

ADDRESS BY ROBERT MORGAN  
UNITED STATES SENATOR  
AIA FORUM ON PUBLIC ARCHITECTURE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
APRIL 6, 1976

I think I had better explain, first of all, the position I am in with regard to the decision-making process for public buildings. I am a layman, who is also a public servant, and who is also charged with making sure the public's money is well spent when it is spent on buildings.

As Attorney General of North Carolina, I served for some six years on the Capitol Building Authority, which was involved with the whole planning process. As a senator, I am a member of the Committee on Public Works, and am chairman of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds.

But you cannot make a layman an expert by Act of Congress.

And a layman I remain. So I am not going to stand up here and pretend I have all the answers. In fact, since I have come to the Senate I have become better and better supplied with questions instead. If there were any market for questions, I could go into the business on a wholesale basis.

So it seems to me I ought to find out if you experts can't come up with some answers. For answers, there is a better market. I want to hear those answers, so the best way for me to proceed is as follows. I will point out problems, and make some suggestions -- which I invite you to argue with -- as to what should be good public policy. Bear in mind I do not have my mind made up. I want your reaction. I think we laymen are

in a position of looking for new routines, new rules of thumb, to go by. So please make a mental note as we go along, of any policy area in which you think a rule of thumb can be established, and then we can talk about it.

The first, and in many ways the most important part of the planning process for any public building is the pre-design stage. Here, the general parameters for the building are to be outlined, and fairly complicated questions have to be met. I am not going to tell you what you already know. But it does seem to me that there are some things we need to make routine parts of the pre-planning stage for any public building.

In the first place, there ought to be at this point a

real question as to whether we are going to build -- or not build. And the option not to build a new structure ought to be seriously considered. The fact of the matter is, it seems to me, that we are past the age of what we might call the "architecture of abundance." I think it is clear that if it is economical, we ought to seriously consider reusing, rehabilitating, or refitting present structures.

I introduced, along with Senator Buckley, a bill, S. 265, which is now public law, requiring the federal government to make this kind of decision and to use historical and existing structures wherever possible.

Such a decision was made in my home state of North Carolina. It was decided, instead of building a new Governor's mansion, to rehabilitate the old one. Please understand that I am not necessarily arguing for rehabilitation in all cases.

But the point is that this "go or no-go" decision ought to be a routine part of the pre-planning process.

Now, another element of pre-design which has been suggested to me is that an architect be hired for the pre-planning work on a flat fee basis. This architect would not be eligible to execute the final plan. Thus he would have no vested interest in the eventual outcome and could render his advice independently.

This may be a good idea, and I would like to hear your opinion

of it. It seems to me we are facing a crisis of expertise.

The independent expertise available to the laymen who must oversee the pre-planning process is of the foremost importance, especially when you have to get into things as complicated as life-cycle cost analysis.

Some of the things you need to decide in the pre-design stage are relatively non-technical. For example, you need to decide whether you are going to build a monumental building or a completely functional building. I think monumental buildings have their place. We don't need to be so cost-conscious that we forget how much architecture represents the spirit of a people. Great architecture is one way in which we as a people show our respect for democracy, and show what spirit we share. But this

is a decision which needs to be made at the outset, so you don't find yourself with a monument when what you really wanted was "plain vanilla."

Other questions are much more complicated. We might very well need expert help to decide, in the early going, just how much experimenting is to be done. The energy situation calls for us to try some new approaches to building design and mechanical systems.

Now, I am sure you have heard it argued that the public sector should undertake tremendous amounts of experimentation in energy conservation, and in the design of buildings to use new sources of energy, especially solar energy. On the other hand, there are those who would rather leave it to the private sector.

The happy medium lies somewhere in the middle. I am not one to say that the government ought to stay out of experimentation entirely. I think it can serve a role in stimulating solutions to the problems which are facing us. But I do not think we ought to go overboard and start experimenting pell mell with one building after another.

But it is in the pre-planning stage that this decision needs to be made. Some buildings you just don't want to experiment with. I cannot imagine using an untried heating and cooling system in a hospital or a jail. In some case you might want to try new technology and see how it works, but you ought to decide early how far to go. This would be



one of the major parameters you will give the architect who eventually designs the building, and I think you can look at this as one of the purposes the building will serve.

Now, let me concentrate for a moment on this area of energy. Basically, the problem is that designing a building to be energy-efficient is not just a matter of insulation and what kind of heating and cooling plants you choose. Rather, to some degree, the whole design of the building involves questions of energy consumption, and there is a considerable difference of opinion as to what design will produce the best result. Very complicated trade-offs may be involved.

My feeling is it may be best to proceed, right now, by allowing the architect considerable leeway in the area of

energy savings.

Correct me if you think otherwise. Perhaps it would be possible to say, once we have some norms established, that we want the new office building to be 50 percent or 60 percent more efficient in energy consumption than an office building, of equal capacity, using traditional techniques. This much could be accomplished in the pre-design state. In planning then we could let the architect come up with a solution which would accomplish that end, in keeping with our long-term cost objectives.

Now, if you are going to try to use a life-cycle costing approach, very complicated predictions have to be made, and very precise statements need to be made as to what kind of

long term-economy you expect the building to have. This, too, belongs in the pre-planning stage, and requires expert help.

Finally, there is the question of architect selection. This is an area in which ideas have come along which are radical departures from past routines. I am sure you know they involve the idea of competitive bidding. A bill introduced by my colleague on Public Works, Senator Gary Hart, would require this.

That is S. 2095. Competitive bidding by architects is a knotty problem, and I would be pleased to know if you at the state level have had any experience with it. Right now, selection is liable to depend on the issue of competence and certainly, this must remain the single most important criterion.

One thing which is done now by the General Services Administration, which is bound to avoid a lot of criticism, is to have a panel of practicing architects draw up a list of architects competent for a project, based on certain specifications. GSA has ten regions, and in each, there is a volunteer panel of architects who serve for a year. These are selected from nominations made by the state societies of architects and engineers.

The panel selects a list of three to five firms for a given project, and submits them to the professional staff at GSA. After the design is brought to the conceptual stage, the same panel will gather and review the concept. This is something

we did not have in North Carolina, when I was involved with architect selection, and I think it is a good idea.

Finally, let's move on to the matter of contracting, and see if changes need to be made in public policy in this area. Of course, we are not completely out of the decision-making process, and in fact, that is the question.

I spoke a moment ago about the discretionary powers that would be extended to the architect, but a big question that has come up is how much discretion is to be passed on, beyond the architect, to the contractor. I am speaking of the concept of "performance specifications," as opposed to prescriptive specifications. Some people make the case for allowing the contractor considerable choice in how he will execute a plan.

The argument goes that he will have incentive to solve the problem in the most efficient way. For example, the architect specifies what level of illumination he wants in a building, and leaves it to the contractor to produce a system which will provide that level.

It seems to me that doing this sort of thing makes the oversight process -- which is in the hands of laymen assisted by staff -- all the more complicated. It will be ever so much more difficult for laymen to review decisions made once the design phase is over. Delay caused by the need to decide would be tremendously expensive; yet some kind of oversight by the people's elected representatives is in order.

I have tried to touch on several topics here today.

While they are varied, I think they are some of the major issues facing those involved in the nuts and bolts of decision-making.

I believe this is a good opportunity for those of us who are involved to compare notes. What we need is some idea of our real needs and real restraints, now that the energy shortage has demanded some changes in our ways of doing things.

I think we need to hear, especially, about new approaches which have been tried at the state level. If you have had some experiences which seem to give answers to the questions I have raised today, you would do much to help us all regain that sense of real possibilities, which we very much need.