A group of architectural graduates revitalized the AWA in the Los Angeles area during the early 1970s. The increased enrollment of women in architecture schools and a renewed interest in women's organizations during the 1970s have continued to boost AWA's membership. Although not affiliated with AWA, organizations of women in the architectural profession have emerged in Boston, New York, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Seattle, Denver, San Diego and Austin.

Advancing the Profession

The Association of Women in Architecture is a professional, nonprofit organization, dedicated to improving the status of women in architecture and related fields, and to advancing these professions. The specific objectives of AWA are:

- to inform the public of the qualifications and achievements of women in the architectural professions;
- to exhibit the work of members;
- to help women find employment in their professions;
- to cooperate with local, national and international groups of design professionals; and
- to increase the number of women in the design professions.

The AWA provides career counseling for women in schools and colleges, and for women returning to work. Two scholarships are awarded annually to southern California women in architecture and related fields. Monthly meetings of AWA offer professional development programs, including speakers, tours and exhibits. AWA also publishes a monthly newsletter.

A number of membership levels exist within AWA. Professional members hold either a license to practice architecture, an architecture degree, or have five years of experience in architecture or a related field. General members have an interest in architecture or related fields, but do not qualify as professionals. Members-at-large reside outside the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Student members are enrolled in college level courses in architecture or related fields. The organization confers life membership for service to AWA, and honorary memberships are awarded in recognition of contributions to the profession of architecture. AWA currently has 183 members.

An Active Image

Exhibits of the work of AWA members have been presented throughout Los Angeles. AWA members active in the American Institute of Architects were responsible for AWA sponsoring a women's caucus and information center at the 1977 AIA Convention in San Diego.

AWA has participated in the Union Internationale des Femmes (UIFA) conventions in Monaco, Romania, Iran and Seattle. During the Seattle convention, AWA arranged a West Coast tour for foreign visitors and hosted a banquet in Los Angeles. In conjunction with UIFA, AWA has mounted exhibitions of members' work at the Georges Pompidou Museum in Paris and the Pacific Design Center in Los Angeles.

AWA continues to sponsor activities for its student members. The first AWA student conference was held at Hollyhock House in Barnsdale Park (Los Angeles) in 1973. Next year, AWA will sponsor "Design Forum '82: Women Up Front," a conference addressing the issues that concern women in the environmental design profession. Scheduled for January 29-31, 1982 at Scripps College, Claremont, California, the conference will be cosponsored by California Polytechnic State University in San Luis Obispo, California.

The conference will feature a series of seminars and panel discussions structured to make women aware of the career options available in fields related to the built environment, to generate new enthusiasm for participation in those fields, and to promote communication among student and professional participants.

Further information is available from the Association of Women in Architecture office in the Bradley Building, 304 South Broadway, Suite 320, Los Angeles, CA 90013. Phone: (213) 625-1734.

—Doris Poffer, AWA President
—Lorraine Rudoff, AWA Historian
Sell the Sizzle: Some Marketing Concepts, by M. Arthur Gensler, Jr., FAIA.  
Design in a Creative Community, by Robert B. Marquis, FAIA.  
Joint Venture in Beijing, by Roger S. Hong, AIA.  

Interview: Rob Wellington Quigley, AIA.  

Departments:  
On The Move  
News  
Letters  
Points of View: Competitions, by Maris Peika, AIA and Joseph P. Martinez, AIA  

Front Cover:  
The Primate Discovery Center at the San Francisco Zoo brings together a representative mix of animals, landscaped animal habitats, multilevel public viewing areas and an interpretative center for educational purposes. Architect: Robert B. Marquis, FAIA and Associates. Photographer: Gerald Ratto.  

Back Cover:  
The Monahan Residence, a house with casual formality. Architect: Rob Wellington Quigley, AIA. Illustrator: Mel McGee.  

Janice M. Fillip  
Tom Glass  
Pamela Boyd Williams  
Cindy Trantham  
Rebecca Houser  

Publications Editor, CCAIA  
Art Director, Roosevelt Studios  
Director, Governmental Relations, CCAIA  
Editorial Assistants  

Architecture California, an official publication of the California Council, the American Institute of Architects, is published six times a year. Subscriptions: complimentary to CCAIA members: $12 a year for all others. For subscriptions, write Circulation Department, 1414 K Street, Suite 320, Sacramento, CA 95814. CCAIA is not responsible for statements or opinions expressed in Architecture California, nor do such statements necessarily express the view of CCAIA or its committees. © 1981 by CCAIA.
**Downsizing for Tomorrow**

Compact, energy-efficient homes are the wave of the future, according to a recent study of builder attitudes conducted by Dow Chemical Co. A majority of the 743 builders surveyed predict that the trend in the next five years will be to downsize homes to conserve on heating and cooling expenses.

Traditional living areas such as dens and dining rooms may disappear. To eliminate the expense of heating and cooling a seldom-used formal living room, the house of the future may have one large room which serves as both a living and family room. Similarly, builders predict that kitchens and formal dining rooms will be combined into one-room "country kitchens."

Reaction to downsizing may create a new segment of the housing market, dubbed the "mingles market" by some builders. People unwilling to adjust to smaller living spaces may double-up and share homes designed with two private sleeping wings and a single, shared kitchen and living area.

**Highlighting Highland Park**

After a year of deliberation, the Highland Park Improvement Association unveiled a plan to revitalize the downtown retail area of Highland Park. Storefront and interior rehabilitation of existing businesses, street and parking lot improvements, landscaping, and traffic coordination are proposed for North Figueroa Street from Avenues 50 to 61. The focus of the revitalization plan is a 50,000 square foot village mall between Avenues 57 and 59, to be constructed behind existing storefronts on Figueroa Street.

The Arroyo Group, architects of the revitalization plan, say Avenue 58 would be widened, closed to vehicular traffic and made into "Paseo Figueroa," a pedestrian walkway running from Figueroa Street to the new development behind existing stores. About $6.7 million is required to fund public improvements, including sidewalks, streetlights, benches, trees, trash receptacles, accessible curbs, synchronized traffic signals, and expanded and beautified parking facilities. The Arroyo Group anticipate completion of the mall by 1983.

A special commercial area revitalization effort will offer local retailers free architectural assistance, under the guidance of Adolfo Mirales, AIA of Mirales & Associates, and will provide a 20 percent cash rebate for money spent on approved improvements on individual buildings.

**Grand Terrace Strengthens Architectural Review**

The city of Grand Terrace has adopted an ordinance giving the Planning Commission comprehensive responsibility for site planning and architectural review. The Planning Commission is charged with ensuring that new development and/or alteration or enlargement of existing structures be consistent with the city's general plan. Design review approval by the Commission is necessary for all new commercial, industrial and office developments, and for remodeling or renovation of existing buildings.

Since Grand Terrace occupies only 6 square miles, open space is highly prized by the city. The ordinance is designed to preserve the natural beauty of the city and setting, and to prevent indiscriminate clearing of property, destruction of trees and natural vegetation, and the excessive and unsightly grading of hillsides.

The ordinance specifies that the location and configuration of buildings must be harmonious with their sites and surroundings, must not unnecessarily block scenic views from other buildings or dominate the townscape or natural landscape, and must create an internal sense of order to provide a desirable environment for the general community.

Even signage comes under the Commission's review for design, location, materials, and colors, to ensure that signs are consistent with the scale and style of surrounding structures.

**Architectural Exhibition Funded**

The La Jolla Museum of Contemporary Art received a $10,000 donation from the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in Fine Arts to assist in mounting a 1982 exhibition of "Ten California Architects."

Scheduled to open June 12, 1982, the exhibition will feature conceptual drawings, models and presentation drawings of both constructions and conceptual
projects, according to museum director Sebastian J. Adler. Chicago architect Stanley Tigerman, FAIA, curator of the exhibit, says, "California once again seems to have put together an extremely gifted group of young architects who are beginning to be seen as contemporary inheritors of the distinguished mantle of former great architects."

Public Works: Going, Going, Gone
Public buildings, bridges and highways, water distribution and treatment facilities, and sewers are wearing out faster than they are being repaired, according to America in Ruins, a study prepared for the Council of State Planning Agencies. Among other facts, the study found that:

- One out of every five bridges in the U.S. requires major rehabilitation or reconstruction.
- The nation's interstate highway system is deteriorating at a rate requiring reconstruction of 2,000 miles per year.
- Major modernization of ports is needed to service world shipping at American docks.
- Between $75 billion and $110 billion is needed to maintain urban water systems over the next 20 years in the nation's 76 urban areas with populations over 50,000.
- In New York City alone, $40 billion is needed over the next nine years to repair or rebuild public facilities.

Since 1965, the percentage of gross national product devoted to public works investment has declined from 3.6 percent to 1.7 percent. The economic recovery plan recently proposed by President Reagan calls for a further decrease of at least $18.2 billion in public works spending.

The Post Office Does It Again
San Francisco's Palace of Fine Arts was more or less memorialized on the 18¢ postage stamp, as the Palace of Arts. Postal authorities are at a loss to explain the error in commemorating this outstanding example of early 20th-century American architecture designed by Bernard Beck ... or was that Bern Maybeck?

Interior Architecture Committee
Leaders of the Los Angeles design community and the Los Angeles Chapter, AIA have formed an Interior Architecture Committee. According to organizing members Harriet Stuart and Bernard Zimmerman, FAIA, the purpose of IAC is to encourage dialogue between the two professions on common goals and philosophical differences.

Committee meetings will be held on the fourth Tuesday of each month at the committee headquarters in the Pacific Design Center. For further information, phone (213) 651-5511 or (213) 852-1067.

No Design Standards for Barstow
Barstow's city Planning Commission recently considered whether to adopt architectural design standards to promote a consistent style in the city's downtown redevelopment area. Planning Commission Chairman George Harris' recommendation that an architectural review board be created was dismissed on the grounds that the board would establish another level of bureaucracy and delay redevelopment, according to the San Bernardino Sun. Commissioner Leonard Duran asked for a special study session to consider design standards. He noted, "Barstow has become a speculator's paradise and we must be careful."

The proposal for architectural design standards was not warmly received. At the study session, broker Gene Miller told the Commission, "We don't need you to tell us how to design our buildings and what color to paint them." He added, "If we get too restrictive, nobody will want to build. Good business dictates that people be competitive and improve designs (of their buildings and offices). I'm saying we don't need additional standards."

Commissioner Duran's concern that the quality of building materials be upgraded to improve their ability to endure Barstow's blistering sun was countered by building contractor Joe Gee, who responded that quality is difficult to legislate.

Pointing to the sparse public turnout at the study session, the Commission concluded that Barstow residents were not particularly concerned with architectural standards. The Commission decided to launch a cleanup campaign and to vigorously enforce building codes, rather than adopt architectural design standards.
Awards


Two restaurants designed jointly by Wudtke Watson Davis, Architects and WME Interior Architects, both of San Francisco, were awarded first place in the 1981 Interior Design Competition sponsored by Restaurant Hospitality, a national trade journal for the restaurant industry. The design team on Top of the Hub in the Prudential Center, Boston was Donald E. Wudtke, AIA, Eric G. Engstrom, ASID/IBD, Daniel W. Whitney, AIA, Charles Dresner and Barbara Dineen. The design team for Mangia Mangia in the Embarcadero Center, San Francisco, included Dick Watson, AIA, Eric Engstrom, ASID/IBD and Joan Diengott.

Courses for Architects

This fall the University of California, Berkeley Extension offers a variety of courses for architects: Introduction to Fire Safety in the Design Process, October 14 to November 11; The New-Generation Energy-Efficient Office Building, October 24-31; Effective Management for Design Professionals, November 18 to December 16; and Environmental Psychology: An Introduction for Interior Designers, December 5-6. For further information, contact UC Extension, 2223 Fulton Street, Berkeley, CA 94720. Phone: (415) 642-4111.

Publications

Designing for Energy Efficiency: A Study of Eight California State Office Buildings by Sam Davis, AIA is now available for $3.50 from the Center for Planning and Development Research, 373 Wurster Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720.

Installation and Operation of Solid-fuel-burning Appliances is now available from the International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO). The manual provides specific information on Uniform Building Code requirements, test standards and ICBO research reports, and contains illustrations and photographs. Available for $1.50, plus sales tax, from the Publications Department, ICBO, 5360 South Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90601. Phone: (213) 699-0541.

The Earthquake Engineering Research Institute (EERI) announces a new publication, Dynamics of Structures, a Primer, by Professor Anil K. Chopra of the University of California, Berkeley. According to EERI, the 125-page monograph provides the basic concepts and knowledge needed to understand the response of structures excited by ground motion. Available for $7.00, plus handling, from EERI, 2620 Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94704. Phone: (415) 848-0972.

The National Lighting Bureau has three publications available: Getting the Most from Your Lighting Dollar ($1.00), Lighting Energy Audit Workbook ($2.00), and The Energy-Saver's Guide to Good Outdoor Lighting ($3.00). To order, send full payment to National Lighting Bureau, 2101 L Street, N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20037.
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CBAE and NCARB Hold Summit Meeting

On August 24, 1981, a meeting took place in Washington, D.C. between the California Board of Architectural Examiners (CBAE) and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB). The meeting was requested by Harry Hallenbeck, AIA, President of CCAIA, in an attempt to reconcile the growing differences between the two organizations concerning the National Examinations. R. Randall Vosbeck, FAIA, President of The American Institute of Architects, assisted in coordinating the meeting. The meeting was attended by representatives of National AIA, ASC/AIA, CBAE, CCAIA and NCARB.

The CBAE and NCARB have had a stormy relationship for the past 20 years, culminating in a recent disagreement over proposed revisions to the licensing examinations. The CBAE was on the verge of carrying out its proposal to develop a new California examination to accommodate new, more job related testing

CALENDAR

October 22-25 CCAIA's 36th Annual Convention, the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles. Contact: Cindy Trantham, CCAIA, (916) 488-9082.

October 15 to November 15 An exhibit of Masonry Buildings in California features the materials and methods used to fabricate granite, marble and sandstone buildings in California. Wednesday, Saturday and Sunday afternoons at the California Historical Society, 2090 Jackson Street, San Francisco. Phone: (415) 567-1848.

November 6-16 The International Passive and Hybrid Cooling Conference will be held in Miami Beach, FL. Write the Local Organizing Committee, P.O. Box 248203, University Station, Coral Gables, FL 33124, for further information.


November 24-28 The ASC/AIA Student Forum '81 offers workshops and seminars which enable students and professionals to discuss relevant issues facing the architectural profession today. Forum '81 will be held at the University of Southern California, School of Architecture, University Park, Los Angeles, CA 90007. Phone: (213) 743-2723.
techniques. In response, NCARB circulated a letter to California certificate holders suggesting that they could be expelled from NCARB should the new examination be adopted and the CBAE withdraw from NCARB.

In reviewing the results of its practice analysis, the CBAE found it difficult to perceive the current NCARB examinations as valid, and modified its budget to eliminate the money used to administer the NCARB examination normally scheduled for December 1981. Subsequently, on August 14th, the CBAE announced it would not give the professional examination in December. In an attempt to resolve this crisis in occupational licensing, the Washington meeting was arranged.

At the Washington meeting, agreements were reached and culminated in a "Memorandum of Understanding." Both the CBAE and NCARB agreed to dedicate themselves to preserve a national examination and to accept and implement the findings of the Resolution 5 Committee (R5C), a national practice analysis conducted by NCARB. The CBAE agreed to make its examination findings available to NCARB to be integrated into a new national examination. Burt Beall, Jr., FAIA, NCARB Western Regional Member from Utah, became a voting member of the Examination Coordinating Council, and Thomas Moon, AIA, was asked to represent California as a member of the NCARB Methodologies Committee. California, however, will continue the work of its consultants as a contingency.

The Memorandum of Understanding outlines the following examination schedule:

December 1981
Pretesting of new methodologies.

Spring 1982
Receive input from regional NCARB meetings.

June 1982
Additional pretesting of methodologies, if necessary, and/or possible incorporation of methodologies previously tested.

June 1982
The new examination will be presented to NCARB for approval at its annual meeting.

December 1982
Implementation of the new examination.

The CBAE and NCARB agreed that the new examination should address the following points:

1. Administration of a single examination with no distinction between qualifying and professional examination.
2. The examination will test for basic competence.
3. The graphic design examination will be comprised of both building and site design.
4. Time and speed will not be stressed; the examination will be a "power test."
5. The examination will be broken down into discrete areas to allow candidates to take failed sections. Sections will be small enough to assure no one could fail an important subject, but long enough to make cutting scores reliable.
6. A transitional plan will be drafted to accommodate the variety of candidates both within and outside the United States.
7. The test must protect public health, safety and welfare.
8. The test will be limited to the profession of architecture.
9. The concept of producing a single project for use in developing a total test was abandoned.
10. The R5C Report will be the basis for developing examination specification data.
11. A semiannual examination will be considered.
12. Special jurisdictional concerns—such as seismic, permafrost, etc.—will be included.
13. A procedure for advising failing candidates of areas of weakness will be developed.

The actions taken by NCARB in writing a new national examination will affect 54 states and jurisdictions. The new examination which is now being developed has the potential to increase a consistency of testing for competency, to increase freedom of mobility among the states, and to improve the status of architectural professionals across the nation.

—Tom Moon, AIA

Position Available

Architect. Passive solar design firm seeks architect with experience in passive/environmental design to do architectural design, project management and business development. Architectural license preferred. Send resume to: The Habitat Center, 2293 Olympic Blvd., Walnut Creek, California 94595.
Competitions offer architects a chance to unleash their imaginations on challenging design problems, and to win cash prizes and lucrative projects. Since 1870, The American Institute of Architects has issued guidelines to promote fair conduct in architectural competitions. This year, AIA published a Handbook of Architectural Design Competitions which offers architects criteria for determining when to enter a competition, explains "Everything architects do is a competition."

Maris Peika, AIA

Oh! What an exhilarating feeling when one begins work on an architectural competition. The challenge has been taken up and you know you will be the one with the solution that will influence the course of architectural history. During the process there are even higher points, and many lows as well—sleepless nights and the anxiety of getting it all together before the deadline. Ultimately there are many disappointed competitors and only one winner. And the course of architecture is rarely altered.

Competitions tend to create a team spirit in a group of professionals, a spirit that cannot be equaled by any other endeavor. There is an opportunity to let yourself go, without the constraints of cost and client. The time you put in is all yours, and the late nights are due to pure love of the struggle. The percentage of winners is small and the human energy expended is staggering. Since we as professionals collectively continue to compete, we obviously do it more for the benefits of the process than for the ultimate prize.

Of the professions, why are architects singled out to compete with design solutions in order to be selected by a client? I suppose it's because our profession is more subjective than others such as medicine or law. A doctor's reputation is developed by his past performance, and that performance is easily quantified—the patient either lived or died. The lawyer's reputation is developed on a similar line—the defendant was acquitted or jailed. While an architect also develops a reputation by past performance with buildings that stand, rather than fall, his efforts are not as easily quantified as those of other professions. You can't argue with death or jail, but, due to the subjective nature of our profession, you can find proponents and opponents for any building, regardless of its excellence.

Our product requires a process in the design of a building which entails developing drawings, models and renderings. The design can be perceived before the project is constructed—you can't preview your open heart surgery or your trial. Given the fact of life that architects can be judged before a spade is put into the ground, we always will be subject to rejection, the ultimate result of most competition entries. But a client who has retained an architect to design a building usually can terminate the agreement and hire another architect if he doesn't like what he is getting.

Everything architects do is a form of competing, be it in the simplest form of an interview or a full-blown competition carried out under the strictest rules of the AIA.

I recall a specific commission that our office, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, was pursuing. The project was the master
various types of competitions, provides tips on evaluating a jury, and gives advice on a wide range of subjects from forming design associations to the whys and hows of copyrighting and/or patenting submission materials. For a first-hand look at the world of competitions, Architecture California asked two California architects to recount their experiences entering, losing and winning design competitions.

"Benefits offset the cost of participating in design competitions."

Joseph Martinez, AIA

Architectural competitions always have occupied a special place in the mind of the architect. The process has permitted new firms to open their practices with a good commission, to receive public exposure, and to design projects they might not otherwise have undertaken. At the same time, the selection procedure, the composition of the jury, the professional expense, and, most important, the construction financing, are major considerations in deciding to enter a design competition.

Design competitions generally are acknowledged by both the architect and the client as a good method for the selection of a project design. Competitions provide the architect a free hand in design, and allow the client the opportunity to select from a number of schemes. A variety of underlying benefits offset the cost of participating in design competitions.

Martinez/Wong & Associates, Inc., which was established in October 1978, has entered six national or international competitions to date. Our record in winning/placing is not bad. In each submission we have learned something about our capabilities, our staff, the building type, meeting deadlines, developing technical documents, and providing presentation drawings.

In June 1980, we won the Design Charrette Competition for the Oceanside Restoration Master Plan—an 80 acre beachfront site for recreational purposes—sponsored by the California State Coastal Conservancy. Six teams participated in the four day competition, including Charles W. Moore, FAIA. Besides competing against a fine architect and scholar, we had the chance to talk with him at length about our firm. This discussion led to a joint venture with his firm for two Requests For Proposal for major work in Los Angeles.

The University of California at San Diego sponsored a turn-key developer competition in May 1980, for 200 units of Faculty/Student Housing. We mutually discussed the RFP with a few developers that we felt would be receptive to our design philosophy, and who had the ability to perform the work at a high level of construction. Our association with McMillin Development Corporation required us to supply the construction documents for bidding, and the presentation drawings and specifications for the University submittal. As a firm, we had not provided such services for a project of this magnitude before. For this effort, we received a direct hourly fixed fee, and negotiated a slightly higher percentage fee should we receive the first award and commission.

Based on the strength of our close finish—finalist and cash prize winner—we are now working again for McMillin on a National Turn-key Design Competi-
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plan for a state capitol. The selection of a firm was not made through a design competition, but rather through a Request For Proposal (RFP) process. Coming out in the second choice position left me unhappy, but in an analytical frame of mind, I quickly went through some mathematics and came up with some startling observations.

The RFP was a three-stage event in which about 100 firms responded. 25 were asked to elaborate further, and five were invited for an interview. All others involved went about the process with as much determination as we did (I estimated our costs for Phase I, II and III to be $2000, $4000 and $5000 respectively). The total spent by all competing firms came to $330,000. The total anticipated fee for the commission was around $200,000. I concluded that energy conservation within our profession is applicable to buildings, but not to people.

A number of years later, I was privileged to participate in a genuine competition—the selection of a developer and architect for the design of about 1 billion worth of construction on Bunker Hill in Los Angeles. Five teams competed and again the results left me analytical. The five teams spent different amounts in their endeavors—I estimate from $50,000 to $500,000. The total spent—let’s assume a million dollars—seems mind-boggling until one looks at the prize: a real estate developer’s opportunity that I will not attempt to describe, and an architect’s fee within a $50,000,000 range.

Whether competitions are a cost-effective way to secure business for your firm depends upon the potential project. Think about the two examples of a “non-competition” in which almost 200 percent of the potential fee was expended by the participants and a competition in which “only” two percent of the potential fee was expended by the competitors.

A nation based on the free enterprise system will continue to present its architects with a variety of processes by which to obtain work. Design competitions that are open to all are perhaps the best vehicles by which talented young firms can break away from the “pulling yourself up by the shoestrings” syndrome, and have an opportunity to do large projects. How many capable architects have been rejected for a commission because they have not done a similar project before? It is partly in respect to this opportunity for smaller firms that our office does not participate in most design competitions, and limits its involvement to very few, selected cases.

There are more losers than winners in competitions. Considering their usually large egos, architects will search for “faults in the stars” rather than in themselves when they lose a competition, and the process will continue to be faulted. But, assuming that competitors enter into the competition knowing the conditions of judgement and the consequent risks involved, I cannot argue that competitions are unfair. I think our firm’s solution to the Bunker Hill competition was the best, and I hasten to add that the other three “also-rans” felt the same way about their schemes.

I used two examples of my personal failure in competitions to provide some food for thoughts, but I don’t want to leave the wrong impression about my track record in winning competitions. Only yesterday I learned that I came out on top in a design competition for an office building in Glendale.

Receiving a commission through an interview process is, of course, rewarding. Ah! but to win a design competition is the closest thing to victory on a field of battle that our profession offers.
from page 9

with the ELS Design Group for the San Diego Convention Center. The opportunity to assist in the development of the initial proposal was invaluable. Preparing for and attending the final set of interviews and questioning sessions probably would not have occurred for our firm for another 10–15 years. One cannot place a price on this type of exposure.

We also submitted a scheme for the re-invested by the firm and by consultants. Case two relies heavily upon the design sensitivity of the jury for its selection. (The jury was not very sensitive to our submission for the Memorial.)

At the time of this writing, we are one of five finalists selected from a field of 70 submissions for the National Design Competition for the Rancho Bernardo Symphony on the Green, a two-stage competition. The RFP indicated to us that a strong consulting team would be cent National Design Competition for the Vietnam Memorial, Washington, D.C. In this type of competition, there are two basic design strategies: the first is to submit a strong competent solution, well developed and detailed; the second is to present a conceptual solution which exudes design genius. In the first case, a significant amount of time and dollars are necessary for Stage I. This included ar-

chitectural presentation drawings, concept philosophy statements, and a professional experience relevant to this building type. To secure this commission we retained Mitchell-Giurgola Architects as our design consultants, T. Y. Lin International for structural engineering, and Jaffe, Inc. for acoustics. Working closely with these internationally-prominent firms on the Stage I submission has been a pleasure.

When we started the competition in May, our workload was very light and Mitchell-Giurgola was deeply involved in the Steamboat Springs Competition in Colorado. We agreed that our firm would take the lead for the design and final requirements for the Stage I submission, and that they would act as design critics. This studio-type approach was exactly what we were interested in. For Stage II, which is a five-day design charrette at the site in Rancho Bernardo, California, the strategy will be to assist Romaldo Giurgola and T. Y. Lin as may be required.

The financing for these competitions always has come from our steady clientele. For us, this includes local, state and federal governments and selected private entities. Without a constant source of income, competitions for us probably would be an impossibility.
It is important to understand how to market your services, even though many people in our profession are afraid of the words “marketing” and “selling.” Marketing professional design services is selling the sizzle, not the steak. If you sell the sizzle, then you have the opportunity to sell the best meal you can create. What is selling the sizzle? It is having confidence in yourself, knowing your market and client, and knowing your competition.

Having confidence in yourself is basic to effective marketing. If you do not believe in yourself, you cannot expect the client to believe in you and to offer you the job. Before I say anymore about the importance of confidence in marketing your services, I want to tell you about my background, so you will know that you can start out with zero and end up designing on a national scale.

In 1963, a friend became the development manager of the Golden Gateway, which was building the Alcoa building in San Francisco. He needed someone to do tenant planning. I did not even know what tenant planning was, but I said I would try. I learned the interior planning jargon by reading some pamphlets that another firm had written. Then I made up some forms and started seeing people.

My next task was to decide what to charge for my services. I found out what everyone else was charging and I charged a higher rate. Arrogant? Maybe. But I was convinced that, if I did not position myself, I would never gain the respectability I wanted. I was prepared to fail, but on my terms, which were that I wanted to be treated like a professional. People value what they pay for; they do not value what they get for less than they should. If you have confidence in yourself and you believe you are good, you probably are. If you do not have faith in yourself, you probably will not be hired.

A second factor in selling the sizzle is knowing your market and your client. To market properly, you have to understand to whom you are marketing, and learn everything you can about that client. I read 52 publications a month and three newspapers a day because that is where information about my client is. If I am going to service our clients, then I need to know what they are doing and what they are thinking. Reading about them is the quickest way to obtain this information.

Most architects are lazy. They spend too much time reading architectural publications, too much time talking about design, and not enough time understanding the client and his needs. Learn the client’s language. If you are working with an institutional client, an entrepreneur, a developer, know their vocabulary. You must know the client’s business as well as you know your own.

I'm not busy, start looking at what you are selling, not how you are selling. Figure out who you are, then position yourself in the marketplace. Are you a specialist? Do you want to be known for designing office buildings? Churches? Educational buildings? Remodeling? Or do you want to be known as a generalist who can do all those things? It is very important to write a long-range business plan. It helps one focus on who and what you are, and where you want to be.

We are in a period of change in design and design philosophy. One did not go to Mies van der Rohe and request a little wooden bungalow or to Frank Lloyd Wright and ask for a pristine glass box. When you went to them, you got what they were designing. Today’s posture holds that the client should have an influence on his environment. Architects often downgrade the client and think we have all the answers. The problem with that kind of thinking is that the client is paying the bills. As designers we should remember that our clients are asking us to build a flexible environment. The idea that you design a room with a set furniture layout, an ashtray here and a flower there, is unrealistic. People do not live in spaces that way.

This posture, however, does not absolve the architect from
his responsibility as a competent professional. The successful design firms have the ability to lead—but not intimidate—towards goals that are higher than those the client would strive for alone. An example: Pacific Gas & Electric asked us to remodel their space, “to do a little open planning,” using existing furniture. They also asked us to replace the lenses on the light fixtures because they were so yellow. This was the entire job.

But when we tried to remove the lenses, the light fixtures fell apart. The ballasts were gone. We put in a new ceiling because we couldn’t afford the ambient light fixtures on the market. A job that initially was replacing lenses and putting screens around the furniture brought us more business in terms of special lighting and open planning projects.

Clients’ desires generally are lower than they should be. They are afraid to risk. Many of them want to see what you have done before. Oliver Wendell Holmes said, “Man’s mind, stretched to a new idea, never goes back to the original dimension.” An architect must learn to help the client stretch his mind and bring out the best in design that relates to that client.

You need to interrelate with your client and to establish trust. Several years ago I was vacationing in La Jolla. The man lying next to me on the beach leaned over and asked me if I was an architect. He told me he was trying to open a chain of pants stores. He was behind schedule and asked if I could loan him a draftsman. Later he called and asked if I could loan him a project manager who could organize his systems. I loaned him a project manager. Eventually he decided it was ineffective to have an in-house department and asked us to do the work. Today, that company is called The Gap. We have done over 500 stores for them nationwide and have billed several million dollars. Being able to establish trust can be very important to your future business.

You also need the skills of discovery; listen to what the client says. You need the skill of advocacy: how can you solve his problem? And you need the skill of support to relieve his fear of making a mistake. Ultimately, the client buys from the person he likes the best. That he likes you the best is key to your future marketing. We all live or die on the reference of our last client. Eighty percent of our business at Gensler and Associates is repeat and direct referral. Those clients that we had—5,000 in 15 years; we currently work with about 1,500—are our sales force. We do not have a marketing manager and we do not have any sales people. What we have are 5,000 sales people, our clients, marketing our firm.

Finally, to market successfully you must know your competition. We spend a lot of time analyzing our competition. Years ago I thought it would be an accomplishment to be the number one firm in the country in terms of size and billings. We have achieved that goal. Now my goal is to be known as one of the best design firms in the country. But how do you measure your competition in that area? Awards? Repeat work for the same client?

I used to be called a “kid huckster,” which everybody thought was insulting. I thought it was flattering. I was not afraid to be called a person who went out and got a job and worked on it. Now I am looking at the next kid huckster to learn what he is doing that we are not.

If you lose a commission, find out what you did wrong. Do not ask, “What did I do wrong?” You will not get an answer. Ask, “What factors influenced your final decision?” and you will receive a response that will help you market yourself better to the next client.

A great line says, “The harder I work, the luckier I get.” If you put your mind and energies behind marketing your talents and your firm, you will have more opportunities to realize your goals.
Design in a Creative Community

by Robert Marquis, FAIA and partners

How closely a line succeeds in achieving a unified architectural style and philosophy with five partners, three associates, and a staff of 27 young and talented assistants?

Can so many strong-willed (sometimes opinionated) individuals collectively arrive at a consistent architectural expression or style, leaving room for new ideas and change, without dogmatic edicts laid down by one principal? Is this elusive goal desirable?

We at Marquis Associates believe the goal is not only desirable, it's achievable.

A very successful northern California architect recently stated with pride that his office has no style; that each building is entirely different, reflecting the client's wishes and taste. Our firm deplores this "hired gun" approach to architecture. While no one can argue that the program, site and client are enormously influential in the final appearance of a project, we still believe that the final designs must evolve from the philosophic concerns and style of the architect (in our case, the firm).

We do not want to develop into a multi-style office, but we also are concerned that every project not bear the distinctive stamp of an individual principal-in-charge. A client who comes to an individual architect knows generally what to expect. We believe that a client who comes to our firm should have a certainty about the quality, style, approach and outcome of the project irrespective of which principal is in charge of the job.

This concern with achieving a unified style stems from three goals. 1) Major commissions come to design firms with a reputation for producing a consistently distinctive architecture. 2) Unless a clear and uniform approach to design is developed within the firm, the staff is confused, inefficient and frustrated; it tries to second-guess what is wanted and gets contradictory instructions from the principals. 3) Most important, we are interested in continuity so that the line of thinking and design that started 28 years ago can continue while growing through the infusion of fresh ideas.

Architectural firms generally fall into two categories: those led by a strong personality and large corporate firms. In firms whose design direction is established by one strong person or a few partners, the younger partners and associates learn to work in and carry on this idiom. I call this the après moi, le déluge approach. When the leading force retires or dies, this type of firm
usually falls apart or staggers ineffectually on as “successors to X.” Examples range from Louis Kahn and Frank Lloyd Wright to lesser, but fine, design firms.

The firm where design responsibility is parcelled out among many individuals, or passes from hand to hand, occasionally may produce distinguished architecture. But usually this turns out architecture without a central theme or trace of continuity. A portfolio of work by one of the country’s most prestigious firms, recently published in Progressive Architecture, showed a variety of handsome buildings that might as well have been designed by five totally separate and unrelated firms.

Developing a Design Philosophy

I started our office in 1953, and was joined by Claude Stoller, FAIA in 1956. Our office was run in the après moi manner, with the two principals totally responsible for the design direction. Seven years ago, our firm was reorganized. Claude Stoller left to establish his own practice, leaving Peter Winkelstein, FAIA and me as the senior partners. Three young partners—Phyllis Martin-Vecque, ASID, James E. Caldwell, Jr., AIA and Cathy Simon, AIA—as well as several associates were added during the period 1976–1978.

We made a considered decision that our firm would try collectively to develop a philosophy of design and a direction that did not depend on the whims and dictates of the senior partners. We wanted to develop a firm that could carry on a strong, consistent, design-oriented line of work with or without (hopefully for a while longer, with) the senior partners. In order to do this, we had to reach agreement on the principles and ideas that inform our work and, while doing so, allow room for new ideas and the modification of old ones. With five partners, this has not been an easy task.

We identified a number of issues that concerned us above and beyond the usual concerns of program, function and budget. Those issues include contextual design; historic continuity; circulation, energy conservation and structure as form determinants; and user involvement in design and planning. We also identified the desire to organize our office as a creative community. Our selection of these concerns was based upon our perceptions of the societal forces and needs to which architecture must respond. Frequently, only one or two of these concerns are addressed by architects. We feel we must try to deal with all of them, if our design response is to be valid and useful. Ideally, an energy-conserving building responsive to its community’s need also will be designed in its environmental context and, when appropriate, will have historic references and enrichments meaningful to its users.

Our concern with contextual design goes beyond adapting our buildings to a site’s light, views and contours. Buildings, particularly those in urban areas, do not exist in isolation. They must be incorporated into, and preserve the continuity of, surrounding buildings, streets, open spaces and sidewalks.
The materials, grain, mass and scale of a building should conform to and be sympathetic with those of the community. For example, the Design Professionals Insurance Company in Monterey, California, whose clients are architects, structural engineers and mechanical engineers, wanted a building that would celebrate these three professions. The new office building we are designing for them has all the structure (heavy timber) and the mechanical system clearly exposed on the inside (page 16), yet the exterior—with its metal roof, wood balconies and wood sunshades—makes reference to the early Monterey style buildings.

A sense of historic continuity connects a building to the past and to the future. Forms and concepts from the past still can contribute to a well-built environment, and we do not avoid an idea simply because it has been used before. Traditional forms can be adapted to serve future needs. The Primate Discovery Center at the San Francisco Zoo (cover) easily could have been designed with tent-like “animal park” enclosures. Instead, for this urban zoo we chose to draw on forms closer to the Conservatory in Golden Gate Park or the great steel and glass exhibit pavilions of Europe.

Similarly, the “gateway” in the center of the new Braun Music Center at Stanford University will serve as a link between the academic and residential portions of the campus (page 17). Its arch, columns and tile roof band are not an arbitrary or whimsical choice, but are based on the “old quad” design by H. H. Richardson in 1890.

A clear circulation network can make both the organization of a building and the spaces within intelligible, by locating the user in relation to the building. Corridors, walkways and courtyards can enrich the experience of the building and facilitate its use. The 350,000 square foot office complex now under construction for the California Department of Justice is organized like a town for its 2000 employees, with a main street, civic center, side streets, and courtyards.

This organization of streets and courts not only clarifies this large, complex structure, but gives form to the energy-conserving features of daylighting and night air-cooling (page 18). Energy conscious design can increase the control people have over their daily working and living environments. We seek passive solutions to develop energy-conservative architecture. The emergence of new design forms and the reemergence of principles of vernacular architecture provide exciting forms based upon energy conservation.

In designing a building, sensitivity and responsiveness to people’s needs are not enough. We encourage the community for which we are designing, both owner and user, to take an active role in making design decisions. As often as possible, we seek to involve the owner and user in the decision-making process. Their wealth of ideas and information enriches, rather than compromises, the designer’s creativity. In master planning St. Mary’s College High School, a Take-Part Workshop...
was organized to reach a consensus on priorities for the initial two buildings. Changing concerns in the intervening three years emerged in a later workshop and resulted in a revised master plan for the next building phase. (The workshop process is detailed in *Architectural Record*, June 1976.)

**Where Does the Buck Stop?**

Creating a unified, distinctive design style is an evolutionary process. While all of us at Marquis Associates agree on the design principles illustrated above, the relative importance of each is far from resolved. A spirited dialogue continues among the partners over the primacy of principles, as well as the introduction of newer ideas such as the use of imagery as an expression of subject matter.

For the past five years, we have held weekly “show and tell” meetings, where a project in progress is shown and discussed with the entire staff. Occasionally, we invite other architects whose work interests us to show us their projects. Currently the partners hold a weekly management meeting. We are, however, changing the management meeting schedule to once a month, so the partners can devote Monday mornings to discussion of design issues.

Each job done by our firm is subjected to periodic design review meetings at its inception, when the direction is set, and at frequent intervals during the design development and working drawings stage. These are attended by two principals, the project architect and, when appropriate, the entire team working on the project.

The question of who has final say in matters of design is frequently brought up, especially by staff members who seem to feel more comfortable in a more defined atmosphere than our present system provides. Rather than invest buck-stopping power in a senior principal, designer or project architect, we have decided to strive for consensus. The advantages in consensus are that ideas can come from anyone on the staff or on the team, regardless of rank, and that discussion (and even debate) cannot easily be cut off. The disadvantages are that consensus is a time-consuming process, and carries the inherent danger of compromise and dilution of ideas.

Problem-solving governed by these principles is one thing, but shaping spaces and cladding them is another. The basic problem is how not to water down design decisions with a cumbersome, populist structure. We have no certainty that a strong style of architecture can be forged from our collective working style, but so far the method appears to be working. We believe that, given our goals, this method is preferable to either one individual dictating the design or to a group of partners each doing his or her own thing.

*Robert B. Marquis, FAIA is the senior partner of Marquis Associates, Architecture, Planning, Interior Design, located in San Francisco, California. In the spirit of the philosophy of the firm, his four partners assisted in writing this article.*
ARCHITECTS POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

More than any other professionals, architects are trained to design and build an environment for the future. Politics is the process by which we, as a country, shape the future. Yet, how many architects become politically active?

ARC PAC is the California Architects Political Action Committee. Established in 1979, ARC PAC was formed to promote the improvement of government by encouraging architects to take a more active role in the political process, and to help us organize ourselves for more effective political action.

The purpose of ARC PAC is to solicit, receive, and distribute political contributions to help in the election of State Senators and Assembly Members who have demonstrated their interest in and commitment to advancing the goals of the architectural profession. Membership in ARC PAC is open to both AIA and non-AIA architects, and to students of architecture.

Why is ARC PAC necessary?

Every year, the California Legislature acts on over 3,000 pieces of legislation. Nearly ten percent—over 300 bills—either directly or indirectly influence the practice of architecture. Professional representation on licensing boards, tiered registration, handicapped access, historic preservation, energy, sunset laws, architects registration, professional liability—all these issues and more are decided by legislative votes. Those votes drastically affect both the climate in which we practice, and the quality of the environment we design.

Contributions made through ARC PAC can greatly increase the visibility and impact of architects as a profession. The distribution of contributions by ARC PAC demonstrates that we, as a group, actively are monitoring the actions of members of the Legislature as they affect the architectural profession. By combining the financial resources of all the architects in the state, ARC PAC's contributions have a greater impact for the profession than if the same amount of money were contributed by individual architects. ARC PAC enables architects to be a viable political force in California.

In the absence of public election financing, it is an economic fact of life that candidates must have money to win elections. Political Action Committees are growing in popularity, especially with business organizations. PACs provide needed coverage for effectively competing in the political arena.

ARC PAC does not “buy votes,” but it has a considerable impact on making office holders accessible to architects and our legislative advocates. Campaign contributors are friends and allies whose views are heard.

ARC PAC can reach and influence office holders from areas not heavily populated by architects. A key legislator may be from a district where few architects reside. ARC PAC provides access to those individuals.

ARC PAC is administered by a group of seven Executive Trustees, all architects, who are elected by the contributors. Their decisions about who receives financial support are based on careful study of candidates' positions and voting records on issues related to architects' concerns, face-to-face meetings with legislators, and input from legislative consultants and advocates.

As an individual, you are allowed a maximum federal income tax credit on one-half of your contribution to ARC PAC, up to a credit of $50 ($100 per joint tax return), if not already taken. Individual contributions are deductible up to $100 ($200 on a joint return) on a state income tax return, if not already taken. Corporate contributions are not tax deductible.

Together We Make a Difference

As more and more architects recognize the need for architects as professionals to be actively involved in political affairs, they are becoming aware of the positive role political action committees can play in influencing legislative activity.

ARC PAC is designed to make your participation in the political process a little easier and a lot more effective. ARC PAC is based on a simple political principle: by joining together, we can make a greater impact.

Join us by returning the form below, with your check made out to ARC PAC. You will receive an acknowledgement of your contribution for tax purposes. You also will receive regular legislative updates and selected publications on the political process.

Enclosed is my personal check in the amount of

☐ $25
☐ $50
☐ $75
☐ $99*
☐ $100
☐ $250
☐ $500

Name

Address

Employer

Occupation

* California law requires the above information for all donations totaling $100 or more. Anonymous donations may be only for amounts under $100.

Mail this form and your check to: ARC PAC
1414 K Street, Suite 320
Sacramento, CA 95814
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Joint Venture in Beijing

by Roger Hong, AIA

In July, 1980, the Qiong Hua International Tourist Corporation, one of several travel bureaus operated by the Chinese government, interviewed a number of internationally-recognized corporate architectural firms to design a 1000-room tourist hotel. The firms of Warnecke/Dolinsky were selected to be in joint venture with the Beijing Institute of Architectural Design, a 2500-member government-operated architectural department. Thus began the first professional joint venture between American architects and those of The People’s Republic of China.

Working in charrette for two and one-half months, an international collaboration produced design scope documents encompassing preliminary structural, mechanical and electrical drawings, in metric, written in both Chinese and English. The effort included the simultaneous production of bilingual presentation boards, printing of brochures, and construction of a large scale model of the building and its site development. The project culminated in a formal presentation by the American and Chinese design team before multiple government authorities in Beijing last November.

The 1000-room Metropolitan Hotel was designed as a contemporary Western hotel to meet the need created by expanded international tourism in China. Larger than any recent construction in China, the 80-meter high structure contributes to the new urban scale of development surrounding Beijing. The hotel symbolizes a gateway to the city of Beijing when approaching from the airport, and eventually will link with other planned highrise hotels to form a new “city wall.” The physical scale and scope of the functional program represent a conscious act of will by China’s government to project an image of technological accomplishment as well as social and political openness in communicating with the West.

The Political Climate

When the joint venture began, the political climate in The People’s Republic seemed to favor such a development and predicated a very short timeframe for completion of the design phase of the work. The timeframe, plus the Western standards of quality sought for the hotel, caused the Chinese government’s tourist corporation to seek design and project management expertise beyond that domestically available. This decision, overlayed by the nationalistic ego needs of a developing country, became a sensitive political issue.

Several large hotel projects were pending government approval for construction in China at the time, but these all were designed and developed by outsiders. Unlike these hotel proposals, our project was being financed by the Bank of China. National pride demanded that a grassroots project of equivalent magnitude and scope precede approval of these other projects. (A close parallel situation was found in the fact that the Chinese government delayed approval for an American air-

Roger Hong, AIA and John Carl Warnecke, FAIA confer with the construction team on the job site in Beijing.
line's nonstop flight to Beijing until a government-owned airline first had landed in San Francisco.) The professional joint venture proposed by the government tourist corporation attempted to address the need for a grassroots project.

**Bridging the Culture Gap**

Ten select architects and engineers representing the Beijing Institute of Architectural Design traveled through the United States to research Western hotel design. A separate studio space established for the joint venture project within the Los Angeles office of Warnecke/Dolinsky provided space for seven Chinese architects, only one of whom spoke fluent English. Two Chinese engineers found temporary space at the office of our structural consultant, Martin & Huang International.

To overcome the language barrier, several of our staff workers who speak and write Mandarin, the prevailing dialect of our visiting colleagues, were assigned to the project. Since I was Director of Design for the Los Angeles and San Francisco offices of John Carl Warnecke & Associates at the time, I was chosen to lead the architectural design team in the United States. As a third-generation, American-born Chinese, I possess a limited understanding of the Cantonese dialect and none of Mandarin. We had to rely upon and develop a dialogue within the "language of architecture;"

One of the conditions of our firm being selected as joint venture partner was that we accept our Chinese colleagues' preconceived notion that the hotel tower be highrise. Our Chinese colleagues were adamant that the hotel tower form "break out of the box," and had explored several alternatives: clustered triangles, a cross and finally a serpentine slab form. An S-shaped tower footprint in plan had received conceptual approval in a preliminary review by governing authorities.

After considerable study, I employed a geometric planning module in the form of an equilateral triangle with sides of nine meters in length. This triangular module formed the basis for the required S-shaped tower and allowed the orderly planning of public areas at its base. Public rooms and amenities in the form of an atrium, tea lounge and Chinese Garden were arrayed along the culturally-preferred south orientation, facing the international embassies across the Bright Horse River.

This module also allowed an immediate visual grasp of scale that helped overcome the incremental change to square meters from square feet. Besides the integration of required structural and mechanical technologies, the American design team made its greatest contribution in reshaping the program of the public support spaces and their functional organization.

**Within the Language of Architecture**

Ideas in architecture are published worldwide. The well-worn pages of *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* inhabit the archives of the Beijing Institute of Architectural Design. The propositions of post-modernism are familiar to our Chinese colleagues, but the freedom to pursue these concepts in practice is proscribed by the level of acceptance and approval by government officials. I believe one of the underlying reasons the Chinese tourist corporation retained outside consultants was the conjecture that Western expertise would command more clout and expedite acceptance of progressive design features.

The major cultural differences are most evident in comparing the practice of architecture within private enterprise to that within the confines of a government bureauacry. American corporate architectural practice operates with a distinct division of responsibilities residing with key individuals. Characteristically a principal-in-charge, a project manager, and a project designer are assigned, and the corporate organization protects and preserves the prerogatives of each role to be played. The cumulative decisions of these key individuals allow a project to proceed expeditiously under increasing time constraints. By contrast, our Chinese colleagues observed that architects practicing within a governmental entity such as their own operate on a consensus. Often the strength of concepts is diluted and diffused for the sake of political expediency.

**Within the Palace**

In November, 1980, the American consultant group composed of architects, structural, mechanical and electrical engineers, and our cost estimating consultant, journeyed to Hong Kong and then to Beijing. Our Chinese colleagues and the Qiong Hua International Tourist Corporation were impeccable hosts. Every courtesy and consideration was extended to our group. Both our cultural and our culinary appetites were sated with sincerity and generosity. Between our numerous formal meetings, our hosts exposed us to fragments of history—the Imperial Palace, Temple of Heaven, the Ming Tombs, and the ethereal landscape and pavilions of the Summer Palace. The Beijing Institute of Architectural Design hosted a banquet at the legendary Winter Palace, replicating the menu served to the dowager Empress on her birthday. We reciprocated their kindness with a banquet centered upon an elaborate version of fondue prepared in a Chinese firepot.

One of the genuine pleasures was the sense of accomplishment and fulfillment shared with a fraternity of professionals from far across the sea. I derived a great personal pleasure from knowing I had in some way closed a circle in the chain of history initiated by ancestors I never knew.

A formal presentation was given before 250 persons representing innumerable government agencies. I was humbled by the impact this single project might have upon China's image.
and the employment to be generated for over 300 youths who were training to staff the hotel.

Several days of smaller meetings followed in which every concern regarding the hotel, whether technological or political, was voiced. We were asked to respond to design modifications within a very short timeframe, and a charrette ensued. I could not help but feel that the concerns expressed were minor details compared to the significance this project represented to both East and West. A kitchen was enlarged, a rooftop restaurant was lowered in height to appear less extravagant, and additional parking was provided. In the United States, detailed concerns usually are refined during design development and working drawing phases, not while schematic design approvals are being sought. This was our first indication that all was not right within the palace.

Our joint venture colleagues, the Beijing Institute of Architectural Design, insisted that they would make the necessary refinements in Beijing for resubmittal to the authorities, since time was of the essence in a volatile political climate. The American consultant team returned to the United States to await that submittal and approval.

In subsequent months, a series of inexplicable cables were received from the general manager of the tourist corporation explaining that the project was in jeopardy and had not been approved due to controversial design features such as the revolving rooftop restaurant. No communication was forthcoming or permitted with our Chinese colleagues. The drawings that were to be modified by the Beijing Institute of Architectural Design were never made available for our review. Despite the fact that we had completed our scope of services, the client contended that failure of the project to receive government approval gave them the avenue to renegotiate our fees. The last of our remaining Chinese colleagues was recalled to Beijing, and many months ensued before an equitable settlement was negotiated.

As recent history has unfolded, China's open door to the West was closing to industry and trade, as well as to the exchange of technical services. A shift in China's national priorities has caused this developing world power to look inward again toward social and economic reform.

One of the pervasive and paradoxical features of doing work with China is that there is only one client: the government. Like the Hydra, this entity has many heads with each pursuing its own priorities. Satisfying the tourist corporation and the government architects did not insure that the project would be approved. Students of the China scene conjectured that our client, the Chinese government tourist corporation, came under heavy criticism from other government entities for seeking and retaining Western consultants which may have been interpreted as a “loss of face” for their architects' technical abilities.

Will the joint venture plan for the hotel ever be realized? Many rumors abound, but informed sources reveal that construction will begin this month on the Beijing Metropolitan Hotel. I look forward to someday traveling to China to appraise whether “the language of architecture” has transcended the travails of a developing nation and its politics.

Roger Hong, AIA is a partner in the firm of Archaederra/Hong/Treiman, Architects & Planners in Santa Monica, California.
The distinctive design elements in your buildings bear the stamp of a strong artistic personality. Do you insist upon complete artistic control of a project?

No. Unrestrained architects are clearly dangerous. Look at Brasilia. There the designers had total control and the result is a sterile competence.

We recently completed a demonstration house in Japan. At first I wasn’t that excited about the project because it was so remote. There seemed to be little possibility that the house would get built as designed. So I insisted on complete artistic control. I thought they would shove that down my throat, but their attitude was, “Of course you have complete artistic control—why do you think we hired you?” I get good clients, but that’s a little more faith than I’m used to working with.

Complete control leads to an unhealthy self-indulgence. I come from the old school. My concern is solving the problem, not creating some personal vision. Unless I have a problem, I don’t even know where to start. Finding and articulating the problem is the whole search and mystery and excitement.

How do you identify the problems?

We interview our clients very intensely. For our residential and commercial work, we use a programming score, which is
an idea I took from the dancer Anna Halprin and some architects. We score, in a musical sense, the client's lifestyle. We use a 14-page questionnaire; we also use magazine pictures like inkblots. The reason we have not had any disasters with something as complex and personal as a single family house is that we're so careful at the programming stage. Before we ever draw a line, we understand exactly how the clients live, what their prejudices are, and what they like.

Each one of our houses is different, and they're all houses I never would have done for myself. Not even close. Because they're responsive to the client's very particular problems and dreams. We always try to give our clients what they really want, which sometimes isn't what they ask for.

How do you convince them of the difference?

We don't try to convince them of anything. We try to analyze what they want and hand it back to them in a bare and logical form so they can make an intelligent decision. We see ourselves as a conduit or translator. One of the arts in architecture is knowing when the client is telling the truth. Sometimes when you do three-dimensionally articulate a client's request, it isn't successful, because he's talking at a superficial level. It's our job to get inside, beyond the superficial, to the more fundamental aspects of design which he will find satisfying.

No matter how many beautiful buildings you design, there's still a hamburger stand and telephone poles next to them, and a moneylender who only cares about the bottom line. As long as architects think of these as negative things, their impact will be largely irrelevant. Instead, we can choose to interpret these things as positive elements, and incorporate them into our designs.

Our clients tend to be happy, no matter how strange the building may seem to others, because it's a solution to their requirements. Our experimental ideas come out of this problem solving. They're not preconceived. We don't come in with a direction or idea that we want to exploit in a particular house.

Recently your work has received a great deal of media attention. What impact does the media have on the way people perceive architecture?

The media sanitizes living environments. When you see a picture of a building in a magazine, it's arranged. Deceit has to take place on some level in order to make the dimensional transition from a three dimensional building to a two dimensional photograph.

The unfortunate byproduct is that the public gets the idea that people actually live in those highly-refined, noncluttered environments. But the natural process of living is, of course, one of clutter and mess. Many of the best pieces of architecture have carefully orchestrated media images which hide the conflict between the natural lifestyles and the theoretical architecture. People simply don't live like architects wish they did. It's like putting on a coat that doesn't fit — no matter how well it's designed, it still looks bad.

One of my focuses as a designer is to address that fit
The sun is a dynamic tool to light and change the environment. Our buildings are totally different spaces during different parts of the day and seasons. We allow the light to be the kinetic quality, rather than trying to make the building move, which is usually too expensive.

One exception is the Greenstein house where we put a large damper—a moveable piece of plastic—in the throat of a belvedere. The damper is justified for energy reasons, but its primary purpose is to allow the space to change kinetically. It is a psychological tool to change the ambience of the space in a very small house.

between the idealistic magazine design and the way people actually live. I hope to get to the point where a photographer from a magazine could just walk into one of our projects unannounced, snap a photo, and that photo would be beautiful, would show a harmony between the architecture and the lifestyle.

You speak of using “organized chaos” in your designs. What does that mean?

My favorite definition of architecture: an architect is one who organizes chaos and intoxicates reason. If it’s absolutely ordered, architecture is boring—there’s no mystery, no way to make it valuable to your life, because there are no interpretations. It’s just a piece of construction. On the other hand, if architecture is too esoteric and there is no perceptible order, it’s upsetting, frustrating and incomprehensible.

We use the concept of organized chaos in an attempt to make our design presence strong, but minimal. Organized chaos is simply a tool for designing. Highly organized elements are made important and other elements are allowed to degenerate into their natural state, with no attempt to control them at all. The real people and their real lifestyles are allowed to take place in an unartistic way.

Organized chaos is an architecture of juxtapositions. In our office, for example, we have a linear idea, a walkway of tile, that is kept pristine. Everything else is allowed to degenerate into its natural pattern. It’s an attempt to make legitimate the architect as slob.

Are your designs intended as a comment on society?

So much of architecture is in the interface between esoteric theory and practical service. Just serving society or just intellectually commenting on society is not enough. Anybody can design provocative buildings in their closet. But when they are built, what happens? It’s this interface between academic theory and the way people really live that fascinates me.

Architects are interpreters. I intentionally try to use less jargon than my contemporaries because it’s a largely unnecessary code that lay people don’t understand. Architects should be clarifying, not confusing the issues.

But professionals love jargon because it creates a mystique.

I prefer the mystery to be in the building, not in the jargon. If our final built object does not have an intrinsic mystique, then we’ve failed.

You speak of the choreographic quality of architecture. How do you make a concrete structure dance?

Ballet and dance are a primary influence on my work. All the arts use similar vocabulary, similar ideas. In architecture, the stage set or the physical product is static and the people are
kinetic, moving through that static space. That's how the choreography takes place.

I hope my architecture responds to a kinetic viewpoint. My buildings are extremely hard to photograph and very unsuccessfully photographed. People who experience the buildings are often surprised at the spatial continuity and complexity. I think that's because of the awareness of choreography.

You are among the architects who pioneered passive design in this state. What sparked that early interest?

The choreographic quality that we were discussing comes from two sources. One is the user as a kinetic participant. The other is the sun. I must confess my interest in solar energy and energy efficiency has never been primarily to save BTU's. To me, the whole intrigue, the whole fascination with energy conservation, is that it's a chance for people to rebuild a sensual rapport with their environment. Buildings have gender, they have personality quirks, they are sexual. The more animalistic a building or a design is, the more successful it is. If it doesn't have that animal quality, it's lifeless—regardless of architectural style.

There's a tendency to encapsulate people from the environment, to desensitize the individual. Windows don't open in the office. You can't control the lights or feel the breezes. That whole movement is so inhuman.

Energy conservation is the key for me as an architect to allow people to feel those things again. I can tell my client I would love to do a building with windows that can't open, because it's the latest thing. But I'm forced to make the windows open, because the cooling loads are too high.

What influences other than dance have affected your work?

My father is a civil engineer, so I was exposed to the architectural profession at an early age, although usually in a negative context. As a child, I learned from engineers and developers that all architects are misguided egoists, doing irrelevant things that upset the logical building processes—all they did was make things more expensive and weird. That explains my paranoia of being an architect who doesn't solve problems.

Another significant influence was being in the Peace Corps in Chile. For two years, I was able to completely disassociate myself from the academic world of architecture: didn't read any periodicals, missed all the trends, didn't talk to any architects. It was cleansing.

I was doing architecture, but on a menial level in a remote

In the Johnson Residence, I was inspired by the Anasazi Indian cliff dwellings, particularly the way they dealt with voids and solids against a wall. A wall became an appropriate organizational tool for organizing a vast interior space in this residence, which is built around and over an existing 1920s pool and grotto. A 6 foot high by 50 foot long glazed south facing truss provides direct passive gain in this house. The pool and dark-colored, heat-absorbing masonry interior walls act as thermal heat storage and moderate the inside temperature. There are few windows on the north, west and east sides to minimize heat gain. A vacuum tube active solar system provides pool, domestic hot water and space heating.
area trying to make little shacks stand up, building houses for lower middle class people. My office was in a construction shack on a 500 house jobsite at the edge of the Atacama desert.

From that vantage point, I gradually became aware of two things. In American architecture, for the most part, there is no quality of joy. Architects take themselves so deadly seriously that their tenseness is translated into the building, becomes the essence of the building. And people feel that. This sort of professional pessimism under the sad guise of "social responsibility" is transferred to a public who has to live with it daily.

Your buildings seem to contain some humorous elements. Do you use humor to create feeling or joy?

We sometimes use humor as a tool to create and problem solve, but only as a means to the end. When a building lacks a fundamental sense of joy and optimism, the architect has lost something, and society has lost something. Our clients and critics comment on the buoyancy, the spirituality that exists in our work. Like environmental responsiveness, joyfulness or lightheartedness in architecture has a long historical tradition that recently has been neglected.

The other thing that became very apparent when I was isolated in Chile is that American architects are not dealing honestly with the American culture. In fact, they seem to be running away, outwardly ashamed of the decadent, consumer society that we have created in this country.

Can architects change society by changing the structures that shelter it?

Architects in the modern movement thought they could restructure society by restructuring buildings, which proved untrue. It is true that people, even if they're nonvisual, are impacted by their environment. But architects only impact a small part of the whole equation. And it's important to realize where our place is, that we're not going to turn society on its head with our buildings. Architects can have influence, but we're most effective working within the system.

When we do our buildings, we never talk about aesthetics and art, even though that's a primary goal. It's not important to our clients on a level they understand. It's only important on some level deep inside them.

Being in Chile the year before and the year after the election of Salvador Allende really redefined architecture in my mind to its proper place. It isn't the most important thing in people's lives. We had friends who were shot by right-wing firing squads. How important is their house?

I am obsessed with the coming earthquakes, and actually build simulated or stylized earthquake damage into many of our buildings. History has proven that engineering alone will not safeguard buildings from major quake damage. It is up to us to take the next appropriate step. While being a mystical offering to the earthquake gods in one sense, the "damage" is used as a design tool to articulate masses or accentuate aesthetic transitions. In the Pacifica Condominiums, for example, arrested fault damage is used to define the front entry mass (see arrow).
What lessons can an architect learn from working in more primitive situations?

In Chile we weren't concerned with exotic detailing and fine materials, we were just trying to put a roof over somebody's head. Those kinds of gut issues definitely influence my work. Unless the budget is very large, I try to use the simple, unsophisticated and cheap "tract house detailing vocabulary." Again—working from within the system. I do, however, sometimes find myself selling out and becoming interested in some aspect that is of no interest except to other architects. Keeping perspective is difficult.

You refer to yourself as a guerrilla architect. What does that mean?

Well, it seemed like a flashy media word that might get me an interview in some magazine. Seriously, I mean that I'll steal from another architect, wallow in the decadent consumer society or use modern movement methods if they work, if they solve the problem for the client. I'm particularly concerned with regionalism as an appropriate means to the solution. We look first at what's in the back yard, as opposed to the latest international magazine. I want to be part of an architecture that is obviously southern Californian, that would be inappropriate in New York or Rome. If you're sensitive to the local lifestyle, history and microclimate, how can the same building work anywhere else?

I'm a guerrilla only in the sense that I don't feel confined to a particular dogma, a rigid viewpoint. I don't feel I have to defend any kind of integrity to a theoretical stance that can't be changed. I don't feel an allegiance to be totally coherent. I feel free to use any kind of approach that will work. The end justifies the means.

How does an architect respond when you steal an idea?

I hope she's flattered. I know when people steal our ideas, we're flattered. I don't believe in originality—it's a self-indulgent dead end. Architects who spend their time worrying about and trying to develop original thoughts are wasting their time, as far as I'm concerned. I'm just trying to make my clients happy.

You seem to pursue your populist ideas in a rather elitist manner.

Elitism isn't an entirely negative word to me. You have to believe in yourself, in your ability to transform your client's problem into three dimensions and to elevate your client's desires beyond the pedestrian. You have to have the religious fervor of thinking, "I'm right." But that can be done in a positive way: fervent, equally intense, but not coming from a dogmatic, exclusive attitude.
Tools for Energy Efficient Design
New Nonresidential Passive Solar and Energy Conservation Design Standards

by John R. Schade

Design professionals actively practicing in the area of energy-efficient buildings generally concur that cost-effective measures to increase building energy-efficiency—while maintaining comfort and sustaining or improving levels of environmental quality—often are overlooked or excluded in the design and construction of new buildings. There are many reasons why this occurs, including lack of knowledge of specific measures, lack of information regarding the technical and economic performance of measures, lack of design tools for evaluating building design performance, lack of time and financial resources to adequately consider energy-efficient alternatives during the design phase, construction cost impact of the measures and, in some cases, a simple lack of interest on the part of the building designers and owners in taking advantage of economical energy conservation opportunities. Taken as a whole, these reasons provide a convincing argument that the potential for economical, energy-efficient buildings is not being realized by the market structure within the building industry.

The Warren-Alquist Act and SB 1746 require the California Energy Commission to develop new energy performance standards for the design of nonresidential and governmental buildings. These standards must include cost-effective passive solar and conservation measures. However, historical events in the area of building energy standards development, and in the area of energy-efficient building design, show that standards, by themselves, do not result in more energy-efficient buildings.

In addition to carefully developed building energy budgets, equal or greater consideration must be committed to professional education and development, and to a broad, balanced implementation program which addresses affected sectors of the building industry. A cooperative industry/government approach involving reasonable input from each sector is required. The goal, after all, is a common one: better, more energy-efficient buildings for the private and public sectors, available at reasonable market costs. The California Nonresidential Standards Program is designed on the premise that this goal is shared by the Commission and the design/construction industry.

The Nonresidential Standards Program was developed jointly by the California Energy Commission and representatives of the California building industry. It represents a balanced approach which includes three major elements: 1) energy design/compliance tools development; 2) a set of energy budget numbers for each of 22 nonresidential building types in 16 California climates; and 3) an industry-based implementation program.

Program Objectives

The program is designed to meet the primary goal of closing the gap between current general practice and economical, energy-efficient buildings through a combined package of energy budgets, professional education/implementation and a corresponding incentives program.

Design Energy Performance Standards or energy budgets will be developed for 22 nonresidential building types in 16 climate zones. The design and analysis work will be done by practicing architects and engineers working with Commission staff. A number of design alternatives will be developed for each building type. These will include descriptions of alternative building envelopes and mechanical components designed to meet varying site and climatic conditions.

The process of developing budget standards will be concurrent with the development of corresponding design tools and compliance methods which relate directly to California climates, building practice and costs. Simplified tools which can be used at early stages in the design process to check energy performance and to verify compliance also will be included.
Several simplified methods are being considered for design and compliance tools in the case of smaller (less than 50,000 square foot) buildings. One example of such a tool is a computerized version of Energy Graphics, upgraded to include mechanical system operation, multiple zone operating conditions, and thermal mass interaction and daylighting. The program “Wonder II” provides both graphic and quantitative output to evaluate energy and economic performance of design alternatives. The simplified tool selected for design compliance will be checked during the standards development process with DOE 2.1 to verify that it provides an acceptable range of accuracy for all building types and climate zones.

Twenty-two design manuals will be provided, one for each building type. These will document the energy design process — including base case building characteristics, energy programs, energy budgets, an example building design plus two major alternative design component modifications for climate variations, fuel types and solar access — and illustrate how the budget can be met under the various conditions. The Manuals also will explain an energy design process which can be used to reach the prescribed budget, and will illustrate the use and application of the selected simplified method for design and standards compliance.

A series of educational conferences focusing on the development of the standards will follow the steps of the conventional design process: Preprogramming and Design/Energy Assumptions; Energy Programming; Schematic Design/Parametric Evaluation of Measures; Design Development/Incremental Economic Analysis for Setting Energy Budgets; Design Development/Major Example Designs; and Design Development/Design Alternatives.

Each conference will be held in a major California metropolitan area.

Research Method

Research methodology for development of the standards is patterned closely after the architectural and engineering design process in which all promising conservation measures are evaluated independently and interactively, for both energy and economic impacts. Through a process of interaction, the most economical solution is determined. In this case, the most economic solution is represented by the lowest point on a life cycle energy budget curve. That point then becomes the selected energy budget level. The major steps of the research methodology are outlined below.

1. Twenty-two actual California Title 24 buildings with existing plans, specifications, and costs will be selected and evaluated in terms of energy performance and construction costs. Base case energy budgets will be generated using both DOE 2.1 and the selected simplified method.

2. From an extensive master list of solar and conservation measures, a final list of 20 measures for each building type in three representative climate zones will be determined. Each of these measures will be optimally sized by comparing energy performance with life cycle costs for a series of measure sizes (Figure 1). The lowest point in the life cycle cost curve will represent the optimum size of each particular measure.

3. After the measures are sized, they will be evaluated and ranked in terms of life cycle cost/energy savings benefit ratios. The evaluation will be considered independently for each measure and interactively where two or more measures are interrelated. Parametric evaluation will be conducted using the selected simplified method with periodic checks using DOE 2.1 to establish accuracy ranges between the two evaluation/compliance tools.

4. Using the rank order matrix of measures established in step 2, a life cycle cost vs. energy budget curve will be generated by incrementally adding measures in the order of their cost effectiveness ranking to the base case building (Figure 2). The lowest point on the life cycle curve will become the energy budget design standard.

5. At least two major building designs will be completed for each building type in each of the 16 climate zones to demonstrate and prove that the proposed budget can be met in a cost-effective manner when compared to current California Title 24 base case buildings (Figure 3). Minor alternative designs also will be completed to demonstrate that the budget can be met under varying conditions of climate, fuel availability and solar access.

6. The entire design process used to rank various solar, load management, and conservation measures for each building type, to develop energy programs, to conduct parametric analysis, to rank competing measures for various building types and climate zones, to develop energy-efficient designs and to assure their compliance with energy budget standards, will be presented in the form of a professional energy design manual for each building type.

The end result of this cooperative standards development process is a set of meaningful energy design performance budgets, accompanied by a simplified design/compliance method and a series of building specific design manuals, developed in an educational conference format by the design community throughout the State of California. If positive criticism and input by the building design and construction industry continues as it has during the planning and development stages of this project, the outcome will be a set of tools and a process, guided by a set of standards, which improve the energy performance of California non-residential buildings.

John R. Schade, an energy consultant and an AIA Associate, is the Technical Program Director, Building and Appliance Standards Office, California Energy Commission, and former Director of the Energy and Buildings Research Institute, University of Washington.
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