Rowlett Distinguished Firm Lecture Series - 2004

RTKL

In Pursuit of Great Projects

12:45 pm, February 6, 2004

Presidential Conference Center

Texas A&M University

CRS Center

College of Architecture

Texas A&M University

Introductions by

Bob Johnson, D. Arch., AIA

Director, CRS Center

Texas A&M University

Bob Johnson: Thanks for coming out today. It is a great day for a conference. My name is Bob Johnson, I am director of the CRS Center here at Texas A&M University. I guess I should start out with "Howdy."

Audience: "Howdy"

Bob Johnson: Nice to see you here. I would like to thank a few people for helping out with the conference: The Texas Society of Architects, for providing funding for the conference, of course and the founders of CRS and Mrs. Virginia Rowlett who had the great foresight to create the endowment that created the funds for this conference. The staff of the CRS Center, Jana Gober, and Eberhard Laepple. There's Jana in the back. Wave you hand. Jana, thank you. Eberhard. Thank you very much. A round of applause. And the staff from the College that are helping out. I don't think all of them are here, but I see Trish in the back and Dolores, Kathy Waskom, who came here despite the fact that she was sick. And I asked her why she was here and she said, "Bob, I'm not gonna miss Rowlett Lecture. John Peters the photographer. You'll see him walking around. Sylvia Martinez and Bobbie Smith, they are the staff from the College that will be helping out. A round of applause for them. And student helpers from AIAS, Briton Bostiche, I don't know if

Leslie Smith is here. Matt Gomez and Evan Putnum. Briton and Matt can you stand up in the back? Thank you for helping out. Putting on one of these things takes a lot of help. A lot of people. And we really appreciate all of the support. From all these great people that are helping us. Before we start, it has been our tradition to announce the Jonathan King Student Research Award. The actual award will be made at the College Award Ceremony in office. The selection for this award is actually made from a sub-committee of the CRS Center Board of Directors. The award is named for Jonathan King who is a person of many talents who thought had no formal training as an architect, he became a professor of architecture and a member of the profession. An HAIA member. During his career, he had two life long interests – students and research and the Jonathan King Memorial Student Research Endowment is a fitting celebration of these two interests. This year the award will be presented to Divyam Shah who is pursuing a Master's Degree in Construction Science. Divyam will you please stand.

Audience: applause

Bob Johnson: and Eberhard Laepple was last year's award winner. Eberhard would you please stand. Thank you both very much. And also, this year, we're going to do something a little bit different. We're going to ask the students to fill out evaluation forms. These are in you little booklets. The yellow one is for the first session before the break. The green one is for the second session after the break, and so as were going through this, you might want to pull those out and before the break we're going to ask you to hand them to our AIAS student helpers. Next, I'd like to introduce Tom Regan.

Tom Regan: Thank you. I'm Tom Regan. Its a pleasure to be the Dean of the College of Architecture here at Texas A&M. For many, many years, we've been blessed at Texas A&M with the John Rowlett Lectures. These lectures are made possible by the generosity of Mr. Rowlett and the possibilities have been developed over the years by the Director of the CRS Center and most recently, in most recent years, by Bob Johnson and I want to thank him for the good work that he does. Plus appreciate John Rowlett. How many days do you remember in your professional life? I'll tell you, all of us who studied architecture certainly remember one day. And that's the first day you had a studio. Doesn't matter if you were 18 or 28. Doesn't matter if it was undergraduate or graduate. Doesn't matter if it was in Texas or anywhere else in the world. There's a certain phenomenon about the first day of studio because you're not sure of yourself and you're immersed for the first time in this wonderful world of design. If we had a chance to go around the room, all of us, even old guys like me would be able to tell you exactly what the first project was and how we responded to it. There's a second day that you probably remember. Those of us who have been out for a while anyway and that's your first day in an office. The first day you go to work. First thing that you do in an architect's office. Prepared or unprepared. Large things or small, you generally don't forget your first day. But there is one day that most of us that are my age and even much younger do not have the opportunity to remember and that's the time while we're in school that they could come and sit and listen to the leaders of the largest firms in the world. Some of the best firms in the world. Tell us and answer questions about what is the nature of the firm. How does it work. In my own day, to meet the principal was plenty. You very seldom even did that. Not for a long period of time. The Rowlett Lectures, over the last 3 years. And we have the 3rd one in this particular series, have given us, all of us, the opportunity to hear how large firms work. And to hear how they work by the people who are making them work.

And so it is a particular pleasure for me today and if you can anticipate a pleasurable afternoon, to hear the development, operation, secrets – if you will – and certainly successes of one of the best firms in the nation. Actually, in the world cause they have offices that circle the globe, and that is RTKL. Personally, having grown up a little further east than Texas, and done most of my architectural operations up and down the east coast we've known RTKL for many, many years and have always held it in respect for two basic reasons: one is the consistently high quality of any project or Christmas card that RTKL puts out. The quality is always there. It can be a large project or a small. One kind of project or another. But you can always guarantee the project is good. The second thing we've always appreciated and why this is not done in more firms, I don't know, RTKL does the whole range of design. They have all the way from planners to industrial designers all working together with the synergy that design actually is. So, our respect to RTKL and thank them for being here. It is my pleasure to introduce an Aggie at RTKL, Harold Adams. I'm going to tell you a little bit about Harold before we allow him to come up and talk. Harold was from Palmer, Texas and I understand he was the Valedictorian of his class of 6. Maybe that's where, the first time, that he started to focus on success and didn't pay much attention to how many others were around but still wanted to be first. He entered Texas A&M in 1957. He stayed here for 5 years. In a 5-year program at the time. During that time, he won the Davidson Design scholarship which was indicative of the best design who was around at the time. He was also editor of the Architecture Magazine done by the students called Architecture Plus which for many years know throughout the United States. He worked closely with although never studied with, Dean Romnick who was a great influence as you know with many of the former students who came through Texas A&M. Graduating in 1962, he went to work for Pracht, Bachs, and Henderson architects in Dallas. In the summers though, he would work for Bill Tibler architect.

In 1962 when he graduated he decided to go back to New York City where he had worked during some summers. He had an interview and an offer with IM Pay, with Ed Stone. He decided to go instead, after a little brief stay up there with John Carl Warnicky who had his office in Washington, D.C., his East Coast. His office is actually California though. Harold became the junior designer in the Federal Courthouse project in Washington, D.C. when he was with John Carl Warnicky and as he told me it was interesting because Warnicky decided to take that project out of Washington, D.C. and all the people with it except for Harold. So, for a while, he was the John Carl Warnicky office in Washington, D.C. being the only person there. He became the manager of the office when it developed into an office of about 40 people for Warnicky in D.C. at the age of 25. In 1966 and 1967 he was recruited by some Aggies as a matter-of-fact from what I understand at RTKL in Baltimore to come and join them and in 1968 after being there for I guess a little over a year. Starting as managing architect in 1968 he became the first president and treasurer of RTKL under their re-organization. In 2003 after being the number 1 person at RTKL since 1968, he decided to step down as Chair, and he is now Chairman Emeritus. He's not idle however, as you can imagine, if you know Harold, he is on the board of directors of Legg Mason. Of Lincoln Electric. Of Commercial Metals Company. And he's also still doing work with RTKL. Large projects that he has been involved with such as the U.S. Capitol Visitors' Center and some other projects of that scale. He's Vice-Chair and President-elect or Chair-elect of DBIA. That is Design-Build Institute of America. An institute that champions the interrelation of construction and architecture and I understand he's the first architect to hold that position. He's been the chair of the architecture foundation, AIA Architecture Foundation. He's the Chair of the World Trade Center Institute. He's a commissioner on the Maryland Economic Development Commission. He has been chancellor of the College of Fellows of the American

Institute of Architects. He's won the Kemper Medal which is the second highest, next to the gold medal that the AIA actually ever gives, and he's founded and has been chair for 9 years, the first 9 years, of a group called the Large Firm Roundtable which is an institution that gets the CEOs of 50 to 60 of the largest architecture firms in the country and actually the world together to see how they can learn from each other. In addition to that, personally, if I may speak personally, Harold is one of those Aggies who's realized that his success out in the world can be an inspiration to those of us still back here at Texas A&M, particularly the students. He's been very generous with his time, energy and resources in helping us become a better and better Texas A&M. and I want to please give a warm welcome to one of our favorite former students, as we call our old Aggies, Harold Adams. Harold? [146]

Harold Adams: Thank you Tom. Gig 'em. I was asked to do that by someone who couldn't make it today. It is always fun to be back on campus. I've been away a long time. I've been away from the campus. I graduated in 1962, so you can do your calculation – 41 years. So it is fun to come back. I've lived outside of Texas even though I'm a 4th generation Texan. I've lived outside of Texas a lot longer than I ever lived in Texas. I want to say a word about CRS. And to congratulate the last year's recipient and this year's recipient of the Jonathan King Award. A person that I had an opportunity to know was a true leader and thinker in the profession on research. A unique individual. So it is a great honor to each of you to be the Jonathan King Honoree. When I was a Freshman here, in my first few years here at A&M. This was the headquarters, the World Headquarters, for CRS. Then known as Caudill, Rowlett, and Scott. They had moved from Oklahoma A&M, up in Norman, to down here to be in a larger environment. They kept their fleet of airplanes out at Easterwood Field. That was a twin engine DC-3. Many

of you have probably never even seen a DC-3 and a single engine piper of some sort for their many travels. You see they were already expanding. They had an office in Ithaca, New York. Now, you can imagine how a firm that in the end became such a huge firm could have ever picked these two places as their headquarters and their first office. But they were doing one of the things, one of the lessons that I've learned and that our firm has learned over the years. They were following their clients, and they had a huge practice doing schools and being the first real innovators of school design throughout the southwest and then they grew into the northeast and all over the country. It was a great pleasure even though they were busy with their practice and not so involved in teaching that Bill Caudill was around. Or any of the other of their partners. If they were around. You could look up from your drawing board in the studio on the top floor of the un-airconditioned Academic Building, late at night, and they would be roaming around, visiting with the students. Willing to give crits. Willing to just sit and talk. So, I was influenced greatly by them. Admired them and took lessons that I learned from them elsewhere in my career. I want to first give you a little background on RTKL. Some people say, especially in the international market place, "What does RTKL stand for?" It was a clever marketing person with us that, because it was so difficult to explain that it was the founders of the firm who's names were Rogers, Taliaferro, Kostritsky, Lamb. We were actually named shortly after I joined the firm we had a receptionist who was Dutch. And she got tired of saying, "Good morning Rogers, Taliaferro, Kostritsky, Lamb" and started saying, "Good morning, RTKL." But in Asia, they don't quite understand. Some of our first clients didn't quite understand how we got from one to the other so our marketing guy in jest one day says that RTKL stands for Respect, Truth, Love, and Kindness. Or Kindness and Love. And you may still find people in Asia that will tell you that's our name. That's what RTKL stands for. It is amazing at how people liked that. That

sounded good. And I like to think to a great extent that's what we stand for. So by inadvertent statement he perhaps named us, gave us a different name in Asia from the one that many people know is the derivative of our name here in the U.S. We built a firm and the firm has developed over the years to a great extend on a wonderful foundation laid by our founders. The philosophy of our founders is really the philosophy, the great foundation, that was laid, that we still follow, and I think that is very important and the stories we are going to tell and it is about collaboration that the process, the whole process of design is so very important. It is something that often we observe and our founders observe that people rush too fast to the conclusion. Quality clients. The people you work for whether its your first job or your clients is so very, very important to you because the quality of those clients will be translated into the quality of your projects. And your projects, your reputation, is really all that you have as an architect. Its the most, most important thing. That and the confidence and the trust that people have in you. For us, quality is vitally important. Second is growth. And we have been a firm known for growing. But we do not grow for growth's sake. It is not an end all. And I can give you many examples where we could have grown much more rapidly, and we hold back. In a more studied way and have always grown the firm based primarily on internal growth, hiring the best and the brightest. Keeping them, nurturing them, and having them lead our expansion. The whole understanding of cultures is vitally important. When I joined the firm in 1967, it was a firm of about 45 people, it was already a united nations. They had hired individuals, students from many cultures, and that was a great foundation for us – of understanding other cultures. The move away from architecture as a commodity has been a very important strength of ours and often people will, clients – if you get too many clients in one area will start treating you as a commodity and the quality of the products will go down. We're really offering and selling ideas, creativity, and innovation. That is the

strength of what we offer, and what we, how we have built our practice. The first decades were very, very important to us. I mentioned the founders. Arch Rogers on the left. Frank Taliaferro. Charlie Lamb, and George Kostritsky. That's the way they joined the firm. Arch Rogers came back from World War II. Set up this little practice. Which he said hung a shingle outside his grandmother's basement in Annapolis, Maryland and soon after that a former classmate from Princeton who he said was properly educated needed an architect to design his house. So it was a two-bedroom house was the first project. He needed a draftsman, Frank Taliaferro came along and was hired as the draftsman. And a few years later when they were beginning to get more work, a student came up on his bike, looking for a summer job. He lived in Annapolis. His father was a professor at the Naval Academy. That's Charlie Lamb [278]. Charlie Lamb was a very, very talented designer. After graduating from the University of Michigan, he came back with the firm and joined the firm in 1953. They were doing community projects in a small community. One of the first important steps was Arch Roger stepping out into his community and being a community leader. And leading the zoning commission. The first zoning commissioner of his county, and developing a logical growth pattern for the county that would prevent sprawl and the ugliness that was already beginning to take over America after the rapid growth right after World War II. That opposition to sprawl and to the unchecked growth of suburbs was not always a winning battle. In fact he lost the most important battle that he fought which was to keep a green space on the main road that connected Baltimore the largest city in Maryland to its capital Annapolis. But he got the recognition of many people for taking that strong stand. A few years later he was asked, in the next phase of the development, to take on a job in Baltimore which was leading a major urban design project in downtown Baltimore. And that was the beginning of the foundations of the firm – of taking architecture, more community-based architecture, schools and

community colleges and small office buildings and retail stores and stepping it up into the planning area and the urban planning. They had grown rapidly. From 1946 to 1955, they were up to 15 people. They had revenues in 1955 of the huge number of $172,000. And some of us remember what is was like to work on a drawing board like this in a humid climate, un-airconditioned space, not unlike working on the top floor of the Academic building when I was in school. You see the whole technology, the investment in an architectural office really wasn't very much. It was a door or a piece of plywood and if you were an architect, a young, junior architect, you had to come with your equipment. But the 50's, more importantly were the formative years for the firm to start developing a larger reputation in the region. A growing reputation in design. Charlie Lamb was an outstanding designer. The won their first AIA honor award with a small project for the Girl Scouts. They then started getting the attention of clients in Baltimore. They got their first retail project which was in 1954/55 for Jim Rouse of the Rouse Company. And that laid the foundation for a very large retail design practice, but urban design was still a very big part of it and was really leading the firm into a new phase. Arch Rogers was asked to come to Baltimore and to take on the leadership of the greater Baltimore Committee which was a business group that was going to pay for a plan for revitalizing downtown Baltimore and then give the plan to the city and encourage them to implement it. He led the Business Group in that effort. So again, he stepped out of his architectural practice role and became a community leader and that set the firm for its next phase of development. And during that time, the growing design reputation of the firm came from clients and one of the biggest clients in the country in those days and one of the corporate clients that emphasized design and emphasized the very best designers was the John Deer Company. We were asked to design a very unique building. A warehouse building that we took a different approach and did a cantoneered roof structure. Concrete structure. That

under one roof, about 4 acres, they could move their heavy equipment around. Bring it in and out. This project won us our first national AIA honor award. About the same time, they had joined with P.H. Revolusky, who was the Dean at MIT at the time, highly respected architect, who with the Rogers, Taliaferro, Lamb firm at the time was asked to design the Church of the Redeemer. This was one of the most important community churches in Baltimore with all of the influential people in Baltimore. That project led to a great exposure to Baltimore. That together with Arch's being asked to take over this Greater Baltimore Committee, caused them to open their branch office in Baltimore. That blossomed into the firms really going national. Because the exposure from the planning for Charles Center in downtown Baltimore resulted in the firm being asked to come to Hartford, Connecticut to do a downtown plan. On to Albany, New York to do a downtown plan. To many smaller cities, mid-sized cities and large cities across the county. Cincinnati, Ohio. Eugene, Oregon. And the unique approach to the planning of that day was taking the plans in a step-by-step, block-by-block, way. Bringing the owners of the properties into the process, with a process that Arch Rogers called Political Design. Involved the city fathers, city council members, property owners, all in the community as a whole in a process of design. One step at a time. By the time our plan was finished, we had a plan that the community was implementing. It was a natural transition then for us to start implementing some of the major projects within that, and that really took us national. I joined the firm in 1967 as Tom mentioned. I worked for John Carl Warnicky. I had this great experience. I got a total immersion in management working with vary high level clients, President of the United States and people like that very early on in my career. And managing an office of 40 people when I was quite young. Acting as Jack's Administrative Assistant world-wide was doing projects all over the world by then. We were one of the largest firms in the country at that time. And was being groomed to be his

managing partner. So I had gotten into management and had found a strength that how I could use my design knowledge in running things and had gotten a taste of this. And then I went back and sort of caught up professionally so I could get licensed. But working for Jack Warnicky caused me to look at how firms were being managed in those days and they would go up and down, peaks and valleys, lots of work and then no work. Typically depended upon one superstar. One individual. An individual in my particular case that would not share the ownership, would not share the future. Would not recognize that by sharing the pie, the pie would get bigger. And a philosophy that frankly, abused people. [407] Worked them hard. Patted them on the head. You were either in or out. Coming and going. Always changing people. Projects were complicated. There would be complaints from clients. And the real root of it was there was no consistency. So I brought that experience to RTKL. They gave me a wonderful opportunity because they had struggled with management. They had grown. They were about 45 people. It was beyond the management by committee. And they were having cash flow problems and all the problems that small practices can have. And no one was really in-charge of the office. They actually were on a monthly basis, changing the person in-charge. One month it would be Arch Rogers, another month it would be Frank Taliaferro. All the time they were working on projects and had clients and could not devote the time to the office. They wanted me to come in first, and I agreed to do it, as a person that would concentrate on the office. My projects was the office. Even though I wanted to get back to some projects. And gave me some time to study the office, to know the people, came up with an organizational plan and my buddy, my Aggie buddy who had helped to recruit me. In fact I was going through my archives recently. All the papers. Trying to clean out some stuff, had even written a letter to another person in the firm who was on a leave of absence at the time talking about how ridiculous this management plan, this organiza-

tional plan, that had been presented was, with Harold Adams in a box above everybody. As the President of the firm, over the 4 partners. They were organized into 4 studios. Couldn't believe this was happening. Those guys had a lot of trust. To trust someone that was that young. Who was a Texas Aggie. With their firm, with their future. But they had so much turmoil that they were delighted that anybody would take the job full-time. I took it on. I decided what have I done? Why did I leave this wonderful job with Warnicky? And I started digging in. By the end of the first year, I had the firm profitable. First time they had ever made money. And it was at that point that we incorporated and went from a partnership, Rogers, Taliaferro, Kostritsky, Lamb to RTKL Inc. And they named me and they named two other people as the first partners as owners in the firm. That's when I became President. [458] Arch Rogers fought for the corporation. The reason that's in here – forming a corporation – was he said you know as a partnership, there's a partnership syndrome that takes over where everybody thinks they should have their finger in every decision. That you can't make decisions, and move forward unless you get people organized and focused on what they're best at. And that my role was to provide administrative support, provide the accounting, and all of the other services to all the partners so that they could concentrate on their best clients and build those clients. I look back and think about the brilliance of his decision and the trust that he placed in me and he fought with his other three partners at times to convince them that this should be done. I think it was a real turning point and vision on his part, to see the importance of management and the process. When we went public with this idea to the whole staff, there was a great deal of opposition. And I remember, at the back of the room, one of our talented designers stood up and said, "what do we stand for? Do we stand for design? Or do we stand for management and money?" My answer then to him is still what it is today is that, "You've got to have a balance." Without profit and without the money and the con-

fidence that banks will have in you to lend you money, if you need to borrow money, you can't hire the best people. You can't get engineers to work for you. You can't afford to take risks and go after projects. So profit is very necessary. Just as the technical delivery of your projects is just as important as the design. So it has been a balanced approach that we have followed over the years, but always with an emphasis in always reaching for design. Our goal has been to be not the biggest firm in the world, but to be recognized as one of the best. To be there as a player in every major project type in the world. We, during that time, developed some very important clients. Out of our planning work, IBM came to us with a major planning problem. They were trying to get zoning through and get a plan approved for a major plant in Virginia. That turned into a 25 or 30 year relationship with IBM with projects all over the country for IBM. Johns Hopkins University came to us with a master planning problem. They had chaos with their inner city campus, their hospital, lots of fiefdoms and people, not unlike a city. Trying to pull all these people together so they could grow and expand and come up with a master plan for the expansion of the hospital and renewal of the hospital. We took them through a planning process, developed a plan, and out of that grew another client that set us up for a national practice, an international practice in healthcare design. We were doing the master plan, the downtown plan, in Hartford, Connecticut. The major owner and chairman of Traveler's Insurance Company turned over to Arch Rogers and said, "I've got a little problem I'd like to talk to you about. Could you come over to my office?" He went over after this presentation, and we ended up getting our first high-rise office building. Traveler's Insurance Corporate Headquarters. So each of those projects has lead us into a new area. A new area of growth and opportunity. A new area to demonstrate our design skills. The federal government. I've worked very closely with the federal government while I was with Warnicky. We started emphasizing getting work for the federal government.

Federal government, these days, is one of the most demanding organizations in the world for high design, for the best design excellence. So it is picking those clients and growing to the point where you can compete with the best and win those clients. We added other disciplines to the firm. We were architects and planners up to that point. In 1972 we added structural engineering. This was really because we got the Traveler's projects. We realized that there were no structural engineers in town that could handle projects of that type, so we had to go to New York. Coordinating with an engineer in New York and a mechanical/electrical engineer in New York was very difficult. Getting to decisions was difficult. So we started growing. First structural. That worked so well, we then started adding MEP to our services. That worked great. We were then offering a full package of services. We then added interior design and our graphics to our offerings. So we became a much more well-rounded, more interdisciplinary firm. Landscape architects were added. All the time we were hiring people. The hirings we were doing. We were looking for, to a great extent, architects and planners. We were looking for that combination of architects and urban designers. Because they fit best with the kinds of practice that we had. Large-scale planning that would then be implemented. We developed, as I said, some great national clients – IBM, Federated Department Stores, and others. For instance, the Traveler's Insurance Company, they were investing in properties around the country. They introduced us to a very large resort developer, the Hilton Head Company, and we did four Master plans for some of the best known resorts in the country today on the East Coast and then Puerto Rico as a result of that relationship and that recommendation by Traveler's Insurance Company. During the 70's, there were some very critical decisions made. The Rouse Company came back to us asking for a whole new way of thinking in retail design, and that was to not just sell a product. Because until then, shopping centers had just been selling a product. Frankly, we had gotten away from doing

shopping centers after doing two or three early ones for the Rouse Company because it was a commodity. They came back, begging us, because of our reputation in urban design to get into this new type and design. We designed the first shopping center with food. The first food court in America. That was in New Jersey. It had the highest dollar per square foot production of any shopping center in the country. Developers from all had to go see it. Had to see what was happening. And that set us off on a great deal of growth in the commercial architecture. And we sometimes say that we then had the opportunity to "mall" America. We are critical of ourselves at times, but it was an opportunity to grow. To follow a major client. Did 10-20 major retail shopping centers for Federated, for Cadillac Fairview, for the Rouse Company, for many, many people that we are still working for. We made a decision after doing some exploration to not have our attention diverted to the Middle East. CRS got very tied up in doing a lot of work for the Middle East that was very great for them during that time. 3D/I did. We looked around and thought, you know, "There are certainly a lot of wonderful opportunities." But we decided after several opportunities and explorations that we were going to concentrate back home and to grow our base and become more solid in the U.S. We also explored getting even more diverse and getting into construction management services, real estate development because we were working for a lot of developers and we dabbled a few times with some development but kept our core philosophy that it was this urban planning and design is what we were about and where we really should be, so we'd pull ourselves back to that. Offering the full-service design approach was very attractive to many of our clients, and it was during the late 70's when they started asking us to follow them. To go elsewhere. That set the stage for the next stage of development which was the growth of our regional offices. We did something else, early in the 70's. Recognizing that we were hiring the best and the brightest and to keep them, not only do we have to give them oppor-

tunities to grow, but we also had to do something not unlike and we had always been impressed with organizations that could keep their people there a long time. Very complicated organizations and put together a package of human resource offerings that would take care of our people. Yes, that's health plans, but we also started a pension and we started what was then a thrift plan that turned into being a 401K plan. All toward staying with us. Having the same team that worked together for many, many years. When you become a partner or an owner at RTKL you buy stock, so that when you retire, or if you're not a stockholder when you retire, you have something to fall back on and the fact that we viewed that very important to continuing the practice into the future and that individuals could retire. That we would have a benefit package that they could retire and do something else and not have to continue to work for that paycheck. That was a very good decision that was always funded. We funded it out of our profits. And it is the reason that we have so many people that have so much depth in the workforce for so many years. So, as paying attention to the office, re-investing in the office for the future. Recognizing that we could only grow if we had good people to open these offices and to grow. So the next phase was opening the offices. 1979 we opened the Dallas office. Following clients. We packed up from Baltimore. Came down. Within three days they were back working on their projects with their clients. So they carried the clients with them. So that we fed work into the office here. It grew and prospered. One of the speakers today, Lance Josal, that you're going to hear from later, was our very first hire in Dallas. The others were people we brought from Baltimore or that we had hired from schools in Texas. Very creative designer, Jim Sailor, who we hired out at Texas Tech and others that we had hired had taken them to Baltimore, put them through boot camp, working on projects. We say "learned how to speak Baltimorese" and then brought them to Dallas when we opened that office. The view toward opening the offices was that they were going to be very

independent. They weren't going to duplicate Baltimore. They could grow and follow their clients and create the same pattern that we had grown in Baltimore. So we took a mixture of people. Of design managers, design leaders, of sometimes known as Rainmakers. Someone that was a strong designer. Someone who's a strong manager or projects, technical manager. So we had that balance and came to Dallas. That office has grown. It is 25 years old this year. This August it will be 25 years old, and it has continued to be a very large and prosperous office. The reputation for our multi-use projects. Yes, we were doing retail malls, but we were being hired retail malls in order to the clients viewed us toward doing, making malls as effectively the downtowns of the future. Hotels, housing, office buildings – all in this piece of land [730]

End of side A, Tape 1

Continued Harold Adams: Multi-use projects became very important both downtown multi-use projects and we developed a reputation as one of the few firms in the country who knew how to do these mixed-use projects. The public sector started growing. Importance of GSA, the core of engineers, other major government clients became very important to us. We opened a Washington office to service those clients in the early 80's. In 1983 we opened our Los Angeles office. Paul Jacob, who I'll introduce shortly went out as a part of the missionary team to establish that office. Much in the same way as the Dallas office. Then we opened our D.C. office and an office in Florida later in the 80's. Toward the end of the 80's and about 1986/87 we were invited to Japan by a major Japanese firm. And introduced to their culture and their many companies, and out of that started growing opportunities in Japan. But interestingly, not just Japan. Because they were investing all over the world, and it was because of the Japanese client that we actually

opened our London office. So the 80's were a very busy time. Growing outside from our national reputation. We were beginning to grow all these offices and growing an international reputation. The Japanese client came to us because they had read about us. They had seen our projects. Our mixed-use projects. No one in Japan knew how to do those types of projects. They wanted to introduce new ideas into Japan. They also, shortly after we started working for them, bought at a very large price at that time, the Intercontinental Hotel Chain. Had hotels, 110 hotels around the world. We were a very critical part of their due-diligence. And helping them to buy the hotels. We knew more about these hotels than anyone, and we were asked to open an office in London to service them where they were going to renovate some 35 of their hotels in London and open an office in Japan where we'd be closer to them and could do the hotels in Japan. So we'd done renovation of hotels, from the old course hotel in St. Andrews to the beautiful hotel in Amsterdam which to this day is the Amstel is considered the very best hotel in Amsterdam. To the hotel Manhattan in Tokyo. The 80's strategies were very important from a business standpoint. The things that we followed from a business standpoint. Investing in technology. Re-investing in the firm. Technology. We had some of the earliest, high-tech computer systems. We got into it very early. We kept ourselves up-to-date. We believed that part of the importance of the balance is that we hired a Chief Financial Officer. We'd had, from the time I joined the firm, and sort of cleaned up the accounting, started using outside CPAs. Then hired a full time CPA and then made that person the Chief Financial Officer. We hired our in-house lawyer. Cause we had so much work. We were spending so much money on outside lawyers that we brought it in-house. All to help us to be more mobile. To understand all of our business practices and to follow us wherever we went. We use consultants to help us as we went into China and to Japan and to all the other countries to teach us how to operate in those countries. To give us a cultural immer-

sion. A cultural sensitivity. That has served us very well. We are complemented by our clients because we work so hard to understand their cultures. As I say the, we were attracting some of the best people because we had such a strong benefits plan and the way people could come and grow with us. So we were continuing to hire the best and the brightest but now from all over the world. It was very interesting that some of those very first individuals that when I joined the office in '67, that were working there as their two years after getting their graduate degree ended up back in Japan and other places that have continued to help us. [55] They have their own practices but they've introduced us and are very dedicated to RTKL have a been a secret part of our ability to work internationally. So, the 90's were a time of growing globally. Tokyo and London offices, but then that led to work all through Asia – Japan, Korea, Southeast Asia. All of that work provided us shelter while the devastating recession hit in '90/'91 and all the domestic work. We saw our retail shopping center clients drop by 50% during that time. But we were growing in this other area and it was a great opportunity for us to expand internationally, and during that time we had grown our internationally practice to 30%-35% of our overall billings. We had to give up our Ft. Lauderdale office during that time because we did have to contract. And we moved some of the people from that office to London to help bolster the London office because the opportunities were so great there. So, opportunistic. Following opportunities. Taking chances. All of this means taking chances. Excuse me. Probably a client. Better turn it off. I think it was that client. The architect lookout from Washington. With these offices around the world, we did not want them to compete. So we worked very hard. You know an office develops a client. Develops an opportunity. It is often hard for them to be willing to give up their pie. But we worked hard to keep our offices balanced and healthy by moving work around. That takes a pride in the overall firm more than just in my piece, but as part of the culture of the office people

were sometimes a little reluctant, but were willing to do it for the health of the overall office. We have wrestled with whether or not we should have feeder offices and main offices, but most of our offices around the world are full-services offices capable of doing everything because that's what the clients want and demand. They don't want to have to wait for an airplane to arrive. They want you to be there. China has been an incredible opportunity. We have been fortunate to hire, and I know we have some Chingose University graduates here. A number of graduates from Chingose and other universities in China. Have been with us over 10 years. And as opportunities started coming to us in China, they have been a critical part of our success there. This is a first concepts sketch by one of our most talented designers who went to Chingose University, and has been with us for about 10 years, that turned into this project. This project is an incredible project. It is the science museum of China. It is the statement of the future of China. The new China. A project that involved a great deal of diplomacy and more than just design, but knowing a lot of people and getting a lot of help from our U.S. government because we were the only American competing. We won it. We won it because of the outstanding design and because Shanghai has always taken pride in being, doing things a little differently, and being and stretching, and the judges said, "We like your design best" because even though there were some other very wonderful designs "because yours was different." And that says China and the future of China and the spirit of Shanghai. 2000 on – opening new frontiers. Continuing to balance our portfolio so that we don't get so heavily into any one sector of the office. Our federal work has continued to be a strong differentiator. It is one of the best designs. One of the largest projects. The project of the Capitol is one example of that. The largest addition to the U.S. Capitol in 150 years. A project that we are on the firing line every day. We get calls because we have lots of bosses there at the capitol. A very high profile project that will move our design profile even higher. Healthcare

has become a big engine for the firm. Healthcare design. We're doing major healthcare projects in London and throughout England. We're doing them now in Asia and all through the U.S. China has emerged in the last few years and the recession that we've gone through, we're coming out of, as a very important part of the future engine of the firm. With an unprecedented amount of growth there. High profile projects like the rebuilding of the Pentagon. We were called 3-days after 9/11. Asked to join a team. We had a signed agreement one week to the day from 9/11 to be the led architect in leading the team that worked so hard, day and night, to rebuild the Pentagon. It is reputation. [128] It is the ability to deliver. The ability to meet a commitment. We moved projects that were in Baltimore and Washington to project managers in Dallas and then Los Angles. Let them take those projects, so we could free up 35 or so people that could concentrate on that project very rapidly. Everyone participated in the office and took pride in it and was willing to work around-the-clock. It was interesting that at the end, we finished it in 11 months, Secretary of Defense Rumsfield sent a plaque in a frame, personally signed, to all the people that worked on the project from the mailroom clerk who worked all night to get drawings sent out to the lead person on the job. Thanking them for their effort. So a very recognizing client. And that is what it is all about is having a client recognize you. As Tom mentioned, I am Chairman Emeritus. A part of what we established long ago and the leaders of our firm, the founders of our firm, felt it very important that we continue to grow the firm and continue to turn the firm over to the next generation and to see this firm grow and prosper throughout the future generations. So it all comes out of our emphasis on urban design. We've continued to change and adjust and move so RTKL is never the same. It is a firm that, someone said, is always stirring the pot. Always looking at ourselves. It is this impatient search for new opportunities. We're not known for museum design, but we are doing major museums all over

the world now. And are winning competitions and are beating the best. We're moving into academic facilities. An area that we were in early in our practice, got away from it, going back into it in a big way. And we're continuing to look at new geographies and to grow major offices in China and South America. New services. Telecommunications. When those of you that watched the President's State-of-the-Union address last week, we were on pins and needles because we had taken on a design-build job with our telecommunications group, an in-house group, to redo all of the wiring for all of the media that come to the capitol. You can't imagine how many media connections there are into the capitol building. The deadline was the State-of-the-Union address. We'd torn out that whole area of the capitol where all those unbelievable miles of spaghetti go through and had to replace it and redo it and get it finished in time. So I was very nervous that night knowing that the next day I could be before a firing squad. It came on in time and these areas of telecommunications/security are very important to the future of our firm and to our nation. We work for some of the most sensitive parts of the government doing very high technology projects and it is all a part of the diversity that we think is important to keep a firm healthy, out at the leading edge and continuing to strive to be better and to deliver a better quality product. I have supposedly stepped down from so much activity, but my wife keeps wondering, "when does this retirement really happen?" But it has happened, and I'm delighted that we have a new team that is in full charge. We have a new Chairman in Paul Jacob. We have a new President, CEO in Dave Hudson. And a very capable leadership team in the office that will lead the firm and continue all the great development that we've gone through from our founders. And it is my pleasure to introduce to you, Paul Jacob who is the Chairman of RTKL. An individual that took us a long time to look him over and make sure he was up to this job. 'Cause he joined us in 1970, and you're going to hear that from others. RTKL is a firm with

many people that have spent a long career with RTKL and have gone through many position and many roles in the office. Paul is a great leader. He is a designer. A great design leader in the firm and that is the future of the firm because the quality of what you do is how well you survive in a very competitive environment. Paul Jacob. [192]

Audience: Applause

Paul Jacob: Thank you. What I'm going to do is put some water out here because I don't want to do what Harold did. Harold, you didn't know there was water there, did you? Thank you Harold. Actually, Harold, instead of jumping right into what I wanted to talk about, Harold, in referencing the founding fathers, they really, when you talk to them, they take great pride in their design accomplishments. And listed among their design accomplishments, is designing the firm. And those of us who have come after them, really also understand the dedication they took to really thinking about transition and the firm, not only the bodies themselves but as a living entity that had certain characteristics that would carry on. Obviously, one of those characteristics as Harold's talked about is good management. And Dave Hudson is not here, and he would talk about all the things that Harold has made sure have been happening over the years, good management so that we do manage to have profitability but it is profitability to enable us to produce great design. Our focus is on the design. We do not consciously manage just for profitability. We would do things very different if our end game was to maximize our profitability. So we maximize the design effort that we can in the context of producing a profitable firm. It is a slight different emphasis, but it is an important one. As you have seen, RTKL has been a company driven by a passion for great design. The creative process is very important to us, and the im-

plementation of innovative ideas which is what we believe does drive design. Our primary drivers are creativity and quality, and we strive for excellence in all of our realms of work that encompasses all of the phases, whether it is technical expertise or conceptual thinking, but also talks about a lot of what I want to talk about today, and that is within the firm. Talks about management within the firm and mentorship. Various people around the firm describe these goals for me in various ways or ??? to me in various ways. That we like it at RTKL because we are doing outstanding work while staying at the top of our field. We get to exceed our clients expectations. We're keeping things exciting by continually learning and expanding our horizons. And maybe, most important of all, we're having a wonderful time at what we do best. As Harold has explained, RTKL's roots are in Urban Planning and design and our founders means of practice who's one of consensus-building plus risk-taking. There was a dedication to sharing that experience. Values unique to that partnership. Now as the firm has grown over the years, it has evolved into a very diverse practice. Encompassing a whole matrix of disciplines and locations. That's our business strategy, and we've succeeded in that strategy with the efforts and the tradition of the entrepreneurial opportunist. I think Harold used some of those words. Leaders who have really opened our new doors. So we have two really powerful themes running through RTKL and in a sense they are a paradox. We have the spirit of a partnership and collaboration coupled with the freedom of individual expression, the entrepreneur. Like all paradoxes, it provides us with an opportunity and a challenge to truly practice in the spirit of collaboration and to celebrate this diversity of ideas. And to do it together, not as individuals. Our mission, preserve RTKL as a collaborative and diverse culture of creativity focused on delivering excellent design and innovative ideas. That's a big task. How do you do that? How do you nurture a group of people to do that? Well, we rely on three fundamental tenets to guide the company in that under-

taking. One, the strength of the collaborated team trumps the isolated endeavor of the lone individual. And we believe that. Two, creativity and strong leadership are critical to competing in the marketplace. And three, open and effective communication is critical to our success as the collective unit. Those are three important words to us: collaboration, creativity, communication. Collaboration involves working together in a joint intellectual effort toward a common articulated mission. It is cooperation at all levels uniting us in the realization of a clearly defined goal. These are very specific, deliberate things you have to go through in order to have true collaboration. It is not the heroism of one genius working in a vacuum, but instead the thrill of sharing a victory with others who have persevered in solving the problem at your side. That leads us to really encourage certain behaviors: One, from the get-go, communicating to the client what we believe is that power of how we work together as a collective unit bringing diverse people together. Making sure we incorporate ample time into the project schedules and fee into our budgets for a collaborative approach. Involving the entire team at key moments in the project, at project kick-off, at subsequent design-reviews, to insure that the big idea is really talked about in the beginning of the process. That exploration of all alternatives is really thought thru from many different vantage points, and then through the process, that big idea is carried through to all the people who eventually have to work on the project. We identify various specialists within RTKL and we utilize their expertise through out the process wherever they're located. We have the ability because of the structure of the company to bring in anyone from anyplace within the company to assist us in a project. Also, in part of the design process and a collaborative environment, including fresh eyes into design reviews. That means bringing people in from outside of the team, bringing in people from outside the firm, bring in non-experts. Just people who will look at the project from a different vantage point and make a comment. We're now trying to de-

fine mechanisms to hold team leaders accountable for insuring that collaborative process because we believe so much in it. The second word, *creativity.* Creativity is change effected by the introduction of something new and contrary to established customs and manners. It goes beyond "thinking outside the box." To continually keeping our eyes open and our minds open to everything and anything that may cross our paths. There is no box. Behaviors for that? Creating an environment that encourages and invites exploration by recognizing and rewarding the pursuit of creativity and original ideas. We have set up, within the firm, annual awards to reward behaviors that lead to social action outside the firm. For creativity, for collaboration, and we sponsor a yearly fellowship where we award submissions from within the firm for research. This is a topic we may touch a little bit later on when we get into some of the other panels. We strive for a continual and open exchange of ideas at all levels. Team-wide, sector-wide, firm-wide. We have office exchange programs – moving people from office to office. We have design conferences that we sponsor within the firm. And as I talked about, we have project reviews and presentations that are open to anyone within the office. And we also like to promote things within the office in terms of inviting in people to give lectures, films, for us to go on field trips to exhibitions as a group. We'll talk about a little bit later, the new film, that's out, *My Architect.* And how we can eventually really bring the discussion of those kinds of things into the firm to continue that challenge to creativity. For us to invest in entering competitions and using them as testing grounds for new ideas. New technologies. Where new methods for documentation or presentation. And a new initiative to establish special task force and interest groups within the firm to explore relevant design or technology issues not directly related to client-driven projects which can be applied later to on-going and practical projects. The third word – *communication.* Communication is the exchange of thoughts, messages, and information. Its purpose is to inform

and is most successfully done when done clearly and concisely. Communication is not about controlling the flow of information for you own sake. It's not about leaving people in the dark. It is not about remaining shut-off and remote, but instead, of opening yourself up to dispatching well-articulated conversation. Simple behaviors. There's a lot of information that goes on within our firm, as you can imagine. We have. We are multi-disciplined, global company. Things are happening that no one can keep control of, but we have an I-net. To make sure that on I-net, very easy access, is our latest designs. Information about the firm. About the structure of the firm. About how it works. Our marketing efforts. Our corporate goals. A place where we can share our projects and ideas, successes, and unique knowledge across the firm in a very easy way. And also to publish via quasi-newsletter, our awards. Things that are happening in the press. Our accolades. We also want to develop programs for inter-office presentations and video-conferencing. Technology now allows us to communicate internally, across offices for lectures. For people within the company to really take an advantage to, of what we believe, is critical to training people, and that is continuing education. And also, we ask ourselves, "Can't we broaden the message." If a piece of information typically in the past had gone down to x-level. What happens if we let that go down another level or another level within the firm. We believe that open communication, that an open book, in almost everything that we do is important for growing and investing people into the company as soon as possible. And then keeping our clients continually informed and educated throughout the entire process. By serving our clients, but also realizing they've hired us for our expertise too. And working in collaboration with them. To challenge some of their notions as they challenge some of our ideas. And to have that dialogue and to keep that communication open. So, these tenets and core values are essential to our culture. Those tenets and core values, partnership, opportunism, collaboration, creativity, communication. But

culture is also defined in other and sometimes very subtle ways. Culture is the values, beliefs, and attitudes that permeate a business. And strategy defines where a company wants to go. We believe culture determines how or maybe whether it gets there. One way to measure what kind of culture you have is to ask yourself a few questions. Very simple questions. What is important in your firm? And what is ignored? Who is included? Who is excluded? What is discussable? What message goes out to say what is not discussable? What are acceptable or not acceptable behaviors? How much risk should we take? What resources are available to me? How good is good enough? And what can be challenged? I think Harold mentioned how we believe we've answered some of those questions. Author, Jim Collins, who has written many books. One, *Good to Great,* is looking at companies and making some very interesting observations that we believe in. More companies die of indigestion than of starvation. Think about that one. Great companies were built by focusing on a creative inside-out approach. Rather than a reactive, outside-in approach. Do what you're really passionate about. What you're really good at. And then determine what economic engine can be driven by those contributions. And one I think is the toughest, worry about what you do not about what you say. Frank Taliaferro described the formative years of the firm by these words to live by. Sometimes we cringe when we hear them now. "Break the rules." "Loose every other competition." "Don't be intimidated by the big guns." Now, we're the big guns. "Give it everything you've got." "If you're not happy, its not worth it." "Put it out there and suffer the consequences." Done that one. And, "you don't have to know what you're doing." Now you know why that little two-man office in Annapolis has grown into RTKL. As an illustration of our culture, let me give you a little about the organization. Harold kind-of gave you a history of the company. And it really grew up as offices. But some years ago, we realized that our clients really now aren't, in all cases, regional, and in many ways there's more that

unites us across the geography than separates us. So we change the operational aspect of the company from an office-driven company to a practice group. The practice groups, really, all those professionals within the firm that develop an expertise within a particular market. For instance, two of our practice groups now are commercial practice group and a healthcare practice group among others. We have five. They're charged with creating a structure to support and facilitate the creative process. And to foster a cross-pollination of ideas and talents across offices. So, the practice groups really are what we see is the deployment vehicle for all of our firm-wide programs. To develop design excellence, technical competency or project management. Now because we want to foster collaboration we really break down the side-wall effect and while we came from a management point-of-view, look at revenue and profitability by practice group. The accounting system lets us look at it also by office. And lets us look at it by discipline. Interiors. Engineering. Architecture. It lets us look at it by Vice-President. But that is just for a management check. In reality, at the end of the year, bonuses distributed equally across the firm. We don't reward or punish a particular practice group, office, Vice-President, or discipline by how well they did that year. That is a personnel management and an education, but what we've done is consciously decided to bonus equally. We want to tie this aspect of compensation to the success of the unit we want to encourage, and in our case, that's the firm. The firm as a whole is the most important. [453] Another simpler example of just finding the but put something in place to affirm our culture would be to put into the review criteria, rewarding the behaviors that we've identified for our culture. And not just at the lowest levels or the highest levels by continually at all levels across the firm. Last year, or maybe a year and a half ago now, we decided to see how well we were actually doing. To see how well we were walking the walk. How well what we've been talking about has translated into the experiences of all of our staff. Our entire staff so, we

asked them. Everyone. We commissioned an outside consultant to develop and execute a survey to access our culture. We measured organizational structure, vision, leadership, diversity, creativity, communications, learning, workplace issues, and collaboration. We heard a lot back. We heard many positive things back, they gave us...made us feel really good, but we also heard some things that were below our radar screen. We really heard things regarding an inconsistency or lack of clarity in our mentoring, our review, and our promotion process. So there was a little disconnect, in terms of what we thought as one of our most important things. Bringing people within the firm and having them grow through the firm. There were great examples of that, but there were many examples where that was not happening. So these concerns spoke directly to the need for transparency in our structure. An importance of giving all staff a clear and a fair opportunity to grow, succeed, and progress up the organization. That spoke directly to that Jim Collins quote, "worry about what you do and not what you say." So, we established a board committee to look at the entire spectrum of our employees experience at RTKL. It was tasked with recommending strategic changes in these areas. Title, structure, job description, performance reviews and the criteria for those reviews, a very specific criteria for those reviews. How compensation was then tied to that, what led to promotion and to mentorship. And we're in the process this year of developing the details of those and putting that new structure into place. We think that's key to maintaining the vision that the founders put in place of growing and continuing to keep the firm alive. So where does that leave us? Harold has given us a historic perspective, and I've tried to explain what makes us tick. We thought we'd hold three panels today to discuss further some of these ideas and give them an opportunity for a little interaction. Our first panel will be chaired by Lance Josal, that Harold had talked about. One of the first employee of the Dallas office. He doesn't look that old. He will focus on diversity in the broadest definition of that term.

Diversity of people, of projects, of geography. After the break, we're a little bit late Lance. I'm sorry for that. We'll focus on how a practice like RTKL can raise and maintain its design profile. It is nice to know that lots of people and organizations believe that we really are a design firm. We don't think we are there yet. We really want to reach to the next level. So, how does a firm like ours achieve world-class architecture? And why is that important? I think you know from our point of view why that's important. And then our final panel will really ask that question that was the last one on Harold's slide, that says, "What's next?" And we probably all have different opinions as to what that is. And at the very end, if we have time, we'll have a little Q&A that is open to any topic you'd like to talk on. And I believe that the vast majority of us pursued this field or are in the midst of pursuing this field, because we share a passion for the built environment and our place in it. As designers of the public realm, we can effect change to the human environment. We can transform the human experience. What a fabulous challenge, but what a sober thought. Thank you.

Audience: Applause

Paul Jacob: So with that we will transition to our first panel. A stretch. Lance Josal, as I said, will moderate it and we may go a little later than the scheduled break. Is that okay? Just a couple of minutes. I think everyone. [552]

Lance Josal: All right, good. Well, while some of you may be…

End of side B, Tape 1

Beginning of side A, Tape 2

Continued, Lance Josal: My name is Lance Josal, I'm the director of the commercial practice for RTKL Associates, and my family lives in Dallas. I live at DFW or some other airport, around the world at any one point in time. I would like to take the opportunity to introduce our esteemed panelists, to my right is Dianne Black. Diane. I'm sorry.

Dianne Black: I'm lonely over here. (laughter)

Lance Josal: This wasn't the way. This is a little too formal for us. I mean the chairman feel real comfortable in this environment, but some of us people that haven't ascended to those heights really would much rather be in a bar somewhere talking to each one of you. So, but anyway, just to my right here is Dianne Black. Dianne is a Vice President with RTKL in Baltimore. She's primarily active in the public and government side of our business. She's a member of the board of directors for the firm. She's on three-year rotating term on the board of directors, and she is one of those "old timers," if I could put it to you that way. That's been with the firm for 25 years.
Dianne Black: Lance and I are celebrating our 25th anniversary this year.

Lance Josal: Yes, we are. So, as Harold mentioned a little bit earlier, and I think it is worth emphasizing. The firm really was structured as a long-term career design firm, and we've, Dianne and I, both are here to tell you that it does work out that way for us, and I hope it will work out that way for many of our younger panelist here. To Dianne's immediate right then is Bin Cao. Bin is associate in the Dallas office, and he works currently in our commercial practice. He's

done a lot of work in our multi-family, residential practice, but he's got some experience in a number of different areas there in the commercial side of our business. He's been with us for five years. And then just directly to the right of Ben is Harold Thompson. Harold is also an associate with the firm. Been with the commercial practice for six years in the Dallas office. Harold is an interesting subject, he had a business degree from that venerable university in Austin, University of Texas. But then he saw the errors of his ways, and decided that he would go to Texas A&M University and get a graduate degree in architecture, and we're very glad he did. So, then to start the discussion, I guess the subject of this panel is strength in diversity. And as much as P.J. and Harold touched on it just a little bit earlier, I think it is probably one of the key differentiators of RTKL Associates when compared with other firms. If any of you out there are clients with large commissions, I hope you'll find this subject stimulating and informative enough to come by after the conference so we can inundate you with some of our terrific business, marketing, material. But then if you are competitors of our, I hope we aren't giving away any secrets here today. When we thought about what it was we wanted to present to you today, we looked back at the lecture that was given three years ago, and we've looked at the notes. And some of the notes just really articulated the great diversity in the audience, and a number of people said, "Well, we really wanted to talk more about design." Then others come back and say, "well, we really wanted to talk more about business." So, what we thought we would do today is get the audience participation in a panel discussion where we open up the discussion about what we feel like is important. The key differentiator which is diversity at RTKL. I'll throw a few questions out to our panelist, and then open it up, open the conversation up to the audience and ask you to direct any questions you might have toward any of those subjects to our panelists. So, with that, I guess I'll start with Dianne. And ask her that.. Of course, RTKL, Dianne is proud of its people as any

other aspect of its practice, but maybe you could elaborate a little bit about the diversity of people and what its meant to RTKL.

Dianne Black: Thanks Lance. I hope you guys are going to interact with us because that's very much in keeping with our philosophy and that, just to start with, the people discussion. We do have a very diverse practice, and that leads to a very diverse population of people that work with us to accomplish those projects and it's a self-fulfilling circle. More diverse people, more diverse projects. I think Harold mentioned some of the people that were originally in the firm, many years ago, have gone back to say, their countries of origin, and they've brought us – RTKL to projects in those countries. So, we really believe in a very different, diverse kind-of population. I was going to ask, How many of you guys have ever been done Myers Briggs tests? The personality tests. Oh wow. Not that many of you guys have done it. Well, I mean essentially, it is a test that helps you define what your personality style is and what your sort-of leadership styles are. And one thing that we learn from that process is that we get along the best with people who are just like we are. However, we accomplish a lot more with people who aren't anything like we are, so I think we've learned those lessons and we really work, we have got a lot of very what we call, brutal honesty, kind-of discussions. We work really hard to learn how to encourage each other to push the envelope and that's why I think you will see a diverse population because we believe there's power in that. We believe there's innovation in listening to somebody else's perspective. And the people lead to the best projects.

Lance Josal: So, really, from a diversity standpoint, and probably first and foremost in terms of, I think, the way RTKL views it, our people are really our strength. We often kind-of joke that we

are bankrupt every night when our people turn their lights off and go home, but it is very true, so if you can't bring the right talent to the right project, then chances are you're not going to be successful as a design firm, so first and foremost, in our quest for diversity, is all about people. It is all about people. The second area of diversity, that we're currently involved with is diversity of place in those areas that we choose to pursue work, and so, I'll ask Bin to talk a little bit about. Currently based on the revenue, as much as 30% of our work, Bin, is outside the U.S. Why do you think it is that RTKL's invested so much in building an international practice, and what can you identify is the benefits of this investment.

Bin Cao: Yes, and as we all know in the United States, it is not just single construction, marketing, the whole works which is a great advantage to architecture firms such as RTKL. But however as we have seen in the last few years, the US market is a problem to some remarkably quick and devastating downturns. A typical add to 10-years marketing cycle. It is for that reason that for every decision in the U.S. we ask whether. It has become increasingly apparent that geographical diversity can be key to mitigating the effects of downturns in our domestic market. For example, our international design invitation opens doors for RTKL all the times. For times when the U.S. market softens, it is a great advantage to be able to target in a larger opportunities offshore to people, staff, busy building new relationships. Well, an added benefits in working oversees, however, is that while the U.S. clients typical as they like to pigeon hole architects in the U.S. into specialties who cannot move from one project target to another. We're always encouraging our international clients who remark on our level of qualifications. "You're architects, aren't you?" Very refreshing source which can some times, all of us, the first opportunities to get into building types internationally which eventually become the basis for doing work elsewhere

than the United States. A couple of additional benefits to working outside the United States are that it teaches us awareness to different cultures that turns into the rest of the practice. In the past, we have always prided ourselves on not bringing pre-conceived notions to our project. Now through our international experiences, RTKL has achieved a heightened sense of cultural sensitivity. That has made us a better listener in this country. It has also worked in reverse on our own experience with some of the markets in other parts of the world in which it was again paid dividends to the firm for its international investments everyday.

Lance Josal: Thanks Bin. So its diversity and people. Its diversity and location. That is, applying the people to different locations around the world where we see opportunities, and I guess, the third p in this subset will be addressed by Harold Thompson. It is all about diversity of projects and the types of projects we work on. Harold, from its very beginning, RTKL has always tried to keep a diversity in project types. In an era of more specialization in the field of architecture design do you anticipate it to become more incumbent upon RTKL to shed some of its project types and specialize in fewer design types of interest? Or what are your thoughts on that?

Harold Thompson: Well, no Lance. I think, actually, its just the opposite of that and you mentioned that I have sort-of come into architecture as a career change from the business world and really our portfolio of projects [128] is handled in much the same way that you handle an investment portfolio where diversity really is the key, and as I know and all of you guys know, having been in the recruiting environment, trying to find a job when maybe the economy is bad, or when its good. I was fortunate to get out of school at A&M in ’97 when the economy was really strong and jobs were prevalent. But the point of that is that our business is very tied to the

economy, and goes up and down with the economy, but one of the things that diversity allows us is that just as certain segments of the economy are counter-cyclical, that's true of our portfolio as well. And it really has helped us, I think, to smooth out some of the rough edges over the many years that our firm has been in existence. The other thing too that I would say about that Lance, is that, I know from my own personal experience and I think everyone from RTKL would agree that just from a selfish standpoint it makes our jobs a lot more interesting to be involved in a wide variety of projects. I've been at RTKL now for six years, and I work primarily in the retail group, the commercial sector, but over that six year period, I've on probably every project type that the firm works on. And it really just makes life a lot more interesting. I think that the risk is you don't want to become a sort-of "jack of all trades, and a master of none." You really want to be a master of everything that you participate in. And that's certainly, I'm proud to say, has been a philosophy of RTKL over the years that I've known it is that the management of the firm makes decisions that really position us in sectors so that we are a leader in every sector. Just about four years ago we made a strategic acquisition of a healthcare firm so that our healthcare group really could be positioned strategically in a leadership role in that market. And that really is how we approach every sector that we participate in. I think what that does is it allows us to establish an expertise in every one of these sectors, and that's not only a broad expertise in healthcare or retail, but it also manifests itself in sort-of niche areas of expertise as well. For example, in retail, we are known, as Mr. Adams mentioned, for mixed-use projects which have a strong retail component. Life-style. Outdoor life-style centers for example, have been sort-of the trend in retail for the last few years and we're known as an expert in that type of retail development. So, I think it really allows us to establish ourselves as experts in these various opportunities. The mixed-use opportunities that Mr. Adams referred to are very important for us

because, as an expert, for example, in housing and an expert, for example, in retail, we become, automatically, the go-to firm when a developer wants to develop a mixed-use project that has housing, retail, commercial, office space – whatever it might be. And there are some really exciting opportunities in that mixed-use realm that we see on the horizon for example, interacting with healthcare and some of our other sectors. I guess I'd just conclude by saying that the risk of that, by becoming an expert in these areas and really getting comfortable with our position in these sectors, the risk is that you sort-of become stale. And that is certainly something that we work very hard to prevent. We push the envelop to the extent that we can and we work with some of the best clients in the world and the country that allow us to push the envelop design-wise and in many other ways. So that keeps us on our toes, and really, I think, helps our product. And the final thing I would say, just as kind of a manifestation of the importance of this diversity in our firm, the Dallas office, last year, for example, in the Dallas AIA awards, won six awards four un-built awards and two built awards and in fact, in the un-built category, we swept that category. We won every single award that was awarded by the Dallas AIA. What was really unique about that and I think something that we were especially proud of is that those awards ran the gamut from large scale, master planning projects to an Olympic competition for a stadium in Beijing to a small park and pavilion in Ft. Worth to an office tower in London. In fact, the jurors, I think, were amazed when they realized that they had awarded four awards to the same firm because they were from such a diverse project type. So, I think that was something we were really proud of because it really emphasizes the fact that in Dallas and throughout the firm, we are flexible and we are able to work on multiple projects and multiple project types, and I think that makes us a better firm and a more interesting place to work.

Lance Josal: Great. Thanks Harold. In fact they wanted to go back and take some of the awards back and re-allocate them so those design juries are some very interesting things go on there sometimes as I'm sure some of you are already aware. Well, I'm going to address a few additional questions to our panelists here, but as I mentioned at the very beginning, if there are things that you all specifically because I see there are a lot of students here, there are a lot of active, I'm sure, practicing professionals here, if there are specific issues that you'd like to address, I can have RTKL's version of Vanna White here, Thom McKay, go grab a microphone and kind of move it around. Or, if you'd like, you can just stand up and queue up at microphone. We can address some issues, and if we can't address it here on the panel, we'll ask Harold or Paul Jacob or any of the other people might be with us to address it. So, keep that in mind so that, you know, the subject matter we hit are the things that you most want to talk about. I'm going to address. I've noticed that Dianne is a woman. And I'm also noticing, as I look across the audience, that there's at least 20% women in this crowd, in the audience. And so a question that I guess I have for Dianne is – why don't you see more women in the practice of architecture?

Dianne Black: Is Bruce Bockhorn here somewhere? Hey Bruce. I want to know about the answer to that question. You guys may know that Bruce is actually won an award, the Jonathan King award, at least once, maybe twice for his research on getting more women and minority participation in architecture schools. I don't know why there aren't more women to tell you the truth Lance. [212] I mean, this is a fabulous profession. I think people ask me frequently this question because I'm still kind-of a minority for my generation. I'm hoping as time goes by that really you guys are going to reach a better level of sort-of equity, but I think that question actually leads to the next question which is, well how can you have a family and do all that. And my

advice to everyone in the group whether you're a man or a woman, is it is far more important about the spouse that you choose than the career that you choose and how you will work together to solve your everyday problems over the next 50 years of life together.

Lance Josal: And your husband is?

Dianne Black: He's an architect also.

Lance Josal: Good. Congratulations. We have two architects in the same family. That's terrific. But I know that there's a real balancing act that goes on because we see it in the practice. Its, there is more. There are more pressures, I think, on women architects than there are on men, frankly. And especially if they choose to raise a family, so I think it is a key issue it is just something you need to plan out, and I invite all of you young women that are planning to get into the field of architecture maybe take some time after the conference. Talk to Dianne about it because she might be able to answer a lot of those types of questions.

Dianne Black: Yea. I would say one thing that actually did work well in terms of my professional career and maybe this is one piece of advice which was, I was fairly well established with RTKL before I started having children. And I think you want to have some of your career kind-of under your belt in terms of development before you have to spend time getting started with the family and everything so.

Lance Josal: Bob, do you have a question.

Bob Johnson: Yea, well I want to encourage everyone to line up behind these microphones, so let me start with a question for Harold. You went through business school at the University of Texas and that was, you probably had some team-oriented courses there. Most architecture courses are not team oriented, and when you get into practice however it is very collaborative oriented, particularly RTKL, and so. I was wondering, from your perspective as someone, not only your experiences, but seeing other people going from architecture school into a very collaborative practice, are there any problems that students have, going from architecture school into a very collaborative situation.

Harold Thompson: There are some problems. Obviously architecture is a creative profession. Anytime your involved in a creative profession, you have egos to deal with, and I think that's one problem that is prevalent in architecture firms. But, I think, for our firm, team work and collaboration really are one in the same, and when we take on a new project, for example, we set up project teams that really do work very well together. For example, I primarily work in project management, but the teams that I help manage are comprised of, first of all, a partner in charge that is very involved, in not only usually securing the job, but then client development and to the extent that we need, expertise along the way, they are always available. So, a VIP in charge, a project manager, or project architect, who's really responsible for the more technical nuances of the project and then a lead project designer and then below those four key people, within a project team, are a full staff of people – whatever the project dictates. Some projects don't dictate additional staff and others do. But I think that by setting up that structure for every single project, it is very clear what work responsibilities are, however having said that, there's a lot of

crossover. I'm a project manager, but I make design decisions everyday. The point is, though, that I know what my limitations are and I know when to ask questions. I know when to go to other members of the team, and I think that's true really of designers and projects architects as well. There's a lot of crossover, and RTKL makes a point in training new hires and in training new people to try to give them a broad exposure to different facets of a project so, even if you're skills would imply that you're more design-oriented than technically-oriented or management-oriented, we try to give new hires to the firm, a good broad exposure so that when you finally find your place in the firm as a lead designer, you've had some exposure to production and to technical aspects of a job so that you really bring to that role bits and pieces of the other roles as well. So, I'm not sure if that really answers your question, but collaboration and teamwork really are one in the same for us, and that's important for every single project that we do.

Lance Josal: We have a question over here.

Student: Well, ya'll were talking about diversity. I kind-of what to know more about the design diversity. Harold Adams was talking about the multi-use development where you. How do you incorporate different design aspects, you know, very diverse uses, into one project.

Lance Josal: I can answer a little bit of that, and then if you've got…you know if somebody wants to jump in after that please feel free. Harold was talking about the mixed-use projects, and the way we got involved in those was our preeminence in retail design in the early years, as that market place really started to verge, started to develop as a building type. And what was happening was, there were a number of mixed-use projects being built. It is a great question, by the

way. That had, that were not doing particularly well, and sort-of failed. They were more-or-less super blocks but not mixed-use developments, if you understand what I mean or the subtle difference between the two. And what developers started recognize or understand was that retail is the glue that held all these different uses together. So, you come into New York or Washington, D.C. and you could buy a block of property and you could have plans to develop hotels or residential or office or anything else above that space, but it was really what happened at the base of that project that made or broke the projects. So, it became the glue. And so what happened as a result of our experience in retail and our understanding as to how people use retail projects and the dynamic that draws people from one side of the building to another. What works for the retailers, to make them successful, at the same time, was what got us involved in some of those mixed-use projects, so it was very easy. Once we sort-of planned out the base of the building, to then come along and say, "well, yea, we want a hotel on top – 250 rooms – you all do hotels don't you?" Oh yea, sure, right, yea. And that's where we're at. And now we're in. We're doing hotels. We're doing office buildings. And we're doing a number of other things. Very complex, urban environments that really open a door to allow us to leverage those into other types of projects. Does that answer your question? That's kind-of how it started.

Dianne Black: Yea, I wanted to say one other thing about design diversity although that could be a whole day by itself, but the collaborative nature of the way we work.. I don't want to forget to bring the clients into that collaborative process because our designs are very much a reflection of our clients and their objectives and so there's a lot of diversity in our design. You can't look and say, "This is RTKL's style." And part of that reason is because the client is just as much a

part of the vision and the expression of the architecture as we are, and that's one of the things that is very exciting to us in terms of having diversity in our design.

Lance Josal: Anything else.

Harold Thompson: Well, I was just going to say that that's born out by the award example that I used earlier. Just the diversity of the projects, when you look at them, you would never know that they came from the same firm, and really, you know, from a relatively small group of designers in our office, these very different projects came about, and largely driven, some by program and some by clients, but largely just driven by the creative energy of the people in our office.

Lance Josal: Great. Good question. Yes sir.

Jeff Haberl: Yes, my name is Jeff Haberl. I'm on the faculty here at A&M. As an educator, I'm always interested in feedback from former students and from architects who are out practicing, and I guess, from where you sit, what do you think in terms of what kind of a job are we doing, what sort of things do we need to do different based on things you're seeing. Different. Are you really seeing a lot of people asking for green buildings? Are you really seeing a lot of people asking to get out there and measure the performance of these buildings? Or is it just a bunch of smoke and mirrors and people are interested in the design and not the performance?

Lance Josal: Great. There are two or three questions there. [339] I think, you want to address the green issue first, Dianne?

Dianne Black: Yea. The sustainability issue is coming on. And green architecture, certainly. I work in the public sector, and those objectives are very important to the government entities that I work for, and I think that from RTKL's perspective, we really believe in the sustainability stuff because it starts way back at site selection, and as urban planners, we like to start way back at site selection, and move all the way through the process. So, is it a differentiator? It is a differentiator for some of our project types. My thought on the job as educators is just make sure you encourage kids, all of you students, to get out and practice while you're in college because you have an advantage when you're interviewing if you can show that you've made a commitment to actually working in firms on your way through school.

Harold Thompson: [352] And Jeff, I would say to you that certainly, my experience at A&M, especially with regard to the courses that you taught and many others as well. Have served me very well, and in fact, every time I interact with an MEP consultant or review MEP shop drawings or whatever, I think of you Jeff. And thank you for the good experience.

Lance Josal: If he's an expert on coordinating mechanical engineering, we need to bring him to the office because, as you know, Jeff, I mean, coordination of documents between from one discipline to the next whether it is MEP or whatever is key to what architects and design professionals are tripping over every day these days. Every single day it's a very important aspect and you know, one thing I would add, and I'd offer it up to all you young student architects

that are here as well, is it is. We see. As we interview people. As we look at some of the best talent coming out of some of the best universities, and Texas A&M is definitely in that realm as we look at people, sometimes they get caught up in technology or they get caught up to far in how a design would manifest itself in a three-dimensional wire frame or I don't know, three dimensional computer model and that's great. And it shows the talent and the diversity and there's great things that are happening there, and it is all great. But sometimes the things that impress us the most, and I talk for Paul and Harold and the rest of us is, sometimes it is that really sketchy, pencil line drawing that very crisply and succinctly describes an idea that makes all the difference between... Just like the little sketch that Harold put up on the slide projector a few minutes ago, makes all the difference. It is very impressive. You would be surprised. There are very few people that can think and very concisely draw those ideas on a just a real quick sketch on a pad of paper. And if you can do that, you are indispensable to a project team. Any project team on any type of project you wish to pursue. It is an important asset that all of you should think about. Here's a gentleman with a question.

Student: In conjuction with the question asked by Dr. Haberl, Your firm has been here more than three decades, can you. Are you, like pioneering in sustainable architecture? Can you form help towards a better environment which we can build up. We are all doing research work related to sustainable buildings, energy conscious buildings, but outside. When we go out to practice, we hardly find this kind of architecture being practiced or even the clients are really not keen to do. They'd rather prefer a very spectacular building. No matter what the cost, rather than going for a more humble kind of an architecture. Do you think your firm, since it is such a large firm, can help towards achieving this kind of a goal.

Lance Josal: [404] Great question. Good question. Another sustainability question. Anybody want to take a shot at addressing that.

Harold Thompson: Well, I think a lot of that really relates to helping or us helping educate our clients which often times, if we can educate clients on how beneficial sustainable design issues are to their project, they are more than open to it, but a lot of them just aren't really informed. And I think that goes back to a bigger problem [409] really for architects is that we, we do need to be more socially active and socially responsible and involved more in trying to push the profession forward and part of that is just what you're asking. Its making our products better and more socially acceptable and socially recognized and I think that's incumbent upon us as a large firm and all the other large firms really in the country to try to educate our client-base better than we do.

Bin Cao: One interesting story is, like. Last year when we were involved in that Beijing Olympic design competition for Olympic Village and national stadium design. Specifically, for the program, the client, they asked for some green architecture, green design. I mean, we are very glad to hear about that because we are, have, in our firm focused a lot on this how to make the building, the green building design and we have a lot of knowledge about that so that's one of the reasons, I mean, we can provide. If we prepare them, we can give the client what he wants and also give them more than what they expect.

Lance Josal: Yea. Sure.

Harold Adams: (adding commentary on subject, but comments cannot be heard on the tape)

Lance Josal: Yea. Great.

Harold Thompson: And one of the things I'd just add on that to is. One thing I think we're all proud of is that throughout RTKL in all of our offices, there is an effort to establish sustainable design committees and try to have more architects on staff that are LEED certified and that really have those interests at heart when they approach a design project so that's something that is in the works in all the offices and I think will take on more prominence when we move forward.

Lance Josal: Right. I think one of the things that we bring to the table that a lot of other architecture firms don't bring to the table is what Harold just touched on. Which is the master planning. Trying to plan suburban sprawl out of some of our projects, and the second thing, don't forget, re-use of existing buildings and the energy's already been spent to create those buildings is a great way to build a sustainable project. So that's another thing that can be implemented.

Dianne Black: I just wanted to support our pitch to, when you go back to the studio, you can go visit our website, and you can see our Baltimore office because the building was designed with a lot of sustainable features and the good news, from our prospective, is we got to involve all the disciplines. Anybody who has done any research into LEEDs will see that a lot of the credits are actually more mechanical systems and things where we integrate with other disciplines and its

actually a commercial interiors pilot project for LEEDs. And, so I think Harold brought up the right point which is we have to help our clients be educated. That's a spec. We live in a spec office building. We are actually doing a couple of other spec office buildings that are also sustainable feature projects.

Lance Josal: That's great. There seems to be a lot of interest in sustainability with students at every level in every university we go to. I think this gentleman here was here first.

Student: Hi. My name is Nibel Samuel (?). I'm a graduate student. I would just like to pull us back to the issue on diversity. Last semester I got to work on a project which needed us to work as teams. In fact the entire studio worked as teams. It was a wonderful experience. So, I was just wondering if probably someone could elaborate on the composition of a design team. For instance, I know that people from different professions will come in here so that you're working with people from other professions and people from other cultures too. If you can just give us a hint on the secret. Thank you.

Lance Josal: Do you want to repeat that question. First.

Harold Thompson: Well, I think the question was, just correct me if I'm wrong, but the question was how is diversity brought into a project team and how does that help us with the end result. Is that sort of essentially what it was? Dianne do you?

Dianne Black: Yea. I think you are asking a lot of questions. Well, there's a whole broad range of things there, but yes, we do have different disciplines that will come into the discussion, but I think the more interesting one that you brought up is the difference of say, cultures, or very different perspectives. And P.J., Paul brought up the fact that we try to be very open in our communications, and I will say that that's a challenge. Sometimes people really do challenge one another, but we have taught ourselves to be honest with each other and to recognize that sometimes we're going to have differences that push the envelop in a positive way and sometimes its not necessarily in a positive way but it is always. We try to be as honest with each other as possible in bringing the team together and having diversity in the discussion because we actually believe that's where innovation comes from. [500]

Lance Josal: The more voices heard from, the better decisions you'll make.

Speaker off-mic, Paul Jacobs ??:

Lance Josal: And a great kind-of follow up question to that one would be, do you design as American architects in China? Or do you design what the Chinese would expect to see in their culture in China? And that's another question. It would be an interesting one to pose to this group. Yes sir.

David Woodcock: Hello, my name is David Woodcock. I'm on the faculty here and I've managed to get Harold Adams involved in historic American building survey project, but there's a team building technique, if ever there was one. My question really involves this issue of re-use

and Lance, you've already sort of hinted at it. The early RTKL office was one of the revitalizing elements of the inner harbor in Baltimore, and Harold showed the Amstel in Amsterdam as one of the sort of key projects, how important do you think the re-use, re-vitalization market is going to be, both here and abroad in terms of diversity of project. I probably could have asked this question with any three of the panels, but you're the ones that are stuck with it.

Lance Josal: Great question David.

Dianne Black: We actually believe that's going to be a bigger issue because, like you said, we're urban planners and we like the idea of making sure that there's a vital city center and re-using buildings for real uses so I think we actually believe that we are sort of on the cusp on that. You know I mean that our community is on the cusp of it. I think you remember when there were good tax credits and all kind of things that would help people do that, and I think that we might be lucky enough to see some return to that so that developers will be encouraged to try some of those things.

Harold Thompson: I was just going to add to that David that the bottom line with any developer is does the project work financially and so it is incumbent upon us to help them to achieve those goals by designing efficiently and designing well and giving them ideas that really make good use of existing buildings.

Dianne Black: And I'm glad you brought that up because I always joke about the fact that RTKL to us, that sustainable design means that it is financially viable for the next decade. And I

think we're actually good at helping a developer find something that will be financially successful.

Lance Josal: In China, it is a little different situation though. Isn't it Bin? I mean, they're not re-using a lot of buildings there.

Bin Cao: I mean it is too different. The situation right now there. And I think that's just asking a question about I mean are we going to design like Americans in China. Definitely not, but I mean, the reason we are involved in that market is that right now there are a lot of opportunities over there. On one hand, those clients there, they are, they want some very good design. They want the best architects in the whole world to give them the best design over there. So, that's the reason, I mean, we're talking about on one hand, we, RTKL, we have very high standards of design. We have a lot of very high standard things. We need to keep that. On the other hand, we have two kind-of try to adjust ourselves. Try to fit into that market. Try to grow in that market. But during. By doing that also we can learn a lot of things new. I mean, maybe it is a real benefit of our practice here in the States too. I think that it is kind-of a dynamic process. We learn something, we change something, but we still keep some of our best things over there. I mean that's the reason they want us to be there because they like the things we have been doing there and they like the high standard things we have been produced.

Lance Josal: Yea. I think, just to recap this kind of subject and put a bow around this one is in Asia or at least in China, we don't see a lot of tendencies for re-use from the buildings unless there is some antiquity involved, I guess. In Europe it is just the polar opposite, and as you know

and in London and some of those other, you know. We're doing a number of projects throughout the U.K. that where city's re-genderfication is the main, kind-of political stand that anybody gets elected on there. And it is all about trying to re-use and re-vitalize the existing city centers. Here in this country, it is sort of a hit-or-miss. And what I think is interesting is a lot of these office buildings that were built and may never be used again as office buildings are starting to be looked at as new uses. Because you just can't build 50 story offices and fill them up anymore. Class B and C space is now being looked at as being recycled into potentially residential uses or other uses, and I think that's a far, far more interesting direction that I think the industry is going to start taking. Mainly in the shell. The whole skin of the building comes off and just the structure is re-used. Or it may mean that, if there are operable windows and things, you can reuse the whole skin and just go in and reformat it. But that's. We're seeing that in Dallas right now, but in a number of cities where real estate's hit rock bottom, those things are starting to make sense to our clients now. Question over here. [613]

Student: Hi. My name is Sachit Balak. I'm a graduate student and my question is somewhat you'll talk about globally. In terms of what is your global agenda? In terms of what countries are you really looking at …

Lance Josal: Full global domination. We want to be the next villain in the next 007 movie.

Audience: Laughter

Student: There's a large focus on Asia and on China. I was lucky to do a study on China in terms of the architecture that was there. Now I'm talking about what is your methodology when you go into a place where ya'll don't have anybody. Where you don't know anybody? Do you look to tying up with… do you look shopping for what do you call it…showing for projects or do you look for architects where you can tie up with?

Lance Josal: Yea. I guess if I understand. I think I heard the question right, and I think what I heard you ask is, when you go into a new geography or you go someplace new, how do you get a foothold in that market? How do you, how do we, RTKL, that is, how do we establish ourselves as a design presence in that geography. I think…is that right? [635]

Student: Yea.

Bin Cao: Yes. I think there are a couple of things. One is like Paul and Harold mentioned earlier. We have, I mean, because of our firm's culture, we have all kinds of people from all kinds of different cultures. We have a lot of very talented people, like… There are a lot of talented people that come to the states to go to graduate school here, and RTKL recruits a lot of some very talented people. When the opportunity comes, it has become to our firm's advantage if we can have some people that understand the local culture, and they have some kind of connections with some of the local consultants, architects to help us set-up our foot over there. To start practicing in that market.

Harold Thompson: I think it also goes back to the core concept of design. I don't know the number, but I would guess that a lot of our Chinese work has come just from the reputation that was established by the science center that was such a great building and got so much publicity that it was a building that set us up as a reputable and sought-after firm in China, so it goes back to the core of design, I think, in a lot of ways too.

Lance Josal: We're just like any other business. We try and lead off with our strengths and if that market place is calling out for retail or if its hospitality or if its master planning, that's what we'll lead off with, but that will give us the opportunity to open it up and go another direction.

Paul Jacob: We're going to take a break. Actually, I know I see more people there so I would suggest. I know there are people out there who probably need to take a break, so let's take a break, and Bob, how long is the break? So, say 20 minutes. Let's be back in 20 minutes. We'll pick up right where we left off. [676]

Bob Johnson: off mic. Not on tape

Lance Josal: We'll try to move into. We've changed the entire conference around so what… Let me try to explain what we're going to do. It was very obvious that we were getting some really good questions and we were really happy to see that we were getting questions from the audience because that's really what we would like to do and have that interaction, but everybody from our panels who were later scheduled were telling me they wanted to answer some of the questions too, and we realized that it is very hard to kind of segment like in our practice the

questions into any specific category so, what I'm going to do is that we had a couple of slides on design that I wanted to present, and then what I really want to do is get the diversity panel back up and then the panel that we were going to have for design and to have everybody, essentially, up on the stage so we've got more chairs and an additional table so that essentially the entourage that is here from RTKL can have at any of your questions which I think will be better so why don't everybody come up at this point in time. And sit down. We realize we needed a bigger team to answer your questions so, we're collaborating here. Just to kind-of introduce the little design and does design matter aspect. I've just got a couple of slides. I'm really doing this just to kind of set up what we see out there in the world, and what it means to us from design, and it will be interesting to see how they sit. The one thing you can tell at any corporate meeting is where somebody sits. It will tell you loads about the meeting, and its just not in China. It is also in the United States believe me. There's a chair.

Discussion: off mic

Paul Jacob: Okay. Design does matter. That's certainly what we're all about anyway. And we think there actually is a new designs like ours actually out there in the world. [729]

End of Side A, Tape 2

Beginning of side B, Tape 2

Continue Paul Jacob: …and operating and wonderful times because design has really invaded the culture, our total culture. Its as you can see here, good design has really become a differentiator for products from target to any kinds of car manufacturing the aspect of design really is considered important. Years ago really that wasn't. We can also get into this whole other debate about the commoditization of some of our commercial world and have this debate about walmart and design. I think that's a fascinating thing we could go on down. But anyway, its out there. Design is a topic of conversation. And also if we just watch the television shows you really do see, especially on non-network television, the whole proliferation of shows talking about various aspects of designs and we continue to see the rise of celebrity in architects. Either in individuals and projects or in processes of the world trade center. So design, we think, is really accessible out in the world right now. Which is a perfect opportunity for us to kind of move into that so we have this growing interest in the design profession and that we think spans really not just architecture but talks about interior design, industrial design all those aspects that we believe is the totality of the things that we do. Also there is cultural changes itself in terms of demographics we talked a little bit about women in the market place and women in the design marketplace certainly. It is a global world now in terms of design. It is not the United States. It is not any one particular area that really is ideas come from around the world now and that there is this kind of universal language from design that really does transcend all those verbal problems we have in trying to communicate. Design is a universal language. So at RTKL we know we've got to keep attracting the best and the brightest to play in that world. And kind of an interesting thing, we think we needed to find this great design beyond a thing of beauty. Well certainly, beauty has its place in design and should be in design, but its also more than the built environment. It has to go beyond that. Its not beauty for beauty's sake. Its beauty inherent in something that functions.

And then, really important for us and even though I was hired out of school as a designer back in 1970 when the company was departmentalized a little bit more, I was brought into the company and placed into a production group for a while to get a grounding in how buildings went together. And I think that the way that has evolved through the years at RTKL is really seeing design as a continuum. From meeting the client, investigating the client, understand where your market wants to be to being in the place that you designed. So all, through all that process – from concepts, schematics, working through consultant information, working out a program with the client, developing the design, understanding the materials. That's where the whole sustainability comes in. That its really a continuum and you really have to understand that entire process. And then to continue to cross pollinate among sectors, I think the, one of the interesting things in terms of an earlier question on diversity of design – we're finding really neat kinds of synergies when you bring a hospitality expert in to design a healthcare project. And they talk about the guests and your beginning to see now in healthcare the opportunity to really change the image of a hospital in terms of something that provides much more comfort to a person who needs that and I think we can bring people from those different disciplines and different sectors into bear in early design conversations that really magnifies the kinds of ideas that you can think of. And then one thing that you know what profitability can do is it can drive time and energy and money to allocate the resources for an R&D and I think that's important. That's one of the reasons, aside, putting taking care of money in our pockets and taking care of our families, being profitable also allows you to invest back into the company. Either R&D or growing, investing in our leaders, or moving into new markets. So, with that, that was just kind of setting up design to show what we're all about and then just to some of this we'll just kind of give you some idea of kind of what's on the boards or kind of new thinking. This is a music menu in Shanghai or Bei-

jing. Singapore Embassy. Some of our hospitality work. Some retail work believe it or not. Okay. Some questions. So, I just wanted to kind of set that to kind of move us into design program. We have some questions that were going but you know, I really like those people who were ready to ask a question to come on back up and I think we have a larger panel now to address some of your questions and I'll try to facilitate. [65]

Student: Hi my name is Pradeep and I'm a graduate student here. [Student is off-mic and impossible to clearly hear the question] …approaching a design problem…

Paul Jacob: Okay. Enrico, take a shot at that?

Enrico Francisco: Well, we first of all, we don't try to spread around our way of doing things. If we go I think some of the individuals spread the issue of how do you design abroad. We don't take the American way of doing things abroad. We don't do that. We usually, we try to understand and study what that other culture is and add to that our expertise. So that's the way we try to do things when we work abroad. What ties it all together? I think exactly that, is that openness or that ability that interest in understanding what's going on in that other culture. That openness to absorb and digest, so to speak, that other culture and adds to that with what we bring from here, from the United States, from our experience here in this country. That's I think what brings it all together. You're not going to see a brand of architecture design. You're not going to see the RTKL style. That doesn't exist. You just saw some slides there. What ties it all together? A specific way of doing…is it a language of architecture? Not really. It is the approach that is behind it. And that approach is what I just described. [90]

Paul Jacob: I think that's good and if, by the side, I just want to say I think that's really important, it goes back to the kind of cultural things that I was talking about. The thing that ties this together is that approach to design and the philosophy of how we work together for the good of the firm. There really are no rules in terms of the first week you do this, the next month you do this, then you turn in the project. It really is, I think, an open investigative process that we bought into with a framework of management so that we can at the end get to an end game. A decision has to be made along the way, but it's a pretty open process. Anyone else?

Dianne Black: Yea. I was just going to say one other thing. I think that Harold talked about and you probably have heard it a little too much but that foundation of urban design – we love, our passion is for big complex, exciting projects where we bring a lot of people into the team and so I think that's one thing that really you know ties us together and I think that the whole you know title of our presentation is about how we pursue the best design projects and that's really what our passion is.

Paul Jacob: That side.

Student: Hi my name is Chintan Kesaria. I'm a graduate student from the Construction Science Department. And this question is for Mr. Harold Adams, so you were mentioning that you were pretty novice during the design-build project which RTKL had taken. I wanted to know about, I wanted him to share some of his experience for the design-build delivery system, and is, like how the history of RTKL, say that ya'll used to have consultants, engineering consultants and

mechanical engineering and plumbing consultants, and which later on ya'll turned it as in-house, are you going to have the same system for construction – that in the future ya'll are going to have construction services gonna be adopted by RTKL?

Harold Adams: off mic… We've worked in design-build projects before, but as architects working on a team, and the whole secret there is to select the construction firm that you're working with so that there's maximum trust of each other. Firms that we've worked in maybe in a bit more traditional way we've grown to respect them and have mutual respect. And that's what, I think, so wonderful about design-build is that it gives an opportunity for that extra dimension the construction team to be a part of the design team from the beginning because often the architects and the engineers do not understand the opportunities and the limitations. If the construction team is involved from the very beginning, we have often found that we may think we can't afford a product, or its too expensive, yet it is less expensive to install, so designers are being able to get a better design rather than a cheaper design. Its not about reduction in quality. And its making sure that you team with the right people, so it is just as we select people to work with our firm, its that selecting a comparable group of quality people in construction. So whether you're doing it as a lead or doing it in a sub-role, a sub-contract role, to a contractor, they can both work very well. It is that multiple-disciplinary respect for each other. [137]

Student: off mic

Paul Jacob: Well actually we investigated whether or not we would move into a design-build world. We investigated that, but the board-level say 10 years ago, raised those question. We cer-

tainly would only be interested in going down that path on a design-led, design-build process as opposed to a build-led, design-build process, but I think there was one slide Harold had up there that talked about branching out into other things – real estate development, construction management, and I think the focus of the firm right now really is in our design services. Now where we may go in the future? We're always opportunity-driven, but we're not right now at a point where we would invest in that. We would invest, as Harold said, in collaborating and associating with people and not actually pulling them into the company.

Thom McKay: Can I disagree with that?

Paul Jacob: Sure.

Thom McKay: Am I allowed to do that? It's always struck me as a little curious that

Paul Jacob: That's Thom McKay

Dianne Black: Diversity in action.

Paul Jacob: He use to work at the company.

Thom McKay: My brief career flamed-out this afternoon, but it was a great career while it lasted. I got to visit College Station. I've always found it curious that architecture is the only industry that separates design from manufacturing. If you look at the car industry or the airline

industry its all done in the same place with the same people in the same company and I don't know the history of it, but I think it probably split maybe a hundred, two-hundred years ago. It seems almost inevitable that it will come back together at some time in the future. Its also interesting that if you look at some of the delivery processes and approaches that we're taking outside the United States namely in the U.K. right now. We are getting very, very, very close to working in a design-build format. There's an initiative in the U.K. called PFI – Private Finance Initiative – where they're delivering a lot of their roads and infrastructure as well as their hospitals, and its really a type of modified design-build approach which is really quite interesting. You know, I think one of the things that whenever you say the word design-build to an architect, they seize up because it seems that they're going to loose design control, but I think, as Harold said, when you can find the mutual respect somewhere there's going to be a connection between the two someday.

Harold Adams: (begins off-mic) …hope to help answer that question a little more. It's all about risk-taking. If you read a recent book that AIA published on architect-led design-build, there are a number of chapters in there, and I did the forward of that book. Architects have a lot to learn. We have traditionally stayed in sort-of our box, and for insurance reasons and various reasons we stayed in our box. And there was this other box, and over the years it became a conflict between design and construction. Design-build offers a way to pull people together, but with the firm we're taking baby steps to learn the process of risk-taking, and I realize the risk from that one little project that we did at the capitol, you know, that we could have been, if it hadn't worked, we would have been in real trouble when the President can't speak. Speak for yourself.

Audience: laughter

Harold Adams: But its huge financial risk, and architects generally don't have the kind of net worth that they can step in and take that risk. And they don't understand it, so we need to take a lot of baby steps to understand it. To learn. And its going to take time for firm's like ours and any architectural firm to become big players in design-build unless you're a wild gambler like Chuck Thomsen.

Audience: laughter

Paul Jacob: Thank you.

Student: I'm Christina Cox, an undergraduate bachelors environmental design student. I wanted to be the first woman to ask a question.

Audience: laughter

Paul Jacob: Alright. Come on..

Audience: applause

Student: My question, we've touched on the fact that when you design in another culture, you design for that culture, but we've also talked about the fact that when we design, we design with

influences that we've taken from other cultures for where we are, but in the future, in this world of high speed trains, internet, email, cell phones… the world is getting smaller and smaller. In the future will you be designing not so much for that individual culture but more for the global economy.

Paul Jacob: Great question. Tom?

Tom Trenelone: Well…

Thom McKay: This Thom or that Tom?

Paul Jacob: Not you, you've had your time.

Thom McKay: Okay.

Audience: Laughter

Tom Trenelone: I think that's the hardest one somebody has asked today so far, but I really don't know because, I'm going to try to say that, probably our design process is a little bit of, and its an oxymoron in a way. As a firm, we're very humble and at the same time we have a great deal of, I would just say, confidence. And I would say that every single process that we go through, regardless of economies of scale or anything like that it starts out just like you do here in studio. I mean, we go through our research of what we're trying to find in a culture or eco-

nomic indicators, anything like that that's going to inform that design. I mean, the possibility for that is yea, we could get this thing where its generic architecture that you see all over the place. Lots of big firms like us tend to get that label a little bit, but I think the one thing that happens in RTKL as a design culture, at least, the fact that this humility that I talked about is the fact that we look to other practitioners to inform our design. And that means practitioners everywhere. And it can be something as simple as just, you know, a terra cotta glazing system from Europe to, you know, using bamboo from China. And these things can be intertwined like you said, I mean, I guess maybe the fact that becoming like a smaller world in the fact that, yea, I'd like to spec bamboo floors just about everywhere in the world that I can put them. It's a sustainable material. Terra cotta's the same way. I mean, it works great in just about every climate except for in the frigid north. I don't know. I'm kind of dancing around your question. You've really stumped me, and I'm kind of on the spot. But I would say that, that's the only thing I can tell you is that from the idea of us looking and, the other thing is that everybody here is very worldly I don't know a single person at the table that hasn't traveled all over the world, and I can say that the only thing that can do for you is create a much more informed and the quantity of experience as experimentation that the firm brings to any project usually leads to the quality of the design. I think I've danced around your question, but I'm sorry, you got me stumped.

Paul Jacob: This is called the Texas Two-Step. Its okay. Dan, do you want to take a shot?

Dan Killebrew: Well, to think globally, it always has to start in a sense at home. If you can't design well locally, you're not going to design well globally either. And I think it starts almost with the individual and there are basic human rights which we consider. And this sounds almost

like a preamble or something, that almost seem inalienable, the provision of health, the protection of safety, and the provision for a person's welfare. And these things become spiritual and emotional as well as just very physical in nature, but in seeking the appropriate solutions that Tom was eloquently communicating as far as those elements that inform the design solutions, we really do feel like it has to start with the individual, with the people that are going to be there and use the facility or the park or the place that we're involved in the design of. And regardless of whether its in Shanghai or Beijing or Tulsa, Oklahoma, it needs to happen as though it's a unique opportunity to create a solution for that particular enterprise. [249]

Paul Jacob: Enrico?

Enrico Francisco: Just this morning I was talking with P.J. about a film that I happened to watch yesterday, and I highly recommend that you all go and see it when it comes out. Its called *My Architect.* This is a film that Louis Kahn's son created over 5 years and as you might know, Louis Kahn had three families when he died 30 years ago and this film was created by his son who didn't know much of his dad. So this film was made as a way for him to, for this son to start to sort of find out more about his dad. He went to buildings that he had designed and built. He met people that had worked with his dad. Associates, collaborators and in that way, that process gave him a little more insight into that man that was something like a mystical figure to him. Well, I'm telling you this because Nathaniel Kahn he goes to Dhaka, to see the capitol, those fantastic buildings that Louis Kahn built at the end of his career. Those buildings were designed and built more than 30 years ago, and today, they have perhaps even more of a powerful presence than they had when they were just finished – when they had been finished 30 years ago. So,

you see, Louis Kahn, first sketched forms similar to those buildings that were built in the Seventies in Dhaka when he was working in Philadelphia in the Forties, I believe. That goes back to what Dan was talking about. You have to know how to do it best here locally, and then you take it abroad. Louis Kahn was investigating those forms that language of architecture. He took it abroad. It became our permanent, became of that place, because it was so good, and to this day, we admire that. We look at that architecture as inspiration. And I like to think that what we are doing is more or less the same thing. We're not doing things, we try not to do things simply that follow a trend, a current trend, but we try to look back at what we have done. We try to use our resources, as Dianne was saying, we are at the core, urban planners, urban designers. I am one myself. So that roots our work. Here and also abroad. We try to seek for what is permanent, and take some of that abroad. So, with that, what is globalization? That word didn't exist when Louis Kahn was doing those buildings thirty years ago. The word is new, yet, those buildings are still a reference point. I don't know, maybe we can trace some parallels there. And once again, as I said before, I highly recommend the film. Its one of the, its up for the Oscars. [293]

Paul Jacob: Yea. Best documentary.

Enrico Francisco: Please, go see it. It is wonderful.

Paul Jacob: Thank you. Let me, what I didn't do is introduce the four new panelist. You just heard from Enrico Frederico who's from the Dallas office, designer. You met Bin and Dianne and Harold. Thom McKay, its Thom with a "Th" – he's an instigator. He's our director of marketing though he hates for me to say he's a revolutionary. You know in Shakespeare they have

the fool. He used to have that on his business card actually, and if you really know Shakespeare that was really the person who spoke the most wise sayings in the plays so always listen to the fool.

Thom McKay: That's why everyone's terrified.

Paul Jacob: Dan Killebrew is the designer and architect in the Dallas office and Tom Trenelone, a designer, also in the Dallas office.

Jeff Haberl: In the first question I asked, I mentioned it quickly, but I'll focus on this question – several years back there was some emphasis on performance-based architecture, and then it kind-of went away, and now green architecture's back and who knows how long it will be around. But the clear thing that was different between performance-based architecture and green architecture was that performance-based architecture was actually a mechanism to make more money for architects, and I'm wondering what happened to that? I know that several of the projects that were suppose to be performance-based, I didn't see much documentation on them. In Austin, the Robert E. Johnson building was suppose to be a performance-based architecture building, had terrible problems in getting it off the ground and in some selections for some of the materials in it. Is RTKL still pursuing performance-based architecture, is anybody talking about it anymore?

Paul Jacob: Dianne?

Dianne Black: I can safely say that we are not focused on the phrase of performance-based architecture, I mean, so I would say it is not a leading-edge thought in our processes, but I think sustainable design, I hope it is not something that's going to fall by the wayside. I'm old enough to remember, when I was in architecture school, there was a lot of attention to energy saving that was politically a time when we were trying to use less energy and things and I'm actually glad to see its come back and I really hope that it will stay.

Paul Jacob: Dan, do you want to talk about it from a healthcare perspective?

Dan Killebrew: As, well as commercial architects, in general, I focus, I do focus on healthcare. I do hospitals, but we do find that there is a performance that is required and it may very well not be the kind of performance you're talking about. It can just as likely be the financial viability of a particular facility to make money for its owner and we do encounter that as a great driver of a lot of the design solutions that we have. In a lot of our ambulatory care centers that we're designing across the country right now, there are certain aspects of volume through put for the number of patients they see per day, the number of people that will staff it, how many parking spaces you require, how much land they're going to have to buy. That's a performance of a whole different nature than I think what we've traditionally talked about in terms of performance-based design, but it is very much performance-based design.

Tom Trenelone: I just wanted to take the opportunity to go back to your question you had earlier about what are we doing to promote sustainable design. I mean, because I think it's a huge, its really, really important. I was sitting over there, I was dying to talk to you about this and it

seems like a good segue. I don't know if you're familiar, but recently, you know, we are considered like the retail expert amongst most of the large firms in the country, but recently, the LA forum held a competition called the "Dead Mall" competition, are you familiar with it? Well, if you know that a lot of regional malls all over the United States are all falling on hard times. They're not being fixed up, the tenets are moving out and all of a sudden we have these gigantic carcasses of dead malls just all over the place. And the idea that one of the things that we've been working on at RTKL from an idea standpoint is finding those malls that we've done that have fallen on hard times. We've done hundreds of them. Actually, probably thousands at this point, and the idea is that to become a completely sustainable firm. Not just introducing the technology of building design and anything like that, but actually going out and seeking out those buildings which we've put on the landscape and taking responsibility to see that they are re-used or in some way resuscitated, and it goes back to the core. The fact that, yes, we are urban planners. Urban planners and designers and the idea of taking these things because normally, they have great traffic access. They have exceptional amounts of land. The really difficult thing in reusing it is that the retail structural system doesn't like renovate into anything else very easily, and it is very difficult. But I wanted to tell you, those are the types of things, yes, that we are looking at it, because I probably what you're looking for us to say is that I think we're a huge. We should be a huge advocate for it because as a large firm we have a lot of influence in areas that we can take effect on. So, thanks for indulging me. I appreciate it.

Paul Jacob: Okay. Another question?

Student: Good afternoon. My name is Shalani. I'm a graduate student for the M.A. Arch. My question was "What is responsible architecture?" What does RTKL look at as responsible architecture and what they want to portray to the world? Taking the parameters as the economics of the project, the cultural scenario, like, it could be outside the United States, wherever, like what, how, what, how far do ya'll consider the cultural aspect. The, like, giving a new identity. I mean, you could, like, almost, like in Shanghai, you're giving a new identity to that city. You're creating a new vista for them, so how far is that important, I mean, is that the over riding factor or the economics of the vernacular culture. Do you want to convey that or the planning. How does it work? Which parameter over rides the rest? Or does economics play a big issue in this or if not, how do you strike a balance between all of it and still be, still its responsible and that's what you want to portray to the world? How does that work?

Paul Jacob: Come on Thom. You can do that one.

Thom McKay: Well, its kind of an essay question. Yes. Next question? Well, I think that's the trick isn't it? That's why we get the big money. It's a balance of all those things. It has to be. You know, at the end of the day, RTKL is a commercial architectural practice. If we weren't performance-based, if we didn't find a way to crack that nut, I think we'd be out of business, and we wouldn't be able to do what we do. I think every project we do these days because of who we are and where we practice, is in a way, a wrestle with culture. You know, whether its our culture or the host culture, for lack of a better phrase. And because we operate under those parameters, or with those parameters, we need to be sensitive to it and we are sensitive to it because we represent other. So we come from or we try to come from a more enlightened perspective. I think it

also ties into what Harold was talking about earlier is that, and Dianne, you don't see a particular –ism coming out of RTKL. You know, to oversimplify it, and to sound glib, we do what works and we do what we think is right. And I think that has been the success of RTKL. It has a lot to do also with our clients. I mean, you touched on it, I think if there is something worrisome about the work that we're doing in China – its moving at such a fast pace. And its hard to say whether its going to pass the test of time. Its hard to say whether it is the responsible thing to do. You know, one day it is. One day it may not be. And you know, that's the, as I said, that's why we get the big money. You've got to make those decisions and you've got to do what you think is right. [426]

Paul Jacob: I think that last piece that Thom just talked about and Harold used the word probably more than any other in his part, *clients,* I think that really is important. It really is a partnership between us and our clients which we want to manage the firm in a way where we can choose, in the best world, from among the best clients, so that we're chasing people who have the same goals as we do in terms of the built environment, and we don't put ourselves in a situation where we're accepting commissions because we need to make payroll, so I think you know, that's that balance between pulling up who we are to be able to track the clients and be at the table to try to work in that environment, but by ourselves, we wouldn't be capable of doing anything.

Thom McKay: I think, and every time we've tried to avoid that or every time we've sold our souls, we've regretted it. Not that it happens.

Paul Jacob: Anyone else. Next question. I'm sorry. Follow-up.

Student: No. Its not. I mean, I'd just like to add that I did get to see that movie last month, *My Architect,* and I think it was, about Dhaka, I think that was the best example of modernism which was very well rooted in the local culture and still it was very modern and I think it is a must-watch for any seeker in architecture. I mean, anyone who seeks architecture, it is a much-watch. I highly recommend that movie.

Paul Jacob: I agree.

George Mann: My name is George Mann. I've got two questions but first I'd like to say thank you to everyone at RTKL for being here and thank you to everyone at our college for inviting you. I think the series is wonderful for our students. My first question is, goes backwards in time, I'm going to ask Harold Adams if he had to do it over again, what might he do differently. The second question is to Harold and the panel as to where do you see yourselves going in the future in a rapidly changing world. I remember after 9/11 you were very quick to respond with a conference on security in buildings. I don't know any other firm that did than, and in a fast changing world, do you see yourself in the future as an American company operating internationally, an American-owned company, or an internationally-owned company because some of the questions that we're hearing have a theme of multi-culturalism and how the world looks different. And I might add, in my own personal opinion, the, in light of 9/11, it raises lots of questions between those who have and those who don't have and a lot of sensitivities but without getting into that, if I could then go back to my first question for Harold.

Paul Jacob: What would you do different?

Harold Adams: Be an investment banker. Or better yet, marry an investment banker. Setting on a big brokerage firm, an investment firm's board, and see how much money those guys get paid. They don't work any harder – they work hard – but they don't work any harder than I work. But jokingly, I've often said, its been the most wonderful profession I could ever imagine. Always challenging, always new opportunities, new exposure, so I would be an architect, and the architectural profession gives you so many paths that you can follow. I think its just a wonderful career. To start answering your other question, I think it is a very, very good question and its one that we keep challenging ourselves about – are we an American firm working internationally or are we a true global firm? We don't think we're a true global firm yet. We don't think that we are totally thinking that way, and we battle it all the time within our corporate culture and within our firm. It's the importance of hiring people from all over the world to help us to understand different cultures. I think its even more of a challenge after 9/11 because the view that the world has of the United States is very, very different. And up to 9/11, American's were heroes in most places. We were brought in, and I will say as an architect and growing our international practice, we were brought in because people, the clients loved the fact that we involved them in the process. Where in many other cultures, the architect comes in, is hired and then gives the client their design. They were surprised, that each culture in which we've operated, about the way we have involved them in the process and asked them questions, so we have a better understanding of their needs. Since 9/11 and since we've gone through closing our doors to many cultures, we're finding it more difficult I think its going to be an extra challenge for truly global firms to become

truly global and to be successful because we're never going again I think be able to just rest on "We're from America and we're here to help you." Because all the other cultures are catching up rapidly and in China, very, very rapid development. Education is so important in all these countries and we're going to have, we have a lot to learn to keep pace and we can only do it by joining together the cultures.

Paul Jacob: Now, I'm probably in the wrong building to answer this but in fact, we're finding problems now after 9/11 internally to the United States in terms of getting people into the United States to work for us and in fact we've run into a problem recently, we've had a couple of people when ….is in the company then gone through school working in the company went to China to work on a project and couldn't get a re-entry visa back into the United States [538] because architects are the endangered species. So they go into a special category. So its very difficult. Actually, one gentleman took us six months to get him back and one lady about an additional six months to get back into the country. So, hopefully these political situations go away over time and we're able to really address, in a non-political way, this whole idea of globalization. And I would second what Harold says. Right now we really are an American firm practicing internationally, but I think our aspirations are really to be truly global. And then we really have great conversations within the company because we're a global company talking with internal to ourselves. Anybody else want to kind of…

Thom McKay: Yea, well. I think there are. I have opinions on everything as you can see. I think there's kind of the quantitative answer to that question which is we can do more stuff for more people in more places and charge more money for it which is, you know, kind of a hollow pur-

suit in a way. There's also a qualitative leap there which is we can do what we do better somehow. We can use new materials or make it sustainable or cover it in fur. Whatever it is or however we define better, but I think there's still the quantum leap that we're wrestling with right now and I don't, I sometimes I think it is the "Are we a national American firm, international firm, or a global firm? But I still think there's something else that's out there that no architectural practice has really hit yet. And I see flashes of it every now and then at RTKL where we are a company that truly does collaborate that works and cross pollinates between sectors and services and places and geographies and cultures. And when those things come together its really quite magical. And we like to talk about it and we like to sort of dangle it out there as the carrot, but I don't know if we're there yet completely and I think it is something that we have to work to and I don't think if, I really don't think there's another practice out there on the planet that does it yet or as often as we do it, but that's probably the next leap and I don't think that equates or translates into size either. I don't think we have to be any bigger. I think we do have to be better.

Paul Jacob: I think that within the company its not, I think Harold said it a couple of times, we're continually changing. You know I think we realize this whole thing is a journey, and let's do the journey and see where we go and I think that attitude within the company is really good. Just to kind of, what did Frank say? "Hang it out there and suffer the consequences."

Student: I have a question as an architect and as a grad student, not necessarily in that order, but how do you guys see the ties between research and architecture and what RTKL has been doing in research and in..

Thom McKay: I have to say, you guys are so apologetic when you say you're a grad student. You sheepishly come up to the microphone, "I'm a grad student" as if it were a badge of dishonor or something.

Paul Jacob: Do you happen to have… Tom, I know you'd be, you're interested in research.

Tom Trenelone: I'm huge into like some of the stuff that we just talked about. I think, I think if you know one thing too about the AIA and the government right now, there's more and more grants and money that are being placed out there for R&D of building systems. I mean, at RTKL, we have like in place nationally, or excuse me, internationally, we have an in-house competition each year for a fellowship that allows you cash to go on a research trip. I personally have benefited from that and it was an interesting foray into seeing how automotive and fashion companies on a large-scale work to maintain like high-end couture design and race cars but at the same time were able to turn out the average everyday passenger automobile and the stuff that you'd see at the gap. I think that its one of those situations where more big firms have to really, are probably going to be the individuals that have to step up and do that. I know a lot of small firms like specifically that crosses my mind, recently like, Pugh & Scarpa in LA that have been huge in the sustainable design field in developing stuff from urban planning standpoint and from like a material standpoint, but I think the most important thing is to have the, I guess the way I would say it for myself is that all the things that they've talked about today, the management systems, everything that creates the financial stability that allows me to have those financial resources to do that type of research is probably the most important thing that larger firms have to do and they

have to allocate it because smaller firms like for example again, Pugh & Scarpa, they have a full time person on staff that does nothing but research sustainability. And, you know, I know they're a competitor, I'll bring it up anyway, but SOM specifically has a group that does studies into new curtain wall systems. I think that its happening more and more but I think its incredibly important to the profession. Its something that has to happen. And I see that, I know here and then also I can't think of who the gentleman – I can't remember his name, but the guy down at U of H who's working on the translucent concrete, those types of things, I mean, they take forever, but they are incredibly important and something that has to be continued for our profession to continue to grow.

Paul Jacob: Yea, I know we're very interested in this whole field of continuing education, research and development and it just goes with the culture if we really believe in our employees, we want to invest in them which in turn reinvests back into the company. Anyone else on the panel want to try the R&D? Nope. Okay.

Student: Yea. Hi. I'm a graduate student. My question is more, ya'll have a large stress. Ya'll keep stressing on urban design, urban design and architecture and, now I'm a graduate student in architecture. I've done my undergrad also in architecture and ya'll are looking at, say, hiring people out of grad school. Where do ya'll look at the urban design in the ways, I mean, how do you look at the urban design in architecture in someone coming out of grad school? [669]

Dan Killebrew: I might try to touch on that. What we look for as we interview graduates whether they are master's candidates or bachelor's candidates either one, is we look at their work

and we look at their resumes, just like almost any firm in the county does, but what we're trying to pick up out of that stuff is a determination of whether or not you can really think. We've sold a lot of the concept today to you that, that we are more a firm of collaborative and developmental ideas than we are about building some product, and the only way we can foster that as one of our core pillars is that if we're able to secure bright minds and people who can exhibit the ability to develop creative solutions. Not just creative solutions, innovative solutions. You know, correct solutions. The kinds of things that are going to make our service work, and our service may include things besides buildings at some point.

Paul Jacob: I know that in terms of the roots of the company, from an urban design perspective, it was really thinking of the built environment as contextual. And that is was a continuum and not so much as an object building and also fostered a working process of collaboration. So, it is really bringing that kind of mentality into a design process that I think is when we talk about planning and urban design – its that kind of approach to the built environment that tries to inform our design decision.

Dan Killebrew: I think one of the things that Mr. Josal said earlier today when he emphasized the idea of being able to see a pencil sketch. Often times we're diluted into thinking that because we see a wonderful graphic that's you know, computer generated or generated in some mechanical form, we can be diluted into thinking that sound thought is behind all that but it becomes so much more evident when we see it in a simple expression and there are sometimes very subtle clues that give us that impression that someone has the kind of mind that is open and expressive that way. [725]

Enrico Francisco: I totally agree with what Dan just said.

End of Side B, Tape 2

Start of Side A, Tape 3

Enrico Francisco: When you are you have to pay mortgage and you have the etcetera. You know how it goes. But skills are good. We all have to have skills and when we need them, earlier in the earlier panel someone asked, "well what are we doing right here at A&M? What is your feed-back" I think they were asking from the professionals, what else would you see the school doing, would you like to see the school doing? So, again, its, skill are and learn, by all means, learn to do those beautiful 3D renderings and using photoshop and whatever, but do not forget that if you can't articulate what you are showing there, its not worth much. In urban design, back to your original question, back to your question, urban design is the same thing, if you can't articulate, if you can't explain, if you can't contextualize what you are showing, well, it becomes a little hol-low. Travel, go see other places, go see other cities, there's no better education than that. Incorporate those experiences into what you do, and that will come through your work.

Dianne Black: Again, I really can't help myself because Eurico got me started with the movies that you have to see. Alright, there's a short movie by Charles and Ray Eames called *The Powers of Ten.* Has anybody even know who Charles and Ray Eames are anymore? Has anybody seen *The Powers of Ten?* Okay. That's what I think of when I think of RTKL. Urban design means you can pull back powers of ten out here, but then you can pull back powers of ten to the smallest little

thing that the industrial design people will design for our projects. So, that's one of the reasons why we love people who also have an urban design perspective because its out here looking at the architecture. So.

Paul Jacob: Thank you.

Student: …and I'm an undergraduate here. Someone mentioned earlier about how you have to educate the client to keep in mind sustainable practices for their buildings, and I think it really requires a complete overhaul thinking for the client themselves and for our whole culture to actually live with the environment in mind and so I guess my question to you is: How do you educate the client to actually go into that and live with the environment in mind. I know in Seattle they have developments where you actually can walk to work and things like that. Where you're out of your car and you're not just driving to and from work and you don't communicate with anybody in your community.

Dianne Black: I think the strongest logic for sustainable design is still a financial one because if you do it properly it, it costs you less to maintain your facilities so, I don't think it just has to be a philosophical thing. You know a tree-hugger kind of thing, I mean, the financials are there too.

Tom Trenelone: I'd just say too, the other one is like. I don't know if this is maybe a gorilla tactic or anything, but you don't always have to tell them that its green. I mean, if its good, the money is there, and you can get it in the project, you don't always – I mean – if its one of those things where it's a good product, its sustainable, and your not affecting the clients budget, your

not affecting the design decisions of the building, spec it and put it in there. And you know, make no other mention of it because basically and the fact of sustainable design, I mean, yes we need to continue to educate clients but at the same time your advocacy as a designer is one of those situations where that's all here. I mean, you take care of things the best way you can. You find the way to do it and sometimes the best way to do it is to be, you know, be very quiet especially with, you know, you, we don't need to tell them. It's – we have a project going up in…what's that? Well, I mean, it might be one of those deals that its just, you don't say a thing, you do it, and then maybe in a posted occupancy evaluation, you bring up the fact that, "Oh, by the way, I used high fly ash-content concrete in your building, you know, that's green. All the woods are bamboo, they're, so you know, it's a renewable wood source. That type of thing. Its, it can always be something where its kind of like, we don't always have, to sometimes I think the problem is the way we're going about educating is we're going so, where most people that are really into it are very passionate about it and they're almost, you know, really straight forward about it, and sometimes its just that little bit of relinquishing the directness, I guess, of that passion and just making sure that you just take care of business the way that you need to and don't necessarily have to make a, you know, production about it.

Paul Jacob: Well, I forget what percentage of it was but so much of the LEED certification is just good design. I mean it is really just being very smart about the design process, and in my mind it tied back all the way into some of the China conversations. Its Fung-Shui was developed a long time ago because of just very good design principles, and so some of it is just being a good designer.

Tom Trenelone: But education is a big part of it too. I mean, I don't want to downplay the fact that we have to do that, but just, I'm saying is like when you get out there and you're practicing sometimes that's just the easiest way to do it. Look through your catalogues and if you can find product and you can spec it and it doesn't affect the cost or anything like that, and you know it will be a durable product, stick it in there. Rubber flooring all that great stuff. It works.

Student: Have you actually set down with your clients and had meetings that discuss environmental when they haven't asked for anything that is sustainable.

Tom Trenelone: I've had situations where I've talked to clients about products that I'd like to introduce into their project that are sustainable, but I mean, like, you know, have we, we have a strategic goal right now where its becoming, it's a big deal with the firm on pushing that agenda and its one of those situations where its kind-of like each client is a different entity and you can do what you can with each one, but like I said before, its like, you know, concrete for the most part is a very sustainable resources, you know, you can sit there and there's all kinds of stuff, or you don't have to tell your, you know, your client that I oriented your building this direction so it will reduce the amount of solar glare in the summer time, but it allows for passive solar heating in the winter. Those are things you just do as a good architect that, you know, are taking care of that passion that you have.

Student: Good afternoon. My name is Jeff Chapman. I'm a full-time philosopher, part-time architect, so bear with me. If you imagine, if you will, a continuum with Philip Johnson on my right saying, "Prostitute yourself, get the job, get the job, get the job" and Howard Roark on my left

who would blow up his own building if he doesn't like it. How do you feel, being in a large firm allows you to position yourself along that line and allows you to draw your line into the sand and say, "I will not cross that." And, anybody?

Paul Jacob: No. All. Everybody has to answer to that one. I think you'll get seven answers here. Bin, you want to start? Come on.

Bin Cao: I think it just depends on how different the situation is. Your training and your experience all tells you where that line is. I mean sometimes you won't. It also, sometimes depends on the client, I mean. If sometimes they like something. One day they do something different, you can have a lot of opportunity to do that sometimes the client is very big part of the decision team and the project does not give you a lot of room, but you can still do something very good. I mean, design is not just the only thing, you spend a lot of money on, a lot of other things. Its just kind of something done very neat, very smart and then, I think that also means very good design.

Paul Jacob: Enrico?

Panelist: I want to go blow up one of HKS' buildings.

Panelist: I think you have.

Enrico: First of all, being in a large firm, means that we have access to opportunities that smaller firms, perhaps, wouldn't have so it is many times, most times, it is a good thing to be in a large

firm. We get to deal with projects that are complex. That smaller shops, well, cannot deal with because of whatever expertise that they lack or just the sheer lack of people to produce the work. So, once again, being in a large firm has its rewards now where do you draw the line? Well, first you get at job. At least, that's how I think. We do everything to get the job. You want the job. Period. And then second, you worry how to, about how to make it the best or how not to compromise, so I don't think there is necessarily something that isn't compatible there. Get the job. Put all that you have out there. Get the job and then make your best to make it the best. The better that it…as good as you can. So, the, I don't see things such, you know, black and white. Of course, we don't like to see our works compromised. It happens. Its life. It happens, but, and we don't see that. We don't like that, but it doesn't have to be black and white as you paint it. That's how I see it.

Paul Jacob: Dianne?

Dianne Black: Yea. I wanted to go back to your thought about beauty P.J. You know, these, one of the things we're very proud of is that our buildings work. They do what they were intended to do by the clients, so I would say that it is not Howard Roark's building, I'd say it is the clients building and that we're helping them realize a dream that they have, and so its not just about what we think.

Paul Jacob: Harold?

Harold Thompson: Well I would say that there are obviously some realities of a big firm that we

have to deal with. You know when you're a big firm you have certain financial obligations that a small firm, maybe, doesn't have and I think part of your question is, how do you keep from having to take jobs that you don't really want – just your bread and butter jobs. I think a lot of that goes back to the management of the firm, and the decisions that partners make and as Tom alluded to a minute ago, by being a well-managed firm that provides certain resources to its employees we are able to hold our standards higher than we might otherwise, so we all rely on the management of the firm to make the right decision so that we have the financial where with all to be able to be more choosey about the jobs that we do and the clients that we work with and as PJ alluded to a minute ago, we have, over the years, developed a lot of really great client relationships and these are clients that have a lot of confidence in us and we have confidence in them and we're able to produce very nice projects that we're proud of, so I think it goes back to good management of the firm in a lot of ways.

Dan Killebrew: It is a matter of what you put into it as well. You know, a furniture maker can be as proud of a small jewelry box as he can a whole china cabinet. It is just a matter of the love and care that you put into the work that you do, I think. You have to love your clients, and sometimes they're not very lovable, but we could probably digress into a long philosophical discussion, Mr. Philosopher, about such things as love and forgiveness and mercy and grace and all those kinds of things, but they do become important, not only in dealing with your clients, your contractors, your consultants, but also your own team members. And just care and compassion has a great deal to do with what we do that continues to instill and inspire great work. I get real tired some nights, and I'm ready to go home at 4 o'clock, but you know, I see my team mates across the hall working their hearts out at what they're doing and all of a sudden, I care for them and I'm inspired by

what they're doing and, or I'll get that late night phone call from my client who has that burning question about his project. Is it going to really accomplish this? And all of a sudden, you know, I'm filled with compassion as an architect about whether or not we're going to accomplish his goals and so we'll, you know, we'll pour ourselves out into the work that we do in order to accomplish those things, so we don't have to go blow up our buildings and undermine the work that we do by our own sour attitudes, if you will. [146]

Tom Trenelone: I don't know. Out of everybody I'd say, I wrestle with it all the time, and I have done both. I've worked for the small firm and sometimes I think there's a wonderful thing about scale that makes architecture really, really…you know, you just sit there and its…the scale of certain buildings allows you to appreciate them whereas some of the stuff that we do is so large. Some of the magnificent things that take place that, or some of the things that you have no idea how hard it was to fit a program that they required you to get into a small space like that can never be appreciated because you don' t fly around in helicopters everyday, but I would tell you this – that I've never done anything on a daily basis that I go home, I'm happy. I'm just like you, I've got my heroes and I sit there. And everybody here would tell you that I'm probably one of the most outspoken people in the office on every single day about pushing people and letting them know that we're not about mediocre architecture. I am all for being, you know, doing some of the best and most creative buildings in the world. I'd love to see us win a progressive architecture award if we could do it, honestly, and there's people that disagree with me on that because some people think that progressive architecture isn't necessarily urban or humane, but I disagree with that. But, I mean, I'd tell you "Yea" its like, I have a hard time with it every single day. Its like some days I love the little tiny things, but I have to admit the opportunities that people tell you

that are there. And if I ask you this, and I pose this to all of you out there, if you're a good architect, and the only place that the good architects ever go to is the small, is small boutique firms, the firms with the real power and the firms that are really shaping the world all over the place are a lot of the large ones, and if you don't put in some time there and leave a mark and help make the world a better place that way, I think that the profession has lost out a little bit. I mean, that's my biggest thing is I think sometimes the stigma that in school even sometimes that we place on the big firms isn't justly deserved. There's some great work that's being done there. I mean, I was on the national honor awards jury last year and I can tell you that I voted, I voted like, kept screaming and shouting that the Cincinnati Bengals stadium deserved an honor award in my opinion. It was an excellent piece of work, and when you understand some of the hurdles that you have to go through as a practitioner in a large firm, which we do a great job of making sure that those hurdles are out of the way. I have to admit that there's some wonderful people that are great advocates for good work and great projects here at RTKL. That's my challenge to you. Is like, if you're out there, its like, find a big one, go out, put your time in and make your mark there. Because they need you. [181]

Paul Jacob: And if we get you, we won't let you go.

Audience: Laughter

Student: Hi, my name is Sheruthi, and I have two quick questions on health architecture. I think the only thing that is permanent in architecture is, possibly, change. And in light of this, I would like to ask what kind of change do you see in healthcare architecture in the coming years and in

what way would you think the need and demand would increase or change in health architecture in the coming years?

Paul Jacob: Dan, that's you.

Dan Killebrew: Okay. The second question first – we're all getting older and there's more of us getting older than there are those of us who are younger coming along and that's probably going to affect the greatest change. There's been a huge trend in healthcare to treat people on an outpatient basis, and use the beds less. That tread is going to kind-of go in a different direction in the coming years and probably all the way through the year 2050 that change is going to be a strong need. We're building now more beds than we've built in the last 15 years and the projects that we've just received in the last 6 months and the ones that we'll probably receive in the next two years are probably going also to do that so those are trends. Another trend is that, this is a longer answer, but – and this goes to some degree in answering the question or answering the issues of architecture design being more than just about beauty or that it is beyond beauty. It is other than beauty, but it is every bit as beautiful as what we think of in terms of aesthetic beauty, and that has to do with the convergence and the collaboration of a complex system of integrated pathways and that sounds like big words to say, but what it means is in healthcare and there's not just healthcare but in a lot of other types of projects too there's a lot of stuff that happens all at once. Integration of these pathways is not necessarily making sure that they all happen in the same place at the same time, but its understanding the distinctions and the segregations and the appropriate convergences of these pathways and what I'm talking about, in terms of these pathways goes beyond just simple functionality because we're dealing with systems that involve people and people can either

be the staff that works there or it can be the people who come to use the facility. In healthcare's case the patients or in our day and age of a consumer-focused society we now call them guests, we don't call them patients so much anymore. So you have the people component, you have materials components, there's always income and there's always outgo, there's supply and there's waste – that is a pathway that is critical to understand. Technology which involves not only the delivery of not only water and air and power, but, you know, now also the delivery of cyberspace to its use-ability. Let's say, electronic components that can function, and so, its going to be, and this happens at all scales too. I mean, small projects and large projects are getting equally complex. More is being demanded out of smaller spaces in healthcare. Being more economical with the use of our built environment is going to be extremely critical. We don't just have money to throw at buildings anymore. They have to be designed extremely efficiently, and sometimes how all of these integrated pathways come together and function for the common good of, ultimately, the guest – the one that is going to receive the benefit from that facility – how they all work together is the ultimate solution and that does create, in a sense, beauty.

Student: Thank you very much.

Dan Killebrew: You're welcome.

Dean Regan: I have a question that's easy to understand but difficult to ask. I'll do an analogy with sustainability. Those of us who have been around for a long time realize that maybe Rachel Carson started sustainability movement. Somebody way back there that saw before looking at buildings that the environment relationship with human beings was not going so well in America

in our last half of the last century. That has been shown now to all of us in architecture so the issue of sustainability is seen as "the getting along of human beings with the physical environment" is now onto buildings which is very healthy. If we make buildings more sustainable, we "get along with the environment," quote, unquote better than we did before. Here's the question, what about getting along with each other? We have a crisis in the world with people can't get along very well. You see it wherever you want to see it, and you can say whatever cause you want to say cause. The positive thing about sustainability in buildings is that architects haven't so much asked about the causes and whined about whether it was this groups fault or that groups fault, we have taken on the issue and say how can we get human beings and the environment to live better together through what we know how to do. Here's the question, can we face the next question as architects too? How can we focus on human beings getting along with each other better through architectural design?

Paul Jacob: He didn't say it was going to be easy.

Thom McKay (?): And they all moved away from the podium.

Audience: Laughter

Tom Trenelone: That's heavy man.

Dean Regan: I'm a full-time dean and part-time philosopher.

Audience: Laughter

Dan Killebrew: There's a guy over there that you just…

Paul Jacob: Actually, I'll take a shot at starting this conversation, and I think it has to go back with what we talk about a lot and maybe goes back to the urban design roots but it is the public realm and bringing people together rather than segregating people, and I think just, in terms of philosophy, in terms of making sure that places and spaces are accessible that there's opportunity for interaction because we will only get along with one another when we exchange our ideas and we have an opportunity to co-mingle. So, I think in terms of looking for a specific building to solve that, I don't think…that may not be…that much of an opportunity. Some building types more than others, obviously. But in terms of the built environment as a whole, I think this whole "trying to understand the public realm and how people move through the public realm from place to place is a way to kind of make sure that all places are open to everyone. So that's my shot.

Dan Killebrew: Some things that we do in the work place-type design do kind of address that issue. If you work with a bunch of cranky people because they're not comfortable in how their environment is designed, its not a good working environment and people go home mad at each other who would normally like each other. And so we sometimes think in terms of ergonomic design as being more than just the chair that they sit in, it's the entire room, it's the entire department, it's the entire facility and how it works and functions together and so the word *ergonomics* at least for our health sector designers has come to mean something totally different in the last 18 months than we originally thought of it as being. But I think it has a whole lot to do with

just mental/emotional well being and that all goes to promote some of the things that you asked about there.

Dean Regan: Actually, a little commercial because we do that implicitly now being a good architect. Just as in my earlier school days, in the '60s, we, they did what we would call now sustainable things. Don't try to hurt the environment as implicit. I wonder when we as architects, and its not a question for you directly, when we as architects are going to take making buildings that get people to live better with each other as an explicit objective as we have sustainability rather than an implicit objective.

Tom McKay: Well, I think maybe the answer is buried somewhere in your questions where its not about making buildings but about making places. I think P.J. was kind of skirting on the issue too that it seems to me it has something to do with the notion of community and shared values or at least ones respect for those values and how those ideas can be exchanged in a public forum. Can we create places or environments that foster that in some way or engender it in some way. You know, that being said, you know, some of the best literature of the 20th Century came out of the impoverished environments of the eastern block or the squalor of South America. So, I think it is something beyond that that's intellectually human perhaps. I don't know, it's a tough issue, but I think, I think it is bundled up in ones responsibility as being an architect whereas in having to do with the environment. Whether we call it sustainability or community or shared values or whatever it is, those are important things. [316]

Dean Regan: Thank you.

Student: I think the question the young lady brought up earlier about the globalization of the world will bring your question into full focus. As you notice we have a very diverse community here, and your portfolio showed a very diverse myriad actually of works but there's a similar thread running through all of them similar to the ideas of the international style and the teachings of ???? [324] that as the world grows together and we become more comfortable in spaces that are created and look similar to each other and sustainability and the world around us drives what we think as architecture and not just what one particular culture thinks is architecture, we will all become more comfortable in spaces whether they're in India or in China or in American. Thank you.

Thom McKay: I don't know if I agree with that though. I mean, I do. Are we allowed to debate this? I mean, I do agree that there's a creeping homogeneity to the world and I think that's kind of hard in a way, and I do think its our responsibility to resist that and to work against it. And I do think as we've been saying, that everything we do is wrestling with culture in some way. You know, you, if I see another gap, I'm going to die, and I mean that by the store not the…

Paul Jacob: Caulking. You need caulking.

Thom McKay: What's that? Yea. Caulking. Yea. So, you know, I think we have to resist it, but I also think there is something in the human spirit that will resist it. That will say "No. We're going to take a stand here" and its not, you know, this space here in Cairo is not going to be the same space as Venice as the same space in lower Manhattan.

Student: I think what I mean if you look at Glenn Murcutt's work, and he will never work outside of Australia, there's, his designs are built around like the rainfall and the pattern, the wind, and of that area but there's the materials he uses are very similar to maybe the work of Gary with the corrugated metal, but they're so designed around the place that they're at, using the forerunners of technology you can kind of see some kind of correlation and I agree with you, it would be a shame if Venice turned into Cairo which turned into L.A., especially L.A. or Detroit, so it is a natural part of human evolution that if we can become one culture instead of fighting amongst, and I don't mean to pick on Asians, but Asians tend to have a very "we are the best China", "we are the best India", "we are the best Siam", "we are the best Americans", "we are the best" so once you eliminate that kind of "Who's the best," we're all best as human beings, you'll be able to create spaces where a dichotomy of peoples can live and work together like in London or in international cities that are becoming more of, not just British, just everyone, just together and architecture becomes not just British but of everyone.

Thom McKay: So are you advocating a single culture or are you advocating..

Student: I'm saying evolutionarily it is inevitable.

Thom McKay: That's kind of sad.

Audience: Laughter

Dianne Black: I just would like to say that I'm actually very envious of you in your generation

because this does not get Dean Regan's point about place. I am so envious of how connected you guys are all around the world. You know, you go home tonight, and you're going to internet one of your buddies in Europe. You're going to play x-box with one of your friends in Asia. You're going to be on the mobile phone. You are very connected as a community, and I'm very really envious of all that, so I don't know how that leads to the architecture-thing, but you guys are living in the best time.

Paul Jacobs: And I can't get my PDA to work.

Student: My name is Rhaim. And the question which I have is actually broken up into two parts, the first is, being such a big firm, who is RTKL's role model? And if I ask personally to each one of the panelists out here like what would be each one of yours role model as such? Maybe, like, each one of you can take a go at it.

Tom Trenelone: Well, I mean, I'd go like, if you're asking like architecturally, like, who are my role models? Or are you asking, like, just heroes in general?

Student: That's up to you.

Thom McKay: Can we use cartoon characters?

Audience: Laughter

Panelist: Sponge Bob

Audience: Laughter

Panelist: It's the neolism of Sponge Bob Square Pants.

Dianne Black: I'll start. I have a elementary school diagram on my office that is Martin Luther King's I have a Dream Speech, you know, for like, pared down to the kids, and to me, he is one of my heroes and that's not exactly architecture but we're always talking about having a dream so he's who I bring up.

Paul Jacob: I think if you, really, probably, we'll get 700 answers from the 700 people within RTKL, and I think that gets back to one of the things I was talking about in terms of really honoring the individual within the company. That we really do want a diverse group of people sitting around the table, and so, I would expect heroes to be all over the board. That whole continuum actually, you know, probably not the far ends, but certainly most of that continuum we would hope to have within the company. As a company, I think we are trying to be unique. You know, we have competitors in different markets, but as an organization and if you really drill down in terms of how we hire, how we train people, how we try to keep people, how we just bring people together, how we reward people – I don't, certainly not in the architectural profession do we have a model. I don't… And we're getting very close to a wrap, so is there any more burning questions after this gentleman? One, two, three. Okay. We'll do those and then we'll wrap.

Gavin Daniels: Howdy. My name is Gavin Daniels, I'm a second year graduate student, and I've made the mistake recently of reading a book by a T.U. Professor named Paul Shepard. He defines architecture as "the shaping of nature for human needs," and that really took everything that I've learned about architecture and really put it on its ear, and I was wondering, I just had a real simple question, if you could give me your definition of architecture. What is architecture for you?

Paul Jacob: Ten seconds. We want that answer in ten seconds.

Enrico Francisco: Well, its…Its not a fair question because that guy, that professor took a whole book to answer that question, and now you…holy cow…

Paul Jacob: Yea. That's a tough one. I don't think there's a sentence that can capture that.

Tom Trenelone: Well, it kind of goes back to the role model thing too, I mean, its like, I'd have to tell you different people. You know, I admire different people, like, just in architecture, different people program better, I think there are geniuses at that. Different people do materials better. There are geniuses at that. Its. Yea. I think we'll come back to you in two years after we get a monograph out.

Student: Hi my name is Guy Cheeterman and I'm doing my first year graduate study here. I'm always hearing how important it is for us architects to have good business sense, so this is for you designers and marketing people in such a large firm. How much are you designers really involved and sensitive to the marketing and business side and visa versa, and is there really a compromise?

Tom Trenelone: Well, I'll go first on that one. As an undergraduate, I studied both architecture and marketing, so I think you're right on. I think that it all starts. It starts. Heck, it starts with the first image that a clients sees usually. If they see something and they like it, you could be locked into your entire design process, so your marketing is incredibly important. I mean, its, I think that every single, like, if you're a designer… The other thing though too as we've talked about and I think you'll agree that some of the greatest architects in the world are not just great architects, but they are great promoters. And that is a marketer first and foremost. So, its like, yea, if you want to do great build…Is that a compromise?

Student: Like in the sense that, do you, for the sake of your marketing do you ever give up on your design? This is something that..

Tom Trenelone: I'm saying that for the sake of my marketing, I'd put my design straight out there as a marketing tool for my, for what I want to do actually.

Paul Jacob: Yea, in fact our model are seller/doers. We don't have marketing people who go out and get the jobs. It is really the Vice Presidents and their team who go out and sell their expertise and their jobs, so we are seller/doers. We're not an account executive bringing in work to a group of people who are doing the work, so in that case, what Tom was saying is you are marketing your vision.

Tom Trenelone: I think that goes back to the point though too when you were getting back into

the ethics and morality of all of it, it comes back to the green choices, everything. It is in here. You go out, you market what you're doing. If you're an ethical and you're a good practitioner at what you do, I mean, you go to sleep happy and everything's good. I mean, you know, you know if you're being manipulative or anything like that, but I mean, if you know that you're going to put good buildings out there and you're doing what's in the best interest of your client, and the best, you know. And do it for the interest of your profession as well, I mean. Sometimes, I think, just, this is just a personal aside, but you know, the client is very, very important. Take care of them and do a good building, but at the same time, you know, take care of yourself. When you do your buildings, get what you want out of them, and you know, because, I mean, if you love architecture, which, I mean, the salaries aren't the greatest thing in the world, so I can't imagine that you're all here because of salary, but if you love it, its like, you know, every time you go after it, take the time to get the stuff that you need to kind of feed your soul out there. I mean, that's part of doing the job everyday.

Paul Jacob: And in terms of managing the company, I mean, make no mistake about it, this is a well managed company in terms of the basis of doing business. Harold's whole experience. He was brought in to provide that foundation to let creative energies flow, but without that foundation, nothing can go. So, first and foremost that permeates the firm and we grow from there, but it is there for design. [488]

Dan Killebrew: We sometimes have to adopt the model of our clients. They're not thinking about beautiful buildings all the time, first of all. They have a business plan they have to fulfill, and that a lot of times, is their first obligation, to their stock holders, their share holders, or whoever has a

stake in the specific venture. And so its, we have to conduct our business in such a way that we can continue to provide service to those types of clients and we won't do that if we just make beautiful buildings and don't worry about staying in business, making money.

Enrico Francisco: I have something to add as well. I think your best market is always your good work, your best work. You can't spin, you know, if you have a bad building, if you produce a bad building. You can't fool everybody, you can fool a couple of people. And you can't spin a good piece of architecture…a bad piece of architecture into good marketing. You might do that with a client that is not sophisticated or ignorant, but that's not what we're after. The good, your best work will be your best marketing. Of course, you can help it if you are a good sales guy. Sure you can help to promote that building, but first of all, do good work. And then that will take you a long way, so its not, I don't see it in two things that aren't necessarily at odds with each other. Good work. Do you have to compromise the market to do marketing? No. Do the good work first and marketing will follow. It will come to you.

Tom Trenelone: Sometimes it is just marketing good ideas too 'cause its like, don't ever let a competition idea just go sit on your shelf sometimes. If it is good, go find somebody to build it.

Thom McKay: All that being said, though, if you look at the twenty top architects right now, practicing right now, to a person, they are consummate sales people. They can convince you to do anything. You know, and I agree with the comments about work, but, you know, if you listen to someone like Frank Gary speak, or you know, Bill Pedersen or whoever you might consider a great architect, they can convince you to do anything.

Student: So, are you doing anything to train your designers to, you know, …

Thom McKay: Not enough, well not enough, but I think, you know, that's definitely a part of it, and I think it is also one of the big benefits of a larger firm where we have resources to do that.

Tom Trenelone: I think a lot of that's an intrinsic quality too. I mean, you can do so much to train but after, you know, its like, its tough to learn, sometimes you've got it or you don't. That's one of the reasons, I guess, that some of the those people we've just mentioned separate themselves out of the pack.

Student: Thank you.

Paul Jacob: Last question.

Student: Good afternoon again. My question was what is the firm's stand on proto-typical architecture which is, I mean, the point of Gap was also brought up. Like, I mean, you see Gaps everywhere, I mean, there are clients which would want a similar kind of language happening everywhere for their structures and if one of those clients came to you, and then you had the team of, that building had to be built in several different countries, and again, the question of okay, fine, I mean, how do I respect the culture of the place and still go around, so with the whole proto-typical architecture, I mean, how do you deal with situations like that?

Paul Jacob: Actually we haven't had a whole lot of practice. Dan, probably, you've worked with Tenats, probably the closest to a lot of proto-typical stuff.

Dan Killebrew: It is and its unusual that it occurs in the health care industry because normally that is a retail-type business. But we did, I may have mentioned in one of the earlier questions, that the series of ambulatory care centers that we did across the country. We had a for-profit client that was the second largest healthcare provider in the country, and they engaged us to help them develop a proto-typical design. Now that did not mean that every place had the same plan or had the same functions inside it or had the same appearance on the outside. What it did mean, is that it was a proto-typical concept in terms of the service that the facility provided. Sometimes they were surgery centers. Sometimes they were imaging centers. Sometimes they were both combined, and sometimes they had a cancer center attached. Their goals was to develop 64 of these things across the country, and it resulted in quite a lot of fee for our company, and we were very pleased to be engaged in that from that perspective, but we were also pleased because that represented a very specific type of challenge to architects who like to, who tend to want to do a lot of things in a very customized basis and make each site, the design and the solution for each site exclusive and specific for that particular site. This proto-typical engagement did not necessarily exclude that opportunity from our design. We visited probably, over 80 sites and qualified those sites for these instillations. And so that meant they wanted us to look at each specific site and give them opportunities to provide the right conceptual solution that met their business plan, for one thing, but that also met their goal of providing comfortable, neighborhood, family care to their guests, to their patients who would arrive there and the saying was no more, you know, when you go to the clinic and you put on the gown and it gaps in the back and leaves your fanny flying down the hallway –

no more of that. You know, they were all about a comfortable, warm, friendly, protective environment that protected the patients' well-being as much as it protected their behind. And so, creating those solutions while the concepts in some of the visual outcomes had a lot of similarities. They were all called, Tenant Care because the company's name was Tenant Health System. And so that was, we had a standardized signage program, we had a fairly standardized list of materials that we used in each one. There were, their symbol became a daisy because the daisy was a friendly, simple flower that represented warmth and compassion. And that was the kind of thing that they came up with and wanted us to develop as a part of their collateral materials to market and promote their services. We had opportunities to sit in each community with users. With citizens basically, who would be potential customers. And so, at one point, I think, in the year we had at least in Dallas anyway, we had the largest team on that endeavor. We probably had 20 architects and maybe another 30 engineers and other consultants engaged with us in that. It was, you know, that one client was as large at one time as a small office would be. And we had a great opportunity to remind ourselves that we were architects and designers at every step of the way while providing a very…what's the word I'm looking for…a very standardized approach to building solutions for that proto-typical design.

Paul Jacob: And I think the overall answer there is again, going back to that dialogue early with the client. Really understand what you're engaging in and where their direction is going before you start that dance so that you're not into a situation where you're doing something you don't want to do. So, it's nothing gets rejected outright. There's an investigation in the conversation to understand the parameters of every design problem. Thank you. [659]

Well, I know this has been a fast afternoon for me. I was surprised. I thought the whole afternoon was going to be a long endeavor, but it seems to have flown by certainly for me. Personally, I want to really thank the University. Dean, Bob – I think you've done a great job. I commend the faculty for putting this program together. And the students who probably have engaged us more in ideas and an investigation that will have us thinking and talking, I think, in the future. So, again, we got probably more out of this than we gave. So, I know I speak for the panel in thanking the interactive aspect of this, and with that I want to turn the last words to the Aggie, and invite Harold to come up and say goodbye.

Harold Adams: I think to wrap it up quickly, I would like to say that I hope you understand that the path we have chosen is not an easy path. We continue to challenge our self, we've continued to try to grow and understand our clients and the worlds in which we operate. And you can understand, maybe better, why, after 37 years of trying to herd all of these brilliant cats, that I welcome the opportunity to step aside and turn the leadership over to this firm because I'm confident with the kind of thinking and the creativity and the diversity that we have created in RTKL that we will continue to do great projects, and I think that's what we're about. I thank you all for coming and you're going to continue to see me here visiting the campus because I love the place and I love this interaction and the challenges from meeting the students and talking to you. I'm so delighted that we got so many questions today. Thank you.

Audience: Applause [711]

Bob Johnson: And before you leave, don't forget to fill out the green evaluation card, thank you

very much.

Panelists: Bin Cao, Dianne Black, Enrico Francisco, Tom Trenelone, Harold Thompson, Thom McKay, Dan Killebrew

Arch Rogers, Francis Taliaferro, Charlie Lamb, George Kostritsky

###