradition and innovation as design expressions of British social and cultural phenomena” at the 36th International Conference in Aspen (June 15-20). For further information: IDCA, Box 664, Aspen, CO 81612, 970-925-2257. Robert Imperatore has been issued a five-year permit for passenger-only ferry service from Weehawken, New Jersey, to his pier at West 38th Street. The ferry will begin test runs in May. The Sculpture Center is sponsoring a two part series of panel discussions (March 27 and April 28) focusing on the changes in public sculpture, from the Statue of Liberty to the Vietnam Memorial. It is entitled “Fixed in Time: Public Sculpture and the Historical Moment.” (See Calendar). NYC/ AIA Chapter members who received Citation Awards in the American Wood Council’s 1985 Wood Design Program were R.M. Kliment and Frances Halsband for an updated Shingle Style house in Westchester County; and Michael A. Geyer for a house in Montauk, New York, designed to blend with neighboring buildings by McKim, Mead and White.

The New York State Council on the Arts has announced the four teams of first-stage finalists in the national competition, “Inner City Infill: A Design Competition for Harlem.” They are: Stephen Campbell of New York and Mark Nielsen of Boston; Michael Pyatok, Anthony Bernheim of Oakland, California, Ira Oaklander, William Vito of New York, assisted by Patrick Pong and William Savidge of New York; Jill Stoner and Charles G. Duncan of Philadelphia; Adele Naude Santos, Robert DeJager, and Luís Longhi of Philadelphia. The four teams will now compete in the second stage of the competition. Chapter member Walter A. Rutes and Richard H. Penner are co-authors of Hotel Planning and Design, a comprehensive review of trends in hotel/motel/resort planning, published by Watson-Guptill. “New York Directory of Architects in the Public Service” produced by NYC/AIA’s Public Architects Committee is being published this month. Chapter member Walter N. Breger and William R. Pomeranz are co-authors of Nursing Home Development, A Guide to Planning, Financing, and Construction Long-Term Care Facilities published by Van Nostrand Reinhold. Winners of the Hispanic Talent Search Architectural Competition sponsored by Castro-Blanco, Piscioneri and Feder for the design of a new station house for the 44th Precinct in the Bronx were: Adolfo Perez, first prize, who holds a degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Design and works in Cambridge; Carlos Garcia-Bou, second prize, who is a graduate of the City University of New York School of Architecture and a resident of Manhattan; Bernardo DePablo of Port Washington, New York, was awarded an honorable mention. The competition, explains Castro-Blanco, “seeks to reward excellence in design among Hispanics who are starting careers in architecture.” Peter Blaufeux has called Oculus’ attention to the announcement of the “Lighting World 5 Poster Design Contest.” The particulars: Design a poster and win a free trip to Lighting World 4 in Los Angeles, three nights at the Los Angeles Hilton, registration to all seminars and social events. The design format must be full-size, camera-ready art no larger than 20” x 30” in no more than 4 colors and relate to the 1987 location for Lighting World, which is the new Jacob Javits Convention Center designed by I.M. Pei. It should contain the following copy: Lighting World 5, May 11, 12, 13, 1987, Jacob Javits Convention Center, New York City. Entries must be received by April 11, 1986, at National Expositions, 49 W. 38 St., Suite 12A, NYC 10018. For more information: Marion Greene.
Carnegie Hall's New Lobby

cont'd. from p. 6

Interior Detailing
The scheme for the new lobby interior is to carry out consistently the existing elements that have become familiar.

Among the elements that will be added, a new pedestal base will rise from the lowered floor level up to the present interior architecture. And where the present steps from the lobby to the auditorium now are, balconies with gridded balustrades will overlook the new space.

Blind ticket windows will even out the spacing of three per bay, and thereby create a symmetrically balanced, classical South wall for the lobby. On the East and West ends, new eight-globe light columns will signal the stairs to the auditorium.

The overall scheme looks thoughtful, workable, and right. One hopes that the circulation up the two end-of-lobby stairs will not prove to be more congested, in its way, than the present stair-barriered and ticket-line-barriered circulation. And since the gridded balustrades begin, more and more, to reinforce the idea not only of continuing Hoffmannesque fashion but also of Roman aspirations — indeed the drawings hauntingly suggest the lost Pennsylvania Station — it may not be too presumptuous to suggest that the restoration team save the pieces. Some future society may return to a love of monumental stairs and want to put them all back. But for our times, the Polshek office’s new lobby scheme looks as if it will be a happy improvement on a beloved City landmark.
THE GUGGENHEIM SPIRAL

An Editorial

From analyzing the comments about the proposed Guggenheim Museum addition that appeared—and did not appear—in last month's Oculus, several facts begin to emerge. They have been stated differently by others, and therefore bear reconsideration:

First, most of the discussion of the proposed addition focuses on style—the imagery and design approach of the addition.

Second, the opinions of architects—those few who are willing to express themselves in public on this subject—seem based on their generational backgrounds. That is, the older generation that was brought up on the Modern crusade tends to view the proposed Guggenheim addition favorably; whereas the younger generation that is dedicated to the Post-Modern approach tends to view the proposal unfavorably.

Third, those who have been most outspoken about the proposed Whitney Museum addition have expressed contrastingly genial approval of the Guggenheim addition. And somehow those oppositions look self-defeating, almost cancelling each other out.

Fourth, AND MOST IMPORTANT, much of the discussion is not about the principal issue of the situation. The principal issue is one of the Preservation of an Architectural Landmark. The stylistic issue dangerously beclouds the fact.

Fifth, this raises the question whether some architectural landmarks are more sacrosanct than others. And this almost brings us back, with little resolution, to the first observation. It is a dilemma.

The Debate

Continued

The Modern Triumvirate (concrete, steel, and glass), by Percival Goodman.

The deadline had passed for this issue of Oculus before Gwathmey Siegel & Associates had made their presentation, scheduled for February 25th, of their proposed addition to the Guggenheim Museum. Since the last Oculus, however, several other comments about the proposed addition have been received. They are published below.

Oculus has been sent a copy of the following letter addressed to Herbert Sturz, Chairman, City Planning Commission:

Dear Mr. Sturz:

Ever since the project for the expansion of the Guggenheim Museum was made public, the only positive voice that could be heard was that of the Museum administration itself, and even then, not on its architectural and urbanistic merits, but only pertaining to the internal organization of the Museum.

We would like to raise our voices to those who are shocked that the Guggenheim Museum administration itself—being patrons of the arts—would want to devalue, if not trivialize, their major work on exhibition, namely the building itself, which has over the years become a famous New York landmark... The bulk of the added box, protruding to the center of the great rotunda, is probably the single, most destructive aspect to the building ensemble; because it is no backdrop for the present building, but an unnecessary competitor. A plane 12-stories high and 50-feet inward from the Museum’s eastern property line will be dominating the entire silhouette of the 200-foot block front; no matter what color or texture the tiles are, and no matter what fenestration is used.

Some museum buildings can grow into city-like agglomerations over time if held together by a unifying front; and... others, like the Guggenheim, are single complex objects. This masterwork of Frank Lloyd Wright, known the world over, should not be allowed to be treated with such insensitivity.

Urbanistically, New York City would suffer an irreplaceable loss of cultural value if its government should allow the city to be so callously disfigured. The problem we are faced with here is not just preserving a building, it is essentially a moral test of our great city's guardians and citizenry.

For all these reasons we appeal to you, as our city's conscience, to deny permission for Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim Museum to be mutilated by the proposed addition.

Klaus Herdeg
Division of Architecture

Romaldo Giurgola
Ware Professor of Architecture
Dear Editor:
Should any addition be built on the Guggenheim site? If the only consideration before us was the Guggenheim Museum's need for expansion, the answer would be yes. But from an aesthetic point of view, the practical needs of the Museum are less at issue than is the need to protect the architectural integrity of an extremely important building. For the Frank Lloyd Wright building merits as much conservation as any work of art by a world renowned artist. It is not even a matter of whether everyone likes or understands it, or whether that work performs a function.... Not everyone loves or understands a great Picasso, or a Jackson Pollock, but to tamper with any of their works is inconceivable, and I personally find it just as inconceivable to tamper with the geometry, the massing, or the silhouette of the Frank Lloyd design.

For myself, and as a matter of principle, I must oppose this proposed addition. And whereas I care a lot about the Guggenheim as a Museum, and personally like and respect the persons who run it, and whereas I like and respect the firm chosen to do the expansion, I cannot justify these personal considerations to be paramount and see no reason why a unique landmark and an extraordinary resource should suffer because of my own friendly feelings for those persons whose actions may be responsible for the threatened damage. Thus I cannot remain silent.

Finally, I would like to say, that I have seen, more than once, the excellent presentation by the Gwathmey Siegel office. But what was intended to be its most persuasive point had the most negative effect on me. The very ingenious geometric scheme, is a conceptually brilliant exercise, and the drawings that illustrate the scheme are perfectly rendered and beautiful. But we have to keep in mind that intellectual exercises, no matter how brilliantly executed on paper, are meant to be ultimately translated into a three-dimensional structure. It is that three-dimensional structure that we will be confronted with if it is allowed to be built.

Halina Rosenthal

Ed: Readers will recall the satirical proposal by Percival Goodman for a building that would rise directly over St. Bartholomew's Church "to protect it." (See Oculus January 1984)

Architect Goodman now offers the following similarly intended proposals for the Guggenheim addition:

Dear Editor:
Since our museums need more space for gift shops, restaurants, and income-producing luxury housing to support administrative staffs to curate the ever-enlarging size and quantity of art works, the problem of expansion is a problem not foreseen by even such an eminent futurist as FLW. The Guggenheim is a prime example; the trustees and their architects considered the slot of property next to it adequate for the purpose, obviously it is not. To increase area, the proposed cantilevered structure is a limited solution and in no time at all space will again be short. What will the staff do then, poor things?

So in the public interest I suggest reconsideration of the Gwathmey Siegel design even though—except for the unfortunate cantilever—it more or less follows FLW's preliminary version of 1943. At that time the Master spoke of the Guggenheim as having "concrete rendered strong enough everywhere," of a structure "as near indestructable as it is possible to make a building" of, "continuity everywhere."

Accepting this statement (FLW, we know, was prone to understatement) I suggest expanding the great coil of the building, continue, I say, the continuity! Scheme I assumes that we could extend the spiral indefinitely for the most desirable of all expansion schemes. Here the slot is used primarily for an access tower.

Scheme II assumes a more limited expansion, perhaps the "concrete is not strong enough everywhere."

Scheme III is a bolder, and perhaps the most practical solution, as it does not take the Master's word for gospel. This is a bold scheme, a paradigm, as it contains the seed for expansion of every sort of building. In addition it is a symbol, bringing together in a single composition, weighty concrete, slender steel, and the frailty of glass. From the viewpoint of utility it provides large single floor areas and of course, later, there is always the possibility of adding an air-supported structure.

Percival Goodman, FAIA

The Icecream-Cone Scheme, by Percival Goodman.
ECONOMIC HEALTH


by Martin Raab

As a result of the recent NYC/AIA-NYS/AIA insurance survey, a number of statistics have come to light that illuminate the current economic state of the profession. The Directors feel that an article dealing solely with the financial parameters used to measure performance in the profession will be informative to Chapter Members.

The NYC/AIA - NYS/AIA insurance survey was based on data from the period 1981 to 1985. 126 responses were tabulated for the data, which was equally divided between the City and the State. The current average size of all firms was 14 people in the State and 25 in the City. Based upon division of firms according to gross fees—Small (under $500,000), Medium ($500,000 - $1,000,000) and Large (over $1,000,000)—the size for Small firms remained constant throughout the period at four people; Medium firms remained at 11 people; and Large firms grew in the State from 46 to 64 people and in the City remained constant at 72 people.

Firm Size
The number of firms in the large category remained constant in both City and State, 17 and 10 respectively, whereas the number of Medium firms grew 250 percent and Small firms increased 25 percent. This indicates the difficulty in growing to Large firm status. It also reveals a constant creation of new firms at the small level and a rapid rise in the five-year period of Medium-size organizations. The survey was slightly skewed since only firms who carry insurance were tabulated. Of the 15 percent of surveyed firms without insurance, virtually all were in the Small category.

Employment
Combined employment in all surveyed firms went from 1,951 to 2,472—up 27 percent. City employment rose only 13 percent with Large City firms rising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NY City Survey</th>
<th>Ratio of Gross Fees to Number of Technical Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Firm Classification by Gross Yearly Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>$60212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of empl.</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>$58877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of empl.</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>$51556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of empl.</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$53512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of empl.</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>$47798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of empl.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed is the average gross fees to the number of technical employees for 1981 through 1985. No. of empl. refers to the total number of technical employees that meet classification criteria for that year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NY City Survey</th>
<th>Average Number of Employees per Firm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Firm Classification by Gross Yearly Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of firms</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listed is the average number of employees per firm for 1981 through 1985.

1. Survey data for 1985 was estimated by some firms.
2. No. of firms refers to the number of firms that meet classification criteria for that year.
3. Total number of firms surveyed for NY City is 63. Note that for some years complete data was not provided and, therefore, was excluded for that year.

only 6 percent—a surprising result given the large fee volume increase attributable to Large City firms, up from $65 to $95 million.

Salaries and Profits
The reported national average gross fee per technical employee is $61,000. The survey indicates the City at $73,000 and the State at $66,500 per employee. But whereas Large firm averages for the City were $77,000, having grown 40 percent in the period, the State's Large firms were $70,096, up only 2 percent; Medium firm gross per employee actually dropped $64,000 to $56,000 in the City and was constant at $65,000 in the State. Small firms in the City grew from $48,000 to $60,000 or 25 percent; whereas statewide there was only an 8 percent increase from $50,000 to $54,000.

Given the 20 percent rise in the CPI in the period, only Large City and all Small firm productivity stayed ahead of the index.

Medium size is not a nirvana after it has been achieved. For, while gross income per employee went up in both Small and Large City firms 26 percent and 40 percent, respectively, it actually went down 13 percent in Medium-size firms during the survey period. When the loss of purchasing power over the period is factored in, Medium firms, which doubled in number, lost 33 percent of the dollar returns per technical employee.

The effect on salaries and profits in these organizations can only be imagined, but the medium size firm of 10 to 20 people appears to be a plateau in the profession—one in which expanding capital demands are difficult to meet out of profits. Nationwide capital needs now average $24,000 per employee.

The ability of Large City firms to increase their productivity, as seen by the 40 percent rise from $55,000 to $77,000, may well be indicative of their access to capital markets. This in turn allows for automation expenditures to increase productivity. The consequent profits resulting from the capital expenditure ultimately completes a circle from which Medium-size firms have been locked out. This may be borne out by the State Large firm statistics, which, while they show only a 2 percent rise in productivity—$68,000 to $70,000—indicate a technical population that has jumped 55 percent compared to the City's 6 percent.

It would appear that in the State, where productivity started at a higher level, profits over the period have gone into non-productivity enhancing applications, such as office space and carrying receivables. New Yorkers, who cannot buy space as readily may well have to automate to satisfy client demands.

Average Gross Income for Firm by Size (000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City/State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Gross Income 1985</td>
<td>239/217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross Income of Total Survey Sample (000,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City/State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Income 1985</td>
<td>6.9/8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Income 1980</td>
<td>5.0/7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Income
Whereas average total income for Small firms marginally increased 8 percent (4 percent) well below the CPI rise of 20 percent for the period, Medium firms averages dropped — 4 percent (— 7 percent), and Large firm income rose 40 percent (43 percent). Therefore, real income of Medium and Small firms has gradually eroded during the period. When this is coupled with the dramatic rise in insurance rates and overhead, in general, we truly have a financial crisis in the architecture profession and a developing class system based on office size.

Gross Income
Total gross income for all firms grew to 79 percent in the City and to 89 percent in the State—$62,000,000 to $111,000,000 and $39,000,000 to $74,000,000, respectively. The lion’s share of gross revenues was gathered by Large firms, which maintained a constant 85 percent and 72 percent, respectively, of total revenues.
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