Service in architecture & the allied arts
SERVICE IN ARCHITECTURE
AND THE ALLIED ARTS

In Alpha Rho Chi, pledges are taught that “we have a clear and unwavering responsibility to contribute positively to the society and environment in which we exist.” This issue of the ARCHI focuses on how all of us—as designers, as planners, as people—can fulfill that responsibility.

Several of the articles highlight student service-learning projects. Through words and heart-stopping images, Kristine Stiphany Weimer shares her impressions of the Brazilian favela she helped redesign. Kara Kelly writes about a group of Notre Dame students who spent their spring break building homes in Mexico. Closer to home, David Hinson explains how a community-based design/build studio at Auburn University has stimulated a meaningful dialogue about the role of design in society, and Robert Selby describes how students at the University of Illinois are helping to rebuild neighborhoods in East St. Louis.

It’s not just students, however, who are engaged in service projects. Matt Bremer writes about his experience biking more than 540 miles—from Minneapolis to Chicago—to raise money for AIDS research. And Ralph Fertig points out how community planners, architects, elected officials, and the rest of us can facilitate a “sustainable” form of transportation—biking—that will reduce oil consumption and traffic congestion, benefit the environment, and promote a healthier population.

As you read this issue, I hope you’ll find yourself reexamining your own work from a new perspective and reflecting on how you, too, can make a positive contribution to the world we inhabit.

Fidelitas, Amor et Artes.

Karen L. Marker
ARCHI Editor
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As you approach Sao Paulo from any direction, the scene for miles is of aggregations of shelters that roll with subtle hills, lines of drying clothes, and thousands of blue plastic water tanks. There are no rules as to what is allowed on the highways, so you are likely to find children flying kites off of overpasses as precarious trucks grumble by, men equipped with styrofoam cartons of beer and soda to sell when the traffic stops. Eventually glossy high-rises appear; however, never within moments of the stacked, sprawling shelters.

These masses of planes and line are favelas—plots of land left abandoned or unclaimed that over the years have given way to the mass migration of people, predominantly from the northeast of Brazil, who come seeking work or following family. The building is haphazard, and the houses are like the rings in a tree: you can trace the history of a family’s migration by studying the materials between the sections of the house. Approximately half of Brazil’s 170 million inhabitants are defined as squatters, and their land, the favela, serves as a glaring example of the gross mismanagement and neglect of the surging population of Sao Paulo.

In February of 2002 I participated with architecture students of the University of Sao Paulo in a study and redesign of a favela. The favela actually grew inside of an abandoned building, which made it possible to contain the project, as a solid structure is not usually a component in most favelas. As a future architecture student, I found the materials, spon-
taneity, and industriousness that I encountered in researching this building fascinating and provoking; as a photographer, I found the images profound and numbing.

Like the hills that surround Sao Paulo, the building at Rua Solon, 934, also contains an aggregation of shelters, though they are vertically arranged and without the water tanks. Its eight stories climb above the rest of the neighborhood Bom Retiro’s small buildings, and it almost accommodates the hundreds of bootlegged electricity wires clinging to any spare wall space. The building was originally to be a four-story middle class apartment complex but was abandoned as three hollow floors in the early 1980s when the builder went bankrupt. It now shelters 325 inhabitants, predominantly families, within 170 rooms.

This building has the utility to shelter its inhabitants, yet because of its precarious beginning and deteriorating structure it fails to serve as a livable environment. The building is technically a slum, which incites no one to be responsible for its upkeep despite the fact that ensuing sanitary, structural, and electrical conditions could prove perilous to those who reside there. Electrical and hydraulic systems are incomplete (hence the mess
of wires), the water only rises to the fifth floor, and the stairwell in the center of the building is the only exit for the eight stories that rest above 1200 square feet. I found the structure interesting because the architecture derived from the fact that it was abandoned and grew larger as people migrated: it is a physical record of an expanding community.

The lack of utilities and hazards of design led Maria Ruth Amaral Sampaio, the director of the Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo at the University of Sao Paulo, to structure a project to evaluate and redesign the structure at Rua Solon to better suit its inhabitants. She invited me to photograph and participate with 22 other students of architecture in studying the physical and socioeconomic composition of the building. This included interviewing each family, analyzing the needs of the community and the needs of individuals in the community, drawing up plans (as none existed), and redesigning the space to accommodate the families living there.

This project was particularly interesting to me because I enjoyed the opportunity of both photographing the inhabitants and evaluating the structure. I believe that architecture is a system, that it cannot be isolated and scrutinized but must be explored in the context of what surrounds it. I also believe it is composed of the everyday activities of those who inhabit its membranes and hearths. The towering, fragile, vibrant structure at Rua Solon, 934, is a physical record of the inhabitants who constructed it—through their migration, through their insistence on keeping their families together, and through their ambition they composed a shelter. The images on these pages are my recording of their shelter.

“The towering, fragile, vibrant structure at Rua Solon, 934, is a physical record of the inhabitants who constructed it.”

Kristine Stiphany Weimer grew up in northwestern Michigan and recently lived in Brazil for two years. She is currently a graduate student of architecture at Parsons School of Design in New York City. You can contact her at kstiphany@yahoo.com.
The subject of affordable single-family housing presents a complexity to students and faculty that belies its modest scale as a conventional studio design problem. A myriad of social and economic factors suffuse any real effort to influence the system by which our culture produces affordable housing. The traditional design studio, despite its potential to act as an incredible laboratory of synthesis and integration, remains hidebound in a narrow view of the architect’s role in society and a narrow definition of the skill set and perspective required to realize our ambitions of influence and impact. To change this system—to make it more responsive to the challenges of contemporary practice and to challenges like those presented by the problems of affordable housing—will require innovative approaches to the curricula of our programs and a critical reexamination of the goals of the studio pedagogy.

In recent years, architecture schools have begun to embrace the “service learning” model as a component of their curricula, often in the context of the design studio. Service learning is a teaching method that connects meaningful community service experiences with academic learning, and has been championed by some as a model for education reform at both the K–12 and higher education levels. When married to a community service context, the design/build studio presents a unique platform for addressing this challenge. In this context, students must both meet the challenge of organizing and executing complex collaborations within their teams and also learn how to navigate the web of challenges associated with interactions with real clients.

The Limits of the Studio Model

When married to a community service context, the design/build studio presents a unique platform for addressing this challenge. In this context, students must both meet the challenge of organizing and executing complex collaborations within their teams and also learn how to navigate the web of challenges associated with interactions with real clients.
“complexity, uncertainty, uniqueness, and value-conflict.” However, the strengths of the studio model can also hide its Achilles heel. As with most any classroom environment, some aspects of the design process are emphasized and others downplayed. As Dana Cuff observes, in traditional studios students are most often exposed to “pure design” divorced from the dynamic context of practice. The result, according to Cuff, is a skewed understanding of design and a missed opportunity to teach students the “social arts” essential to effectiveness in intra- and interdiscipli

...
ice ethic and an awareness of the connections between architecture and the social problems of our age.

**DESIGNHABITAT:**
**A COMMUNITY-BASED DESIGN/BUILD STUDIO**

In the winter of 2000, the director of Design Alabama, a nonprofit organization that works to promote design in the state, approached me to enlist the support of Auburn University’s school of architecture in a project to develop new design standards for Habitat for Humanity (HFH) homes in Alabama. Several members of the Design Alabama board of directors were aware that HFH affiliates in some Alabama communities had encountered resistance to the construction of their standard house models (ostensibly) on the basis of incompatibility with the architectural character of the community. The Design Alabama board hoped to sponsor a collaboration between the school and the Alabama Association of Habitat Affiliates (AAHA) to “improve the design standards” of Habitat homes in Alabama.

In preliminary discussions, it became clear that HFH affiliates would be reluctant to commit to an “untested” design, especially one proposed by students. I proposed that the collaboration include both the development of a new “prototype” design and the construction of the prototype by the same group of students. It was also clear that any design effort would have to be based on a clear understanding of Habitat’s goals and organizational culture as well as an understanding of the broader factors surrounding affordable housing. In response, the project was structured as a two-semester effort: one semester of predesign research (in a seminar format) followed by a semester-long design/build studio.

**SEMESTER ONE:**
**PREDESIGN RESEARCH**

In the first semester, 16 third- and fourth-year architecture students and four students from Auburn’s building science program worked in teams to investigate five questions:

- What is the organizational culture of Habitat and how does that culture influence the homes they build?
- What factors influence the form and character of vernacular housing in Alabama communities (with an emphasis on “affordable” housing dating from 1900 to 1950)?
- What are the typical construction technologies used by Habitat, and what alternatives should be considered (with a focus on foundations, wall and roof systems, cladding, and roofing)?
- What principles of sustainable design and energy conservation could be best incorporated into the process of designing and building Habitat homes?
- What lessons can be learned from prior collaborations between design professionals or architecture schools and Habitat?

The students met with four Habitat affiliates across the state and traveled to the home of Habitat for Humanity International (HFHI) in Americus, Georgia, to meet with Millard Fuller, founder of Habitat, and other professional staff involved in establishing design and construction standards at HFHI. The discussions with affiliate volunteers, Habitat homeowners, and Habitat leadership helped to give the students a profound appreciation for the accomplishments of Habitat and a clear picture of how the mission of Habitat would influence (and challenge) the design process that lay before them.

Among the most significant influencing factors revealed during these interviews was the emphasis within Habitat on constructing homes with a pool of volunteers largely unfamiliar with construction. Given the intention that the students’ prototype house would be replicated by affiliates across the state, the emphasis on unskilled labor meant that the
students’ could not develop the highly detailed and idiosyncratic solutions typical to the projects they had developed in prior design/build projects.

It also became clear that the design of Habitat homes was heavily influenced by the structure of the affiliate network. Because Habitat affiliates rely so heavily on volunteer leadership, the vast majority of the time resources were consumed by the daunting challenges of raising money, selecting and counseling homeowners, and organizing the construction process. Affiliates simply did not have the time or resources to consider many design alternatives and thus defaulted to the design standards distributed by HFHI and those passed on from other affiliates. The need to hold down construction costs, combined with the time constraints facing Habitat leadership, contributed to a resistance to innovation in both construction technologies and design standards. The students concluded that the prototype proposal would have to be accompanied by “lay-person friendly” documentation and that any deviation from Habitat’s common procedures would have to be supported by a persuasive “why to” argument.

The students’ studies of prewar housing from communities across the state revealed several common features of vernacular design, such as wood-framed and wood-clad homes with room-sized porches across the street elevation, long axes perpendicular to the street, raised foundations, metal roofs with a 7/12 to 9/12 pitch, double-hung windows with 1:2 or 1:2.5 width-to-height ratios, and generally deep roof overhangs—design features that clearly developed in response to both the climate of the region and the construction materials and construction methods most readily available to the communities of Alabama.

The investigations into possible sustainable design standards and strategies for Habitat affiliates revealed broad potential for improvement, often by simply applying basic principles of energy conservation. While Habitat has been quite successful in educating affiliates about the importance of thermal insulation and the efficiency of appliances, the students discovered that little consideration had been given to natural ventilation or appropriate solar orientation and roof overhangs. It was clear that significant results could be realized if affiliates could be educated about the impact of these issues and equipped with the tools to factor these strategies into their decisions about site development and home design.

Habitat’s commitment to eliminate substandard housing is awe inspiring. In its zeal for this goal, however, its emphasis on controlling initial construction costs (so as to enable the construction of more houses) has led Habitat into some construction practices and material standards that could prove to be burdens for Habitat homeowners as the homes age. For example, the students found that the typical Habitat home is roofed with 20-year asphalt shingles—a system that will almost certainly require replacement before the 20-year (0% interest) mortgage is repaid. Slab-on-grade foundations are also common, in spite of the fact that termite damage is a significant threat to all wood-frame construction in this region. The students observed that much of the existing stock of affordable housing in Alabama becomes “substandard” due to the inability of the low-income families to sustain the most basic home maintenance costs. Should not, they asked, Habitat expand its definition of “affordable” to incorporate design standards such as metal roofs and raised foundations that would feature a greater degree of “built-in” protection from these types of risks at relatively small first-cost impact?

The final area of research, precedents of collaboration between Habitat and design professionals and students, revealed some of the most interesting lessons for the students. The most significant observations centered on the understanding that there would inevitably be conflicts between Habitat’s objective of stretching its resources to enable the construc-
tion of as many houses as possible and the architect’s goal of making each house as well-designed and well-constructed as possible. It was clear that many efforts at collaboration had failed due to an inability of both parties to accept this idea. The examples of successful collaborations illustrated the importance of mutual respect for the goals of each party and the willingness to work through conflicts.

The study of collaborations also illustrated the critical role that communication plays in collaborative efforts. The feedback received from both educators and practitioners with prior “Habitat experience” stressed the importance of understanding that HFH is not one monolithic client but rather a group of stakeholders (homeowners, affiliate leadership, affiliate construction coordinators, material suppliers, house sponsors, etc.). The designers must often facilitate the resolution of conflicting goals among these parties and make a concerted effort to clarify the goals of the collaboration.

**SEMESTER TWO: HOUSE:1A**

At the beginning of the 2002 spring term, the results of the first semester’s research were presented to an advisory group made up of Neville Eastwood, the director of construction technology at Habitat International, and representatives from the boards of AAHA and Design Alabama. The recommendations of the students were well received by Habitat and formed the program brief for the design/build studio.

Working initially in eight teams of two and then in four teams of four, the students spent the first five weeks of the spring semester on the development of four prototype home proposals. Each team was charged with the task of developing a three-bedroom prototype that responded to the project goals established in the research phase:

- The proposal must both provide a "simple, decent home" and "inspire the soul."10
- The proposal must be responsive to the organizational culture of Habitat (“volunteer-builder friendly” and buildable within HFH’s budget of $35,000 to $40,000).
- The proposal must be responsive to the climatic and cultural context of Alabama.
- The proposal must incorporate the construction systems and methods recommended in the research phase (raised foundations, metal roofs, etc.).
- The proposal must reflect the appropriate use of sustainable design principles, including passive solar design strategies, and be designed so as to lower the homeowner’s dependence on energy-consuming heating and cooling appliances.

As the design phase began, the local Habitat affiliate agreed to sponsor the construction of the first prototype house and...
Community-Centered Design/Build Studios selected a homeowner, Nancy Johnson, and a site for the project. The students met with Ms. Johnson several times during the design phase, presenting design updates on each scheme and soliciting her feedback on their proposals. They also met with representatives from utility companies and Habitat construction leaders during the design phase to obtain feedback and to test the feasibility of their proposals. Students from the department of building science developed cost estimating tools and construction schedules and worked with each team to “tune” their designs to the budget target.

The four proposals were presented to the Habitat advisory group on February 11, and one of the schemes was selected as the initial “DESIGNhabitat House.” After presenting the designs to the news media the following day, the students regrouped into “team five” and produced permit drawings for submittal to the local building department the next morning. By week’s end the foundations for the project were complete and construction of the masonry foundation walls was underway.

To complete the house before the end of spring semester, the students quickly shifted from design to construction teams. Working again in teams of four, they were assigned specific parts of the construction phase (foundations, framing, cladding, etc.) and charged with the development of material lists, development of construction details, and coordination of the on-site work for that phase of the project.

Working three afternoons a week along with five Saturdays, the students completed the construction of the home—now dubbed House:1A—in 11 weeks (about 2,700 man-hours). About 25 percent of the students had some general construction experience and the balance were, by and large, unskilled in construction crafts. Per standard Habitat practice, the plumbing, electrical, and foundation work was completed by licensed professionals, and the drywall and floor-covering installation was subcontracted to professional installers. The home was dedicated on May 19 and occupied by the Johnson family on May 21, 2002.

In the final accounting, the project was built for $25,000 in purchased materials and services, plus $10,000 in donated materials and $5,000 in donated services.

A Community-Based... Studio

One of the common ways that community engagement influences projects like this one is by transforming the students’ ideas about whom they are designing for. At the conclusion of the semester the students were asked to reflect on the year’s experiences in essays addressing the project’s key issues and learning
objectives. The students consistently cited working with the Johnson family and the larger group of “advisor/clients” from Habitat as the source of the most meaningful learning experiences—experiences that transformed their perception of the studio as well as their understanding of their role as future architects.

In all four years of being at Auburn and doing studio projects, I have never been able to really understand “the client” as well as I have on this project. Being able to have so much interaction with the Johnson family while designing and building has given me a clearer and more meaningful idea of what being an architect means. Because of this interaction I feel that I have gained the valuable skill of being able to put myself into the client’s shoes with more sensitivity and purpose.12

The understanding that they would ultimately be designing for “real” clients—that their research and proposals would be presented to clients who trusted them—had a gradual transforming effect on the students, deepening their commitment to “getting it right” and to communicating their thoughts clearly to a lay audience. The engagement with the Johnsons and the interaction with Habitat pushed the focus of the studio to expand beyond the traditional focus on form and technique to include a meaningful discussion of architecture’s purpose.13

The client interaction also presented the students with insights into how complex the social aspects of the project process can be. As the fall semester drew to a close, the students were clearly eager to turn their minds to the design task. Conscious now that there were potential tensions between Habitat’s policies and the desires of the homeowners, they pressed Habitat to identify the prospective homeowner so that they could better understand where these pressure points might be. It was clear that the students were confronting the challenge of reconciling the different (and sometimes conflicting) influences of multiple stakeholders—a challenge common to architectural practice but rare to the traditional studio.

The fact that we were exposed to more than one client at the same time was one of the great learning experiences in the studio… we discussed how having a design/build studio in the manner that we did mimicked the real world as much as was possible in academia, and maybe even more because we were not only dealing with an individual client, but the 10th largest homebuilder in America, which is a hell of a big client to convince to change. We learned how to “coax an elephant into the water without it knowing it was getting wet” in our dealings with all of the Habitat partners, which alone was enough to take from this semester.14

Over the course of repeated interactions with and presentations to lay audiences, the students also faced the challenge of translating their values and beliefs about design and design issues from the metalanguage of studio
I realized how caught up in architecture terms we can get in studio. You have to be able to explain your design to clients in a way that they can understand it. Big words and architecture jargon just confuse the hell out of them.

A... DESIGN/BUILD STUDIO

This semester has been a source of rejuvenation for me. I leave the work site every day excited about what we have done... I have been watching how pieces go together and how they affect one another. I am curious about architecture once again. How will this ceiling height affect the feel of a room? Is there enough natural light in this space? Is there too much? What are the results of placing a window here? These are questions that once interested me; then did not; and now do once again.

Never before have I been able to completely understand a wall section. Building one from the ground up changed everything.

The design/build format offers students the opportunity to translate their ideas about form and program response into a rigorous and demanding tectonic proposal and then test that proposal in the field. These students had never been challenged to consider issues of cost, material limitations, and the skill-level of the constructors. The design/build format presented all of these issues as subjects within the realm of architectural design and therefore within the domain of the architect. Too often these issues are never introduced into the students' experience of design and as a result are seen as foreign to (and in conflict with) the aspirations of architects.

The challenge of working as a team was [the] one experience that has had the biggest impact on both my architectural and personal thought process... I think group work requires a different kind of designer and communicator than the usual studio designer.

The design/build format presents the collaborative process in a different light than the traditional studio, where the principle activity to be shared is design. In the design/build context the students must share a significantly broader spectrum of tasks and roles, allowing them to measure their skills in tasks such as oral presentation, writing, technical development, work planning, and organizing their teams to take advantage of the best talents of their group. The task of organizing the studio to complete specific phases of the house construction introduces the students to the challenge of thinking beyond what they plan to do next—the typical form of time/task planning they've experienced—to how they will make best use of the resources and talents of the whole studio (as well as manage the groups of outside volunteers that want to help construct the project). This collaborative process adds significant depth to the students' understanding of how creative teams work, the breadth of skills needed to accomplish even the most modestly scaled projects, and the leadership challenges faced by architects in collaborative practice.
CONCLUSION

Studio has always been an outlet for self expression, never an inlet for client feedback. It is easy in studio to forget about the “client.” The Johnson family granted me a new and refreshing view of what architecture really is. Architecture is about people and how our ideas play an important role in their lives.20

In response to the work produced in the initial phase of the project and the design work completed in the beginning of the spring term, AAHA has committed to building 50 reproductions of the DESIGNhabitat house across Alabama over the next four years. Groundbreaking on the first of these homes occurred in August 2002, and a half–dozen affiliates have made plans to start construction of their DESIGNhabitat homes this coming year. On the student side of the picture, nine students from the studio have chosen to pursue a design/build thesis at Auburn’s internationally recognized Rural Studio in west Alabama in their fifth year.

When properly structured, these studios present students with direct experience of the connections between design and the craft of making architecture. They offer the opportunity to present community engagement in contexts where that engagement has meaningful consequences, and they offer the opportunity to teach students the value of collaboration as well as the skills to succeed at it.

While the project is still in progress, it is clear that utilizing the format of a community–based design/build studio offers a powerful venue to expand the focus of the studio to a broader discussion of not just how we make architecture, but why we do it—and in the process, engage students and the community in a meaningful dialogue about the role of design in our society. If we are to expand the skills our students bring to the challenges of practice and give hope to the mission of reinvigorating the role of architects in our society, then we need to understand this approach to teaching, and the many other successful examples like it, not as laudable anomalies, but as valuable clues to the future of architectural education.

NOTES
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9. THE CHARACTERIZATIONS OF HABITAT USED HERE ARE GENERATED BY MY WORK WITH ALABAMA AFFILIATES OVER THE COURSE OF THIS PROJECT AND REFLECT THE “ALABAMA CONTEXT” MOST DIRECTLY. DISCUSSION WITH THESE HFH LEADERS AND WITH SELECTED AFFILIATE LEADERS IN OTHER STATES CONFIRM THAT THE CONDITIONS COMMON TO ALABAMA ARE SHARED BY MANY AFFILIATES.
11. THE LOCAL HFH AFFILIATE IS LEE COUNTY HABITAT FOR HUMANITY. THE HOMEOWNER OF THE FIRST DESIGNHABITAT HOME IS NANCY JOHN- SON, WHO HAS FOUR CHILDREN, AGES 5 TO 16.
12. SETH RODWELL, FINAL ESSAY FOR THE DESIGNHABITAT STUDIO (MAY 2002).
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Editor’s note: Due to the spatial constraints of this publication, the preceding article has been significantly condensed from the original. To view Professor Hinson’s paper in its entirety, including a thoughtful discussion of the artisan tradition and the roots of the social vocation in architectural education, please visit WWW.ALPHARHOCHI.ORG.

THE ARCHI • NOVEMBER 2002
THE ROLE OF BICYCLING IN SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

by Ralph H. Fertig

Vice President, Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition

Vitruvius (Penn State) and Iktinos (University of Michigan) Alumnus

The amazing bicycle, the ultimate energy-efficient machine that predates the automobile by decades, is experiencing an accelerating worldwide growth. A half century ago, it looked like automobile production would certainly overtake that of bicycles, but it never happened. By the year 2000, 101 million bicycles were produced, compared to 41 million cars. And the gap continues to grow.

In the United States, unlike elsewhere in the world, the bicycle is frequently considered a child’s toy. Like a skateboard or scooter or pair of in-line skates. But you sit on a bicycle rather than stand. Therefore, the strongest muscles in your body are used to propel you forward, not used partly to hold you up and partly to move forward. That’s why bicycling is the most energy-efficient means of moving people on our planet. That’s why millions depend on it daily for transportation and recreation. And... it’s fun!

Defining “sustainable”

The buzz word “sustainable” has been used—and abused—over the last decade to promote just about anything. Most agree, however, with the 1987 definition that sustainable living is that which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. That means not squandering resources like nonrenewable energy or non-recyclable things. It means that each of us should attempt to leave our world in a condition that’s no more depleted—and hopefully better—than when it was bequeathed to us.

Sustainable transportation

After disastrous oil spills in the 20th century, we became wary of oil extraction and transport methods. Then the oil price hikes in the 1970s heightened Americans’ awareness of our dependence on oil for motorized travel. About 65 percent of current U.S. oil consumption goes to transportation, and the bulk of that fuels our automobiles. In view

I’m on my bike, heading for work, wired into the flux and flow of our planet. My senses are electrified by sights, by fragrance, by hot breezes and pooled chill—by the very real world we live in.

As I zip along, I glance over and see big metal cars with strapped-in people crawling along the freeway. I choose to turn the task of going to work into a spiritual odyssey on my bike. It’s an odyssey that energizes in the morning and calms in the evening. It frames the day with sensibility. Like millions of other Americans who bike commute, I smile because I know how energized I feel from the exercise. And from the benefits I’m giving my home community.

To read why other bike commuters in Santa Barbara, California, love their rides, visit www.sbbike.org/commute/loveit.html.
of ongoing Mideast instability, our growing automobile dependence on imported oil should be questioned even further.

Oil consumption, however, isn’t the only problem arising from too many motorized trips.

As people congregate and increasingly drive cars, traffic increases to a point of diminishing mobility. If nobody does anything about the traffic congestion—like increasing roadway supply or reducing motorist demand—it gets worse. In London today, motorists move as fast as horse-drawn carriages did there a century ago. That’s slower than a person on a bicycle.

If we can induce more people to bicycle instead of drive, we’ll all benefit; not only will we reduce oil consumption and traffic congestion, but we’ll also have cleaner air, less noise, and a healthier population. Because 12 bicyclists occupy the same space as one motorist on the road or in a parking space, we don’t have to pave nearly as much. Government expenses can decrease because it costs less per person to provide roadways, traffic control, police support, and medical coverage for bicyclists than comparable services for motorists. Similarly, parking lots could become smaller, allowing more landscaping, income-producing property, or spaces for people, not storage for big inefficient machines.

Although bicycling reduces the need for automobiles and the social cost of traffic congestion, the primary reason that Americans bicycle is for fitness. With a growing weight problem in our country, any lifestyle change that includes exercise will help us all. Inactivity is now the second greatest cause of early death in Americans, second only to cigarette smoking. Having a healthier, more productive society means that fewer resources have to be spent supporting those with failing mental acuity and physical health.

What can community planners do?

The percentage of trips made by bicycle in a given American community varies from essentially nothing to about 30 percent. One thing is clear: bicycling facilities are a necessary condition, but not necessarily a sufficient one to encourage people to bicycle safely.

For community planners, “facilities” mean bicycle paths, bike lanes on streets, designated bike routes, bikeway signs, bike parking, bike racks on buses, traffic calming measures, and more. It means having safe and convenient means of bicycle travel between residences and work, shopping, recreation, and other destinations. Bike lanes and paths, when properly designed, attract bicyclists, keep them off sidewalks where they endanger pedestrians, and emphasize the legitimacy and desirability of bicycling.

With the passage in 1991 of the federal transportation act, and its renewal act six years later, funding for nonhighway transportation projects was suddenly increased a hundredfold. The result has been that most states and local governments have availed themselves of the opportunity, and thousands of projects that benefit pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users
have been funded. Some other states and cities, however, have continued to fund only more highway projects.

Greenway trails and paths for bicycling and other activities are today the preferred amenity for homeowners. They displaced golf courses a decade ago. These paths not only provide separate travel from noisy cars and trucks; they can also give us needed access across barriers like railroads, streams, and limited-access highways. They give people a way to travel to parks, schools, jobs, and general recreation. Although bicyclists have more accidents per mile of bike path than each mile on streets, the accidents are generally less serious.

Much less expensive than bike paths, bike lanes are increasingly popular on American streets. Bike lanes are striped lanes on the right side of roadways, typically with a bicyclist logo, directional arrow, and the words “BIKE LANE,” but the standards vary from state to state. Bike lanes are safest along the curb or roadway edge, rather than next to parked cars. Bike lanes confer multiple community benefits to everybody, not just bicyclists. Consider how bike lanes help us all:

- Pedestrians are separated from traffic, increasing their comfort and safety.
- Motorists can see better when exiting driveways.
- Buses can pull over outside the traffic stream.
- Bicyclists will be in the bike lane, not slowing motorists in the travel lanes.
- Motorists have more room to maneuver when emergency vehicles approach.
- Space is provided for portable maintenance signs.
- Pedestrians and kids entering the street are more visible to motorists.

Bike lanes encourage more bicycling. A 1993 federal report noted that cities with higher levels of bicycle commuting had six times as many bike lanes per roadway mile. What’s perhaps best is that bike lanes can frequently be striped after a routine roadway overlay, reducing their cost to nearly nothing.

Although bicycle facilities are necessary to support bicycling in any community, they are not sufficient. Teaching children how to travel safely to school gives them a useful perspective that stays with them whether they walk, bike, bus, or later drive themselves on roadways. Promotion of bicycling as a healthy, responsible and normal alternative to the automobile helps make biking more appealing and acceptable to everyone.

The deployment of bicycle police in any jurisdiction always meets with public approval. Officers on bikes are more approachable than those shut inside cars, they are more aware of sounds and events on their rounds, they can quietly approach suspects, they serve as role models for kids, they catch more miscreants than other cops, and they promote the legitimacy of bicycling.

What can architects do?

Cities that have been serious about reducing traffic congestion have already installed bicycle paths, bike lanes, and bike parking in public spaces. Programs that educate residents about safe bicycling have been implemented. Bike racks are mounted on all buses, and bicycle racks serve cyclists on commuter trains. What does that leave individual architects to do with building and property design? Lots.

Secure bicycle parking is necessary today. Long term parking is needed at work for full-time employees. And it’s needed at transportation hubs...
like bus depots, rideshare lots, ferry crossings, or rail stops for those who combine biking with other modes of travel. A bike room within a building, or an enclosed, covered space outside, or individual prefabricated bike lockers outside are best. Means of access to the secure space depends on whether the same employees use it or different commuters use it each day.

For short-term parking, bike racks serve customers or visitors or students. There are many useless racks for sale, including some expensive ones that look nice but function poorly, so beware. The most useful rack is a simple inverted-U rack that holds two bicycles. Locate bike parking in a lighted, busy place near a main entrance, perhaps in view of a security kiosk. If no rack is available for bicyclists, they will lock their bikes to trees, fences, or other places where you don’t want them. And next time, they may take their business where they are welcome.

Many larger employers have bike rooms in conjunction with locker rooms and showers. These facilities serve not only employees who bike to work, but also those who go for a run or vigorous walk or engage in a sport at lunch time. Wise employers will encourage physical activity because it increases productivity and helps retain satisfied workers.

As for school access from nearby roads or paths, try to separate bicyclists from pedestrian sidewalks and motorized traffic. Keep in mind that at schools, more than half of the collisions between motorists and kids bicycling or walking to school involve parents driving their own children to school.

For hotels in tourist destinations, bicycles can be offered free to guests, or a bike rental shop might be adjoined. In order to encourage guests to bicycle, secure parking can be supplied for both touring cyclists passing through and those who arrive with their own bicycles. An assembly, repair, and cleaning area could be set aside for their use. If bike ride maps or books exist for the community, they should be available.

If, as an architect or planner, you want to know what bicyclists need, consult a local bicycle advocacy group—there are hundreds all around the country.

**Toward a sustainable future**

Bicycling is a tried and true mode of transportation and recreation. Traffic congestion and air pollution can be relieved by encouraging more people to enhance their fitness and bike more often. It’s not for everybody, but it’s ideal for half of most people’s trips—those under five miles or so—or for longer “multimodal” trips where bus bike racks are installed, bike hangers are available on commuter rail cars, or secure parking is available at terminals.

Is bicycling the magic solution to our problems? No. However, it can move us closer to sustainability if we choose to make it so. So let’s heartily encourage community planners, architects, elected officials, local visionaries—and ourselves—to accommodate the ready solution waiting in our garages: the amazing bicycle.
Students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign are making a difference: through a multidisciplinary program called the East St. Louis Action Research Project (ESLARP, pronounced either es-larp or eee-slarp), they’re helping to rebuild neighborhoods in East St. Louis, Illinois.

For decades East St. Louis has experienced urban decline and economic distress. Post-war industrial abandonment led to the loss of blue-collar jobs. White households moved out in large numbers, cutting the population by more than 50%. Tax rolls shrunk, causing local government to abandon many services commonplace in other communities. Many employed residents, both black and white, moved to communities that provided basic government services.

Over half of the remaining residents in East St. Louis live below the poverty level. Almost one-third of the residents are unemployed. Some of the existing housing stock is sound, but much is derelict or dilapidated. Many residents are victims of predatory lending practices that prevent them from owning their homes while driving them deeper into poverty.

With so many serious challenges facing them, many residents could have fled to more affluent communities—but they chose not to. These residents feel that the city is their home, and they show a tremendous will to rebuild their neighborhoods. It is these residents who have formed organizations in their neighborhoods to find ways to begin to pursue their redevelopment efforts. It is these residents who have invited the University of Illinois to come and assist them in pursuing their agendas.

The invitation, however, was conditional. In 1990, when the first group of students and faculty came to provide help, residents sought a commitment that there would be continued assistance over time to help the residents implement plans. To meet the challenge of a sustained effort, faculty in the school of architecture, the department of urban and regional planning, and the department of landscape architecture founded ESLARP. ESLARP promised residents that students and faculty would return to East St. Louis every year as needed.

ESLARP serves community-based organizations (CBOs) by involving students, either as part of their course work or as a volunteer opportunity. Service learning is often called reciprocal learning, implying that teaching and learning move on a two-way path.

The university’s mission in East St. Louis is to engage students in the "real world” so that they may learn what processes work and what do not work out in the field. Students learn from residents about

LESSONS FROM EAST ST. LOUIS
LEARNING FROM THE EXPERTS
BY ROBERT I. SELBY, AIA
2001–2002 ESLARP DIRECTOR
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR GRADUATE STUDIES IN ARCHITECTURE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA–CHAMPAIGN
ANTHEMIOS FACULTY MEMBER
The residents show a tremendous will to rebuild their neighborhoods.

The Neighborhood Technical Assistance Center is the university’s onsite office.

Volunteers assist residents with "clean-up, fix-up, paint-up" projects in the neighborhood.

Neighborhood kids work alongside ESLARP volunteers to clean up a local park.
their aspirations to rebuild their neighborhoods. We frequently refer to the residents as our “adjunct faculty” because of the important role they play in the education of our students. Students and faculty, in turn, repay residents by providing technical advice and by working on “clean-up, fix-up, paint-up” projects in the neighborhood.

The short-term projects are often called “demonstration projects” because they demonstrate to uninvolved neighbors that the CBOs can effect positive change in partnership with the university. This demonstration helps the CBOs recruit new members and gain in their capacity to organize community rebuilding programs.

CBOs contact NTAC for technical assistance. If the staff can provide assistance directly, it does so. If not, NTAC contacts ESLARP on campus. ESLARP then recruits the faculty member who teaches the most appropriate course to take on the available assignment.

Once a faculty member accepts the assignment, students and faculty make arrangements to visit the CBO to receive their marching orders. When a neighborhood not previously served by ESLARP contacts NTAC, the first course of action is to work with the CBO to prepare a neighborhood improvement plan, which will be the basis for future development. Typically this task is turned over to a multidisciplinary studio comprised of faculty and students in architecture, planning, and landscape architecture.

Work in the South End neighborhood this past spring is an example of a multidisciplinary service learning studio project. Students met with members of the South End New Development Organization (SENDO) to learn what neighbors desired to be improved in the community. Students prepared written and graphic analyses and inventories of existing conditions, results of resident interviews and surveys, and recommendations for improvement.

Over the years it became clear that neighborhood planning and design are activities difficult to accomplish in one academic semester. The “real” world flows at its own pace, independent of the academic calendar. Successive generations of students must develop work begun by their predecessors. To pass the project on to the next group requires that new students have access to all the data and design recommendations already

INFO IN / INFO OUT

“Many residents could have fled to more affluent communities—but they chose not to. These residents feel that the city is their home.”

RESIDENT INTERVIEWS AND SURVEYS HELP STUDENTS UNDERSTAND EXISTING CONDITIONS AND IDENTIFY AREAS THAT NEED IMPROVEMENT.
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Organizing Service Learning

Approximately 500 students visit East St. Louis each academic year to work with one of the 80 CBOs in the area. When residents seek university assistance they don’t need to call the Urbana-Champaign campus, 180 miles away; they can call the university’s office in East St. Louis, called the Neighborhood Technical Assistance Center, or NTAC (en-tack). This office has on staff a community design specialist (an architecture graduate not yet licensed), a community planner (a planning graduate from UIUC), and a community technology coordinator. A director, usually an urban planner, heads the office.
developed. At the same time CBOs need continuous access to the work developed by the students. Often they need this information when school is not in session and no one can drive 180 miles to deliver project drawings and models to them.

What was needed was a method for asynchronous distant communication. The solution: archive all of the project data and recommendations on the web so that everybody has access anytime—even uninvolved third parties all over the world. Thus began www.eslarp.uiuc.edu.

The ESLARP web site now has neighborhood improvement plans and project drawings and models for work of the past ten or more years. Students and faculty did a good job of building the web’s content as a service to residents in East St. Louis. But there were no computers in convenient locations in East St. Louis so that residents could access this growing supply of information. To meet this demand ESLARP installed computers at NTAC. Soon ESLARP began setting up Community Technology Centers (CTCs) in church basements and other locations available to the public. Furthermore, CTCs provided training to residents on computer applications, making the information superhighway a two-way street.

In the future ESLARP hopes to attract faculty in education policy, political science, dance, theater... and the list goes on. ESLARP is helping to educate new generations of community builders who will find a way to make a difference.

To learn more about current activities or to find out how you can participate, visit www.eslarp.uiuc.edu.
THE HEARTLAND AIDS RIDE

ONE PARTICIPANT’S REFLECTIONS

by Matt Bremer
Assistant Design Center Manager
Freeman Decorating Company—Chicago
Anthemios Alumnus (University of Illinois)

There were a variety of reasons why I joined Alpha Rho Chi during my freshman year, most of them having to do with what I could get out of APX. It wasn’t too long, though, before I realized that the more I put into APX, the more I got back in return. After graduating from college, I put most of my energy into my career—as most of us do—determined to make something of myself. That is, after all, why I went to college in the first place, right? Paying the rent, making the car payment, and sending off that student loan check every month only intensified that focus.

I eventually realized that there is only so much that being successful at work can get you. As I was looking around for various distractions, a friend suggested that I participate in the Heartland AIDS Ride. While raising much-needed dollars for a worthwhile cause was definitely a plus, what I really saw was the opportunity to meet some new people, finally get in shape, and most important prove to myself that I could really raise the money and ride more than 540 miles in six days.

During all of the training and fundraising I quickly realized that I would get everything out of the experience that I desired. From starting out with no money and barely being able to ride eight miles (and feeling really winded) to raising more than $5,000 and riding from Minneapolis to Chicago (and feeling really great), I had the time of my life. It’s difficult to put into words the incredible high and sense of community that I experienced during the ride...

... realizing that I’m moving more than 40 mph down a hill, but enjoying the cool breeze too much to apply the brakes... answering about a hundred questions from one of the locals in Black River Falls, and seeing the excitement in her eyes as she learns more about the ride... waking up at 4:30 in the morning in the freezing cold and actually feeling excited about starting another day of riding... seeing riders break down into tears as they arrive at camp after riding 105 miles to find hundreds of other riders cheering them on... crossing the border into Illinois to find a crowd standing in the middle of a cornfield to welcome us back home... meeting riders who have lived with HIV for more than 20 years... effectively tripling the population of Hammond (pop. 1,067) as 2,000 riders arrive for lunch... sitting at the top of a hill overlooking the entire camp while riders are lying and rolling down... stopping to chat with a nun who just happened
dering what the heck I’ve gotten myself into... seeing the red ribbons and posters on every utility post along the route in McHenry County... overdosing on Starbucks Frappuccinos... turning onto St. Mary’s Road and getting a sudden burst of energy as I realize that I’m almost home... finishing a 112 mile day and still looking forward to doing another 100 miles the next... watching the last riders arrive at camp to find that their neighbors have already set up their tent for them... reading all of the notes and memorials written to lost loved ones in the Remembrance Tent... thinking that this is the hardest thing that I’ve ever done in my life, yet one of the most rewarding.

While I don’t anticipate riding more than 3,000 miles in less than six months again anytime soon, I learned once again that the more you put into something, the more you get out of it. It’s proof that giving your time and service to a worthwhile cause not only positively affects those you’re aiming to help: it can positively affect you as well.

(1) It’s 5 a.m. and Matt (left) and friends are smiling. It must be Day 1. (2) That’s right: those are porta-potties. (3) For some riders, biking hundreds of miles is apparently only half the challenge. (4) A group of riders relishes breakfast before hitting the road. (5) A friend welcomes a rider home. (6) More than 540 miles later, Matt’s still smiling.
A WEEK IN TECATE
BUILDING SMALL HOMES FOR FAMILIES IN MEXICO
by Kara Kelly
Director of Communications
University of Notre Dame School of Architecture

When 13 Notre Dame architecture students arrived in Tecate, Mexico, in March 2002, they wondered what they were doing with their spring break.

"Everything was so shabby and primitive," fourth-year student Katie Courtney says. "We passed houses made from leaning boards—basically trash is what they were made of."

A week later, they had no doubts that they had chosen the perfect place to spend their vacation. The students built small homes for families in Mexico and learned lessons no seminar or studio ever could teach.

There were hardships as students slept in tents in the rocky region, bathed with wet wipes, and mixed concrete and stucco by hand. The houses they constructed reflected the material life of Tecate’s residents, simple and inexpensive. The students used no power tools and the houses were all two-room, wood-frame structures. But the rewards from their "volunteer vacation" far outweighed any difficulties.

"I kept thanking myself for deciding to come on this trip," student Stephanie Zurich says. "There were long, long days, but I know it was the most worthwhile work that I have ever done."

This is the second year Notre Dame architecture students have worked with Amor Ministries, a not-for-profit San Diego-based organization that matches Mexican families in need of a home with groups interested in volunteering their time and talent. Notre Dame’s 13 students were broken into several groups and acted as "foremen"—supervising others who also came to Tecate to build homes. Supervising the work, in itself, taught the students valuable lessons.

"Home is one of the most special, sacred places in the world. To know that the walls that we were putting up could contain years of cherished memories was wonderful."
Notre Dame’s Katie Casanta had a great encounter. Casanta worked with Karah, a high school senior from Discovery Hill Evangelical Free Church in northern California, who was responsible for assigning the various duties their group performed. “Karah knew the people she could push to give everything they had,” Casanta says. “She would pick out the perfect job for the volunteer. Karah, two years younger than me, inspired me to be a better leader.”

The Notre Dame students also worked with the future occupants of the homes. Primitive by U.S. standards, the 11 x 22-foot structures—made from chicken wire, tar paper, stucco, and cement—were “customized” by families.

“It’s nice the owners are able to choose where they want the doors and windows and how they want the house arranged,” Zurich says. “They had their own dreams about their new home. Home is one of the most special, sacred places in the world. To know that the walls that we were putting up could contain years of cherished memories for one family was wonderful. I was reminded that there is so much more to life than studio projects and countless meetings.”

Involvement in every facet of the construction process also provided insight for the students into a different set of realities than they normally encounter.

“I sat down with a guy who has been doing construction for years,” says second-year Notre Dame student Christopher Lagos. “We discussed the architecture major and how architects lack hands-on experience. That’s the primary reason architects don’t understand their designs. In turn, it upsets construction workers who have to deal with designs that don’t make sense.”

“I realized I survived a week without any running water. I was dirtier than I had ever been before,” Canasta says. “My hands were cut and callused, my body ached. But I hadn’t noticed any of those things all week. I hadn’t thought once about the stress of school nor returned to the worries of what I looked and smelled like. I wasn’t the focus
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of my life for one week—someone else was.”

Then there were the people they met along the way: the children, parents, and grandparents for whom they were building the homes.

Casanta talked fondly of Manuela, a woman in her 50s who “was not worried or stressed about anything” despite her husband battling throat cancer and still working long hours. “All Manuela could do was smile and pray for the blessing that she was receiving,” Casanta says. “Her face glowed as she watched us work together to build the structure that she called home after four days... Watching the families that were recipients of Amor’s charity, I saw a sense of gratitude that I’ve rarely ever seen before.”

Zurich befriended a 9-year-old boy named Raul. While she applied stucco to tar paper, Raul followed her around with a trowel and pan so that there would always be materials by her ready to use. “A highlight was talking to the children in the neighborhood,” Zurich says. “My little amigo, Raul, watched us all day. He could not pull himself away from the action of the site.” It struck Zurich that Raul, a bright boy who caught on quickly to the work they were doing, never had the opportunity to attend school.

While it discouraged the students to learn about the lack of resources and opportunities the people in Tecate faced, they also saw their blessings. “Of course these people would enjoy having more, but we should accept the fact that people are happy with less and they do not constantly need more and more to be happy,” Zurich says. “It was so beautiful to see how happy the family was. The mother was pregnant so I’m sure the new house improved their lives tremendously.”

After a dirty and arduous stay, Casanta says “the week surpassed all of my expectations.”
In 1931, the Grand Council established the Alpha Rho Chi Medal to “encourage professional leadership by rewarding student accomplishment; [to] promote the ideals of professional service by acknowledging distinctive individual contributions to social life; and [to] stimulate professional merit by commending qualities in the student not necessarily pertaining to scholarship.” Each year the Alpha Rho Chi Medal is offered to more than 100 schools of architecture, whose faculty select the graduating seniors they feel best exemplify these qualities.

The following students were awarded the Alpha Rho Chi Medal in 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Student Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrews University</td>
<td>Heather Doty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews University</td>
<td>Karen Straub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Alison Franta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Luis Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>Jason Andouchia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Architectural Center</td>
<td>Christopher Meenow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California College of Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>Therese F. Trenney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton University</td>
<td>Mohammed H. Al-Kâiriy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon</td>
<td>Christopher S. Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America</td>
<td>Kevin L. Kaden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>Amy K. Papp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cooper Union</td>
<td>Tao Sule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Casey T. Caddwallahwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalhousie University</td>
<td>Cameron M. Veres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>Natalie S. Malawet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>Shane D. Hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td>Jose M. Calzadilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Joseph E. Lakeri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Erika Silva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>Michael A. Johnson II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>Jennifer L. Knouf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>Christina L. Quinlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette University</td>
<td>Alexandre Freniere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette University</td>
<td>Jean-François Renaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>Nelson Estrada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Tech</td>
<td>Andrea Andries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>AnnaKathrin Hildemand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>Heather Keith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td>Michael Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>Marlin B. King, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Mohammad H. Houssain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Michael Cheng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>Branford B. Britt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich University</td>
<td>Nanay Pinyawatana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>Angela J. Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Glennia Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons School of Design</td>
<td>Christopher J. Forman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Institute</td>
<td>Tamar Kimlevitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Juan Du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Polytechnical Institute</td>
<td>Thomas Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>Brian Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Williams University</td>
<td>Andrew G. Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Adrienne R. Daubes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Laurey Gillette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Institute of Architecture</td>
<td>Robert M. Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Polytechnic State University</td>
<td>Brant J. Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York at Buffalo</td>
<td>Timothy W. Burke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>Jeremy B. Muns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>Denise E. Barry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Miguel Botello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Kevin W. Witt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>Anna O. Eggeland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universidad de Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Angel Rodriguez-Ramon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Michael C. Rubelkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>Ceremonia L. Bohannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>Tillie Kwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Calgary</td>
<td>Kerri L. Rawdahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Berkeley</td>
<td>Jarren Eli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Los Angeles</td>
<td>Aliceon Rudelmayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>Andrea C. Nicholl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit Mercy</td>
<td>Johanna M. Grundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Dana Muller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii at Manoa</td>
<td>Dean B. Johnston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>Charles T. Fulpford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>Tiffany Danielle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>Nicola J. Bezoizowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Katheryn L. Perkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>Pamela S. Clements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>Samuel B. Rue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Manitoba</td>
<td>Daniel Philpott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>Julie Pelletier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>Raquel M. Raimund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Tony M. Lohmando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska at Lincoln</td>
<td>Nicole Lubacka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>Arianne Risto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>Santiago Chiang, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Julie Senseg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee at Knoxville</td>
<td>Brian N. Underwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>Shawn M. Willis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>Merike T. Riego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Carlos Setzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>James C. Kowach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>James L. Berek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee</td>
<td>Brian Domin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>James S. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Becky J. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Justin A. Humphreys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury University</td>
<td>Jose R. Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>James M. Gayed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Be a part of the camaraderie! This is your chance to reconnect with your brothers from across the nation—and take advantage of some outstanding professional development opportunities as well.

At the 56th National Convention of Alpha Rho Chi, we’ll be celebrating professional practice and the renaissance of campus architecture at the University of Cincinnati. You won’t want to miss out on all the great activities we’ve got planned:

- Meet actives, pledges, and alums from every chapter, all of whom share your passion for architecture and the allied arts and your affection for Alpha Rho Chi
- Earn AIA/CES credits through hard-hat tours of exciting new projects and through revitalizing professional development workshops*
- Be a part of the decision-making process that will shape the future of the fraternity
- Relax and enjoy socializing with your brothers at any of the various events hosted by the Rabirius Chapter, including a cookout on Friday evening and the traditional semiformal banquet on Saturday night

The annual meeting will commence early in the afternoon of Friday, March 29, and will close on Saturday, March 30. (Please refer to the adjacent schedule of events for details.) The complete convention price, which will not exceed $75 per person, will include all events and most meals from Thursday evening through Saturday night. Sleeping arrangements are additional. All events held on Thursday afternoon will be optional and may have additional fees.

*Note: this year official AIA/CES credits will be arranged with the AIA prior to the convention.
### Schedule of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday March 27</th>
<th>Friday March 28</th>
<th>Saturday March 29</th>
<th>Sunday March 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00–3:00 PM</td>
<td>8:00–10:00 AM</td>
<td>8:00 AM–1:00 PM</td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-hat tour:</td>
<td>Workshop session 1</td>
<td>Business session 2</td>
<td>Checkout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaha Hadid’s</td>
<td></td>
<td>(includes boxed lunch)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Arts Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(under construction in downtown Cincinnati)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Council annual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00–6:00 PM</td>
<td>8:00–11:00 AM</td>
<td>2:00–5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>Hard-hat tour:</td>
<td>Workshop session 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UC Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renaissance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Mainstreet Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00–9:00 PM</td>
<td>10:00 AM–12:00 PM</td>
<td>7:00–8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening reception &amp; keynote speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closing reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credential check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:00–1:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional practice roundtable luncheon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00–5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6:00–8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus cookout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reservations must be made by March 5, 2003.

All reservations for arrival after 6:00 PM must be accompanied by a first night deposit or guaranteed with a major credit card.

The hotel does not provide its own shuttle service from the airport. A taxi costs approximately $30 each way. We’re currently working on finding other modes of transportation—please check the APX web site for updates. If you arrive by car, you may use the parking garage located underneath the hotel. Overnight parking is $12 per night with in-and-out privileges for a 24-hour period.

### For more information

Please check our web site at [www.alpharhocchi.org](http://www.alpharhocchi.org) for updates. Registration information will be included in the winter edition of the APX Letter, which will be mailed in early to mid-January.

For all comments or questions that are not easily answered by consulting the web site, please contact Nicole Morris, WGAA, at nmorrisapx@netzero.net. Those who don’t have email may call Nicole at work at 215.218.4836. (Please use this number only if you don’t have email or do not receive a prompt response to your email inquiry).
As APX alum Matt Bremer points out in his article on the Heartland AIDS Ride (page 24), often the more you put into something, the more you get out of it—whether that “something” is your career, a special project, or your membership in Alpha Rho Chi.

Alpha Rho Chi is attempting to grow in breadth and influence, and we are determined to become the eminent organization in developing leadership, professionalism, service, and fellowship in our members and our communities. This broadening vision means that we must take on additional expenses. To cover those expenses, last spring delegates to the national convention voted to raise national alumni dues to $50.

Please take some time to think about what Alpha Rho Chi means to you. What impact did APX have in your life when you were in school? What impact has it had since you graduated? What sort of organization do you want it to be? Is that worth supporting? And is $50 per year really all that much?

Please send your check for $50, payable to Alpha Rho Chi, to Rob Ford, Worthy Grand Estimator, 4518 SW 83 Drive, Gainesville, FL 32608. Only with your support can we continue to be an organization of which it is an honor to be a member.

Note that your national dues are separate from any dues your chapter’s alumni association may charge.

The Alpha Rho Chi Foundation was established in 1989 to ensure the long-term stability of the fraternity and to expand its presence in architectural education. To that end, the foundation

- provides scholarships for Alpha Rho Chi members,
- sponsors professional programs at many levels,
- supports scholarly publications, and
- underwrites the APX Bronze Medal program (which recognizes student leadership scholarship, and service).

If you would like to support the work of the foundation, there are a number of ways you can help. Cash, of course, is always welcome. Some corporations and institutions have matching funds programs that double the value of your gift. Stocks, bonds, insurance policies, and real estate can also provide needed resources. All gifts are tax-deductible to the extent permitted by law.

Deferred gifts—such as a bequest by will, a charitable remainder unitrust, a charitable remainder annuity trust, a pooled income fund gift, or a charitable gift annuity—can all support our goals while giving you immediate tax-free benefits. We would be pleased to provide additional information about these programs to you and your advisors.

Please send your checks or direct your inquiries to Sam N. Douglass, Treasurer, Alpha Rho Chi Foundation, 311 South Oak Street, Forrest, IL 61741. You can also reach Brother Douglass by email at sdjdfor@route24.net or by phone at 800.447.4135.

An independent, six-member board of directors, ratified by the Grand Council, administers the operations of the foundation. The fraternity’s WGA and WGE are ex-officio members of the board. All directors are unpaid volunteers.
The Daedalus chapter has undertaken a vast project in honor of a beloved professor—and they need your help.

An imaginative painter and a former curator at the Santa Barbara Museum of Art, Vern Swansen built a legacy teaching architectural history, watercolor, and graphics at Cal Poly, where he left an imprint on all whom he met. When he died several years ago, he bequeathed his life collection of artwork to the Daedalus chapter.

Over the years some of the paintings have suffered damage from acid irradiants due to age and improper storage. The Daedalus chapter has made the restoration of the paintings its top priority. Over the past three years, the actives have been working to protect the paintings from further damage. Next, they plan to repair those that have been damaged, catalogue each piece, and organize the massive collection into an easily comprehensible and accessible storage system. They’ve already begun the process of matting and framing the undamaged pieces for display. Eventually, they hope to show the entire collection and sell prints, using the proceeds to benefit the college with scholarships and grants.

The Vern Project is just getting off the ground—but for it to continue, financial support is a must. The chapter is inviting individuals, businesses, other chapters, and alumni associations to join in their efforts by sponsoring one or more paintings. To find out how you can help, please contact Andy Houghtelin at ahoughte@calpoly.edu or 805.596.0293. And be sure to check your next issue of the ARCHI for an in-depth follow-up story on the project’s progress.
ADVERTISEMENTS 306090 A JOURNAL OF EMERGENT ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN PUBLISHES PROJECTS FROM STUDENTS, PROFESSORS AND YOUNG DESIGNERS FROM ACROSS THE GLOBE THAT OFFER INNOVATIVE DIRECTIONS FOR THE GROWTH OF ARCHITECTURE. 306090 IS A RESOURCE FOR PROPOSALS THAT ARE UNTESTED, UNFORESEEN, UNABASHED AND VITAL. SUBMIT YOUR PROPOSAL TODAY. GUIDE THE FUTURE OF THE DISCIPLINE.

AVAILABLE ONLINE AND AT ARCHITECTURAL BOOKSTORES.
WWW.306090.ORG / INFO@306090.ORG FOR DETAILS
306090 01 FALL 2001 AVAILABLE NOW
306090 02 SPRING 2002 AVAILABLE NOW
306090 03 FALL 2003 AVAILABLE NOW
306090 04 SPRING 2004 FORTHCOMING
306090 05 SUBMIT YOUR WORK NOW

PLACE YOUR AD IN THE ARCHI

The ARCHI is an annual publication with an audience of 3,000 and growing.

We are now accepting a limited amount of outside advertising.

For more information and current rates, please contact Scott MacKay by email at jsmackay@alaarchitects.com or by phone at 847.854.2877.
DISCOVER
WHAT ALPHA RHO CHI HAS TO OFFER

Since 1914, Alpha Rho Chi has been serving students and professionals in architecture, interior design, urban planning, landscape architecture, engineering, and related fields. Our chapters across the country have repeatedly earned the top award in the Greek fraternal systems for academic excellence. Our membership—unique in its diversity of men and women—strives to achieve fellowship and unity by perpetuating merit in studies and rigor in tradition.

Alpha Rho Chi prepares its members to live up to the demands and expectations of the professional world through resume and portfolio workshops, lectures, mentoring programs, and networking opportunities. Moreover, Alpha Rho Chi provides a multidisciplinary forum for social interaction beyond the typical academic experience. The strong ties of brotherhood set Alpha Rho Chi apart from other professional organizations, yet a shared professional interest in architecture and its allied arts differentiates Alpha Rho Chi from other Greek letter societies.

For us, there is no compromise, no uncertainty, and no regret. For us, personal and collective strength is of the essence. Our numbers are small but sufficient. We are not an elitist organization. We believe in equality of gender and race. We strive to uphold standards and ethics of the design world and society in general. So, if you have the inclination, a love of the arts, and a desire to succeed, seek us out and understand why this brotherhood is forever.

For more information, contact Vicki Horton at 972.414.5103 or vjhapx@mindspring.com, or visit www.alpharhochi.org.

CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS
THE ARCHI of Alpha Rho Chi

LEADERSHIP • PROFESSIONALISM • SERVICE • FRATERNALISM

The ARCHI strives to publish fresh, innovative articles that reflect— and stimulate—critical thinking about contemporary issues in architecture and the allied arts. We focus on four key tenets not often covered in other architectural publications: leadership, professionalism, service, and fraternalism.

Our 2003 issue will examine the theme of fraternalism. What does fraternalism mean to you—as a member of our fraternity… your profession… your community… society as a whole?

Send your submissions (text and image files on zip or CD) to Karen L. Marker, ARCHI Editor, Alpha Rho Chi, PO Box 315, Yorkville, IL 60560 or by email to archi@alpharhochi.org by August 31, 2003.

Winner of the 2002 first-place publications award from the North American Interfraternal Foundation.
Don’t miss the exciting 56th National Convention in Cincinnati!

We’ll be offering tours of Zaha Hadid’s Contemporary Arts Center and other exciting new projects in the Cincinnati area, plus professional development workshops and plenty of opportunities to reconnect with your brothers from across the nation. Turn to page 30 for details.

Grand Council
Gregory S. Pelley
Worthy Grand Architect
Tel: 704.333.2811

Nicole A. Morris
Worthy Grand Associate Architect
Tel: 610.458.9589

Vicki J. Horton
Worthy Grand Scribe
Tel: 972.414.5103

Rob Ford
Worthy Grand Estimator
Tel: 352.377.0597

J. Scott MacKay
Grand Advisor
Tel: 847.854.2877

The Archi
Alpha Rho Chi
National Professional Fraternity
Architecture and the Allied Arts
P.O. Box 833432
Richardson, TX 75083

ADDRESS
REQUESTED

SERVICE

Custom to insert indicia