



ATTENTION: © Copyright Western Washington University Libraries Special Collections. "Fair use" criteria of Section 107 of the Copyright Act of 1976 must be followed. The following materials can be used for educational and other noncommercial purposes without the written permission of Western Washington University Libraries Special Collections. These materials are not to be used for resale or commercial purposes without written authorization from Western Washington University Libraries Special Collections. All materials cited must be attributed to Western Washington University Libraries Special Collections.



This interview was conducted with Henry Klein, architect of Mathes Hall, Nash Hall, and the Performing Arts Center, at his office in Mount Vernon, Washington, on June 17, 2003. The interviewer is Tamara Belts.

TB: OK. Today is Tuesday, June 17th [2003]. I'm down in Mount Vernon with Mr. Henry Klein, who was the architect of Mathes, Nash, and the Performing Arts Center at Western Washington University. He has just signed the Informed Consent Agreement, and we're now prepared to start with our oral history. So, Mr. Klein, could you tell me a little bit about your early life and how you decided to go into architecture?

HK: I was born in Europe in southern Germany. I started out in Germany with grade school and a year of high school and then went to Switzerland to finish my high school. It was a classical education: Greek, Latin, and this was some time ago. And, at that time, I decided that my classical education would lead me into academia, and I wasn't quite ready to be an academic. And it was a chance remark, actually, by a history teacher in high school; we were studying Egypt, and he said, "The pyramids..." And I asked him, "How can you explain that shape?" And he said, "Well, I can't," he said. "That's art." And he made the first connection between architecture and art to me. And it kind of rang a bell and it appealed to me. I decided maybe that's what I wanted to pursue (I was about, well, sixteen years old).

I don't want to go through the rest of the story; it may not pertain to what we were talking about here, but I ended up at Cornell, and it was a wonderful experience for me because, at that time, architecture went through the transformation from classical architecture to what was later called modern architecture. We were the first class at Cornell that was caught up in that change. It was an interesting time. Then, to make things short, I graduated from Cornell, went into the army for two and a half, nearly three years. And, then after the war – and I was in India during that time, which was kind of interesting, too, but doesn't pertain to what we were talking about here – I briefly got a job in New York, but I didn't like the city too well. I was taken by the art of the Northwest and came out to Portland because Pietro Belluschi was practicing in Portland. (Well, I went to see Paul Thiry first in Seattle and then to Portland). He gave me a job. It was my first real job.

TB: Paul Thiry?

HK: Well, Paul Thiry did offer me a job, but I decided I wanted to see more of the west, and so I went to Portland, and Pietro Belluschi offered me a job. I stayed with him for three years until he went to MIT to become the dean of the school of architecture there. When he left, his office was bought by Skidmore Owings and Merrill. I don't know if you're familiar with them. They were probably the largest firm of architects in the country then, and a good firm, but it didn't appeal to me to work for a large firm because you lose contact with your clients, and most of the clients are corporate clients. So I decided to try it on my own.

On a vacation to the San Juan's, and then B.C., I came through Mount Vernon, and I rather liked the aspect of the town, the narrow streets -- what I liked everybody hated here (laughter)!

TB: OK.

HK: And so I stayed. I spent a couple of days here. I just wanted to meet people that I thought could help me make up my mind whether this was a good place to be, like the most prominent contractor (there was no architect here), and banker. At that time, there was a frozen food plant, Pictsweet Frozen Food, and I decided I wanted to see the president of Pictsweet Frozen Food because they were the largest employers. And I don't know whether you really want to hear all of this -- his name was L. L. Brotherton, and when I went to see him (I was rather surprised that he would just receive me without knowing me), there was a contractor in his office who wanted to persuade him -- or an investor, I should say -- to build a small housing project in the flats here west of town. And, I was ready to leave, and Brotherton said, "No, I want you to hear this; I want to get your opinion on it."

So I stayed, and when the man left, Brotherton said, "Well, what do you think, should I put some money into this or not?"

And, being young and really not caring too much what the outcome of my interview would be, I said, "No, I don't think you should because I don't think you should build on farmland."

That was it. On the way out he asked me where I was staying, and at that time the President Hotel was still a hotel, and I told him that. The next morning when I came down the hotel clerk said that, "Mr. Brotherton called" (laughter), like God was calling you (laughter)! So I called him, and he said, "Well, look, I think you might be interested in seeing my house because it's an interesting house. It was designed by my son-in-law."

[His son-in-law] turned out to be Tony Smith, a very well-known sculptor, some of his work is at Seattle Center. Tony Smith had been an apprentice with Frank Lloyd Wright. Brotherton's house was very much done in the manner of Frank Lloyd Wright, and at first you could mistake it for Wright's work; I mean it was that well-done on a hexagonal basis and so on.

Well he said, "I kind of like what you said in my office, and if you decide to come here, this house is much too big for us, and I will have you design a small house for me."

So I decided I had my first client. I went on to Portland and my girlfriend, Phyllis Harvey, and I decided to marry and give it a chance. I thought she had a lot of courage, myself (laughter). At any rate, that's what we did. We came up here, and I opened an office and I designed Brotherton's small house, which turned out to be on the foundations of a house that was very deteriorated and partially burned, so we merely used most of the foundations, but it was an interesting job and an interesting client. It was rough going the first few years, but we made it.

TB: So what year did you come to Mount Vernon?

HK: ,52

TB: 1952, OK. Who were some of the people that you studied with at Cornell? You said it was a change from the more classical to modern.

HK: Well, there was one young professor -- Charlie Warner was his name -- who represented the revolution. Naturally, we were all gathered around him. But the rest of the faculty, except maybe for one, was pretty outstanding, too, in their own way. The dean was Gilmore Clark, who was a landscape architect in New

York and had a prominent office there. But he came up only a couple of days a week; that's how informal things were then.

TB: So how did you happen to get involved at Western?

HK: Western, well, one of my early public jobs was the first phase of the public library here, Mount Vernon Public Library. George Bartholick apparently had seen it (who was the campus architect), and at the time, Western wanted to build a second story to the Fine Arts Building, to one wing of it, a painting studio. They decided that it was too small a job to interest some of the big offices in Seattle, so he asked me if I'd be interested, and I said, "Sure."

And this is how things have changed: Jarrett was the president of Western then and Bartholick was the part-time campus architect. Well, Bartholick talked to Jarrett – I don't think Barney was on board yet, but he may have been, I'm not sure – and told him that he thought this young kid did a pretty good job on this library, and he was close by, and why don't we have him do it? So they came down to the office -- if you can imagine that, which consisted mostly of orange crates (laughter)! He was that careful, he wanted to see who I was. We talked for awhile, and he decided maybe I was good enough. So that was my first job at Western.

TB: So Jarrett actually picked you?

HK: Yes, Bartholick and Jarrett, yes.

TB: Right, they both came down to visit you in Mount Vernon?

HK: Yes, which surprised me; I didn't expect the university president to come down. And they were happy – that was a painting studio, which is still there, by the way, and some small offices. Anyhow, they thought we did a first-rate job.

I don't know exactly how this happened, but I do remember that when I came before the Board at the completion of the painting studio, and facetiously I said, "If you're happy with this, we are a small office, but we can do big work, too. I mean, I can hire a couple people to help me."

They were kind of laughing about it. But, at any rate (I don't know the rest of the story); they picked us to do the first dormitory. Then, at the same time, Bartholick decided the two dormitories should be done by the same architect because they were on the same site.

There was kind of a controversy, one of the Board members said, "I don't like high-rise buildings. I don't think they fit here, and what I want you to do is put..."

Well, it turns out to be six hundred students on this couple-acre site. I couldn't see completely covering the site with buildings; it didn't make any sense to me -- with low buildings. And so I held pretty firm and I said, "Well, this is really what should be done, and this is what we want to do."

In the end, I persuaded the Board that maybe I was doing the right thing, and I don't regret it: I think it was the right thing to do. And that's what happened.

TB: Was there any discussion at the time or that you were part of then in terms of it being any kind of boundary to that side of campus? Because now it's looked at as being almost like a gateway...

HK: Yes, I'm glad you asked that because, at that time, that was to be the north entrance to the campus, and there was a small building projected, I think, across the street north on High Street that was to be the

information center and gate. Anyhow, that's, yes. But I think once the information center was built on the south end, that was no longer considered.

TB: Yes, now I think it's just viewed as being a boundary to the north end of campus.

Now, talk a little bit about what styles were influencing you, or what you feel that building represents?

HK: Well, we determined the exterior material, quite early and thought it should be brick. Mostly because the only other buildings there were -- well, Old Main and the Library. Everybody felt this was the proper material right there because it's a permanent material, for one thing, needs very little maintenance, and it has the scale you'd expect in a residential area. So we never changed that. We wanted it to be a very -- even though the buildings were tall -- human low scale.

At that time, Mathes was strictly a girls' dorm, and Nash was to be the boys' dorm. But, halfway between, well, I think, right after Mathes was completed, the residential policy at Western changed, and the two were co-ed, so that presented a few problems which I didn't have to face at the time. But it maybe illustrates how fast things were changing at that time. That was another reason how the buildings were designed and had a certain almost authoritative quality about them (besides being of a domestic scale). We wanted them to last and to be substantial enough so that changes could be made within, without ruining the whole aspect.

I was pleased when we were on campus (Lowell Larson and I went up to the Bassetti talk). Afterwards we walked around and we went to Mathes Hall and I hadn't been there in years. We went to the lounge and the entrance, and I was very pleased the way things have worked out. I mean, the landscaping has grown up, of course, but even the way the kids used the lounge and the deck and the whole entrance was pretty much the way they used it in the sixties. The furniture has changed, but... So I was pleased that perhaps we designed something that bridges generations.

TB: How involved were you in designing at least the initial interior furniture for the building? Did you do all of that?

HK: Yes, we did that. And the landscaping, as well, was part of our work.

TB: OK. I was trying to identify -- because we have such a big outdoor sculpture collection, and a lot of the outdoor sculpture collection comes out of building funds -- if something actually came out of the Mathes-Nash fund?

HK: Probably not. I know we weren't involved in any of that. I was on the Selection Committee for the Performing Arts Fund, but not Mathes and Nash. I don't remember any arts allowance.

And this is the interesting thing: those two buildings, and including the Performing Arts Center, were built before computers, before the handicapped accessibility code was required; those two things alone made a huge change in building techniques, and then those two buildings had to be adapted to that, not always too successfully, I think, but, still, they could take it. And I'm pleased for that, too.

TB: What about the Performing Arts Center? Do you have some thoughts about that? What was involved? You also did the Performing Arts Center, right?

HK: Yes, we did.

TB: And, do you have any comments about what you were trying to do there or how that evolved?

HK: Well, I think maybe that illustrates our philosophy about architecture. Instead of building a building there on that site, we decided that the negative spaces, the open spaces, were even more important than the

enclosed spaces. We wanted to preserve the view. For that reason, the rehearsal spaces all ended up underground because they didn't need or want the view, nor did they need the light. I mean, they wanted to be in closed spaces.

The building was split into three parts: the Concert Hall, then we needed that connection to the existing Auditorium Music Building. We changed the entrance – I don't know if you remember – from the east to the north to combine the two lobbies. We also wanted a pedestrian connection between the Student Union and the Performing Arts Center because we thought it would help; after performances, people could circulate there. So, all those things came together. The way it looks now, it's really three different buildings: the one underground, the Concert Hall, and the rest of the building. It's not one, big, imposing building. And, if I can pat myself on the back a little bit here, we were never interested in creating a monument. I mean, we wanted something that worked, and I think all of our work reflects that. Architecture is just a reflection of circumstances, and it's a bit more than that, but it's not architecture, to us, anyhow, with a capital "A"; it only becomes that a hundred years later, if you're lucky (laughter). But, it's much smaller than the popular conception of architecture is.

TB: Now that plaza; were you involved in making the decision to brick over then the plaza above the studios?

HK: Yes, that was part of our ...

TB: And that was to match Red Square, kind of, to continue that theme?

HK: Well, we wanted an open square there, mostly because of the view, so that meant there was no building there. And in a way Red Square is an enclosed square; this is kind of open on one side.

TB: Yes, I'm just thinking of the brick work. Was there any consideration of there being any other way to have had the top, or the brick was just obvious?

HK: Rather than concrete or some other material? Well, we always liked brick because of the scale; you know it's smaller. And we felt that if something went wrong, like a leak or something, they could take that up and fix it and put it back.

TB: So what about -- you were on the selection committee, you said, for the sculpture for For Handel?

HK: Yes.

TB: Was that an easy decision?

HK: No, it wasn't at all. I took a backseat on that, mostly because I didn't know di Suvero and I wasn't too familiar with his work, and I can't say I was too fond of it. But di Suvero was selected, and I later met him, of course, and talked to him a lot, and found he's a wonderful person, whether I agree with his work or not. But somewhere I read -- I think it was in a book by Lewis Mumford -- about another sculptor or other sculptors who work in a way that di Suvero works. He was talking about something else, but I think it applies to di Suvero. He mentioned that this particular piece looked like something that was assembled after a great disaster, say like 9/11. And this man just found pieces and started to sort of vaguely put them together and make something of it. Well, di Suvero's sculpture reminds me of that. And when you think of it in those terms, it becomes really alive to me, like a resurrection (laughter), you know. It doesn't look that way, but, to me, I see it that way. And di Suvero, all his materials -- he works with just found materials -- he goes down to the scrap yard and picks something out, makes something of it. And, I like his work. And, now, you know, I can't imagine -- the scale of what he did its just right I think -- without it, I can't imagine that square; it would be lifeless.

TB: It would be very empty out in the square.

HK: Yes.

TB: Going back to Mathes and Nash, well, OK, I'm going to say it, and then you can tell me what you think. Someone else has said that there was a Scandinavian influence, that you were influenced by Alvar Aalto.

HK: Alvar Aalto, yes.

TB: Right. Is that true or not?

HK: Well...

TB: What would you say?

HK: I would say, "Who is not influenced by Alvar Aalto?" I mean, he's one of the great masters. And he is one of my favorite architects because he combines ... how to put it? He takes the existing conditions, and what he calls the "little man" -- every man, and he sees every man and woman as the basis from which you start. You don't start from what other people have done. You don't start from what you'd like to do, I mean, from self-aggrandizement; you just start from simple things. And his architecture reflects that. And he worked while the Bauhaus was in its heyday, and, even though he's considered a so-called modern architect, he already started to -- humanize isn't the right word, but -- to introduce other elements to make it less elitist, and I liked that about him. And his work has stood up; I mean, it's as good as anything that's ever been done.

TB: When you talked earlier about when you were at Cornell that there was this modernist movement kind of becoming, and the classical was going away, and yet, to me, Mathes and Nash are much warmer than the true modernists, at least then some that are otherwise reflected on campus, some of the stuff that Thiry did, which was the concrete building and a flat roof and a very... So is there any other way that you would kind of characterize yourself, or you adapted it in a certain way or whatever? I mean, I find Mathes and Nash both very warm, nice buildings. I lived in Nash one summer. And the curvature, I think all that kind of softens it; it's not the block...

HK: Well, the curvature came about because we knew each floor had to have so many students and so many rooms, and that means a corridor. But we didn't like the idea of having these long corridors, and the curvature sort of cuts off the long view; in other words, you only see about four doors at a time, I can't remember. And that's how it came about.

TB: Did you ever consider working with straight concrete? Ibsen Nelsen, I know, did some straight concrete buildings. Thiry obviously did.

HK: All concrete without any other materials? I don't think so. I don't object to it, though. I think it could be done very well. As a matter of fact, we just did a house, an all-concrete house, which the owners wanted to begin with, and you'd think that would be the last kind of piece of architecture that should be all concrete (laughter), but in this particular case with a roof garden and some plants on the roof, it humanized it. It's no one material, that you can say is better than another material, but there are materials that are more appropriate for a particular kind of situation than others.

TB: Let's see, and you were, like you already said, trying to blend in with Old Main, the library, and the Viking Union that had been done in brick.

So were Mathes and Nash your first dormitories?

HK: Yes.

TB: And was the Performing Arts Center your first theater?

HK: See that's an amazing thing, I think, to me -- that the Board had tremendous courage to pick a small office like ours, and relatively inexperienced in large work -- to pick us for these buildings. This could never happen now, because now, in order to apply for a job (and this was originally done to give small offices a better chance to get their foot in the door at institutions like Western), you have to make up a brochure of your work, and that's expensive (although with the new digital imaging it's a little easier now). Then you have to have the right kind of insurance, the right kind of staff, and so on and so on. Then, all these brochures are given to a committee that looks at these and then decides whom to pick, and grades are given to each one of them.

Well, first of all, it's done by a committee, so a committee can't look at individuals; that's not part of their makeup. They look, they add up all the little points that are given to size of staff, liability, insurance, how long they've been in business, and so on and so on, and then it all adds up and somebody comes out on top. I said that once to an architects gathering and I still believe it, that this kind of way of selecting an architect was done to replace the "good old boy system," which was bad. But, there were some things about the "good old boy system," as much as I suffered from it that I think were better. That is (like in this particular case of Mathes and Nash that you brought up), the Board made the selection on other things than what I just described. They decided, "Well, maybe this person has talent or some other saving grace that would make them do a better job."

Also -- the main point I want to make is -- they took the responsibility. I mean, they stuck their neck out. They took the responsibility for their choice. A committee never takes responsibility for the choice -- that's why they're a committee -- that's why they go through all these steps to show that they didn't stick their neck out. I'm not recommending "the good boy system," but in the case of Western, it certainly benefited us.

TB: When you got offered a job, number one: were you surprised that you got offered a job for doing that dormitory?

HK: Yes.

TB: And then, did you immediately have to go hire more staff or more expertise for the project?

HK: I had two friends, one old friend that I worked with at the Belluschi office -- I think he was in Boston at the time -- and I wrote to him and I said, "Look, I've got this job, can you come and help me?"

And he came out and helped me. And I think probably in the early stages there were just two of us and maybe three at the most. Then we hired two more people to do the construction documents because that's a big job.

TB: OK.

HK: That hasn't changed, by the way, in architects' offices. They have computers now, but our work has its ups and downs, and not just small offices, but big offices, and that's the hard part, because when the people you work with, who you become fond of, and then there's no work, I mean, you can imagine what happens.

TB: Right.

When you were originally designing them, you designed them with someone else; I mean two of you were kind of working together on ...?

HK: Right, we talked a lot to each other. George Wallace was his name. He is since gone. And we were both in the Belluschi office; we both had similar views of architecture. He was a native Oregonian, and I was from across the water. But we were friends then and remained friends.

TB: What about some comments about other architects that were on campus or how you see their work? Or I guess I'm just interested in the architectural community. It seems like everybody's friends, even though you're sort of competing for the same jobs. I mean, Fred Bassetti, Ibsen Nelson and you, and George Bartholick must have been kind of like the weaver that brought you all together...

HK: Yes, that's right.

TB: So, maybe could you talk a little bit about him, George Bartholick, and how he worked?

HK: OK, I'm happy to, because I think George Bartholick was the main character who brought us all together, and he had his own ideas about campus planning. And, although he was difficult to work with because he was so intensely interested in what he was doing, you couldn't go home at night because George Bartholick was in your office, and he wouldn't let you go. I mean, he was that devoted. And, at first, we all resented it because we felt, "Look, we are the architects; leave us alone ...". But, I have to give him credit -- the Western campus wouldn't be what it is without him. Red Square really was his idea, I mean, he put it all together. And he insisted he wanted the view to the Bay when we did the Performing Arts Center. We agreed with him, of course, on that. But the big ideas were his. And, like all people with big ideas, he was very difficult to work with, I mean very demanding. But, I feel I owe him a lot, I mean, we would never have done work at Western if George hadn't come down here.

TB: Do you have any thoughts about Fred Bassetti? You really kind of picked up after him ...

HK: Yes, Fred had already done quite a lot of work when we came to the scene. I never knew Fred all that well. As a matter of fact, I don't think I was ever part of the inner circle (laughter) the George Bartholick, Ibsen Nelson, Fred Bassetti, and I don't know who else was there, Baumgartner

TB: Paul Thiry, yes, Al Baumgartner.

HK: Al Baumgartner. Well, Paul Thiry was on his own cloud (laughter).

TB: Yes.

HK: But, you know, that, you ask that question because you sense that there was something going on between all these architects that pulled them all together at Western, and I think there was. I was really more on the outer rim of that circle; I was never one of the confidants. But in every institution it happens at a certain time. If everything falls together -- I mean, the board, the presidency, the campus planner, the architects -- then something blossoms briefly, and then it goes away again. Well, it's institutions and countries and whatever. But, I think that's what happened at Western. It was exciting because even though I wasn't part of an inner circle, George always pulled me in. Somehow I sensed I was part of a bigger thing, and I'm lucky; I felt the same way when I was in Portland working in the Belluschi office.

That was the prime time for Northwest architecture, when Belluschi was in Portland, doing his work, and I was working on his houses and churches, and it was like being in Greece in the 5th century; something was in the air (laughter).

TB: So do you have any other thoughts about your work, not just Western, but in general? I thought it was interesting that you obviously have a concept of architecture and its close alliance with art, and you talked about...

END OF SIDE ONE

HK: You mean the practice of architecture?

TB: Yes, and your philosophy, I think, when you go to do your work and what you're trying to do, just in general?

HK: I never think of myself as practicing architecture with a capital "A." I just think of it as, well, solving problems isn't the right word because, oh, it's part of it, but, it's how you solve the problem. And our office has always been -- because we are small enough, I think -- concerned with architecture as art, for one thing, and architecture as it applies to, well, Aalto called it "the little man"; we call it "every man" (laughter). The dean of Lawrence University, of the architecture school there, stopped in the office here about a month or so ago. He said an interesting thing to me -- (the reason why he came is a couple of years ago I gave a seminar. They wanted me to come out for five months, once a month, and certain students who had graduated, working in other offices would come back to design this building, and I was supposed to be the critic) -- he was asking me about my clients and so on, and I explained a few projects we're doing right now, and he said, "You mean to say you take everybody who comes in the door?"

I said, "Yes, I try to."

And it occurred to me then that maybe that's how we may be a little different, that we do try to take almost everybody that has a problem, sort of like a general practitioner.

TB: Do you think if you would have settled somewhere else -- I mean, how much are you influenced by the Northwest itself in your architecture or in your work? If you would have ended up settling some place else, do you think that your work would have been very different?

HK: Definitely.

TB: So what specific things, maybe, from the Northwest influence you?

HK: When I came to Portland, I was entranced by the Northwest, the history, the country, and I absorbed as much as I could. I think my boss, Pietro Belluschi, who was Italian by the way, obviously went through the same experience because he became the exponent of Northwest architecture; he was considered to be the father of it. And I admired his work.

It all seems very tame now, looking at what architects are doing now, but maybe that's part of the Northwest. I never really wanted to compete with other architects, and I sense now, when you look at magazines, that's what architects do; I mean many of them, those that get their names in the papers. They compete with other architects instead of just competing with themselves on how to make something in a particular situation for a particular person or persons and see what comes out of it, using the appropriate material and so on. But the Northwest then in the early 50's was a much different place. I think Microsoft has made a change.

TB: In making everybody more competitive?

HK: Well, it's thrown the Northwest into the national arena and the national scene. Before that, we never, in Portland, worried about that. I mean, sure we knew who Alvar Aalto was and Le Corbusier and Frank

Lloyd Wright, and we admired them all, but we didn't feel we had to imitate them, only to the extent of what we could use for our own self.

But, now, well, we just finished a house -- and this is how things have changed -- for a young couple, Microsoft people, the house, a million and a half; well, that alone is astonishing to me. When I first started out, a \$30,000 house was a big house. And, yet, I felt all along in talking about this house with our clients, they didn't have the faintest idea how they wanted to live, what was important to them, what was not important to them, and I had the idea that they felt, and it's true, that to find out about architecture, everything, that you could just push a few buttons and the internet will tell you everything, even to the smallest details of mechanical things or air changes and I finally said, "Look, I spent five years educating myself in architecture, going to school, and then worked and, I mean, got experience in life, and you expect in an hour on the internet to learn everything about it?"

That's the situation we're in now. Not with everybody, but...

TB: Going back to...

HK: I think maybe we should cut this short; I'm complaining (laughter).

TB: No, no. I mean, I just got a couple more questions, one of which is going back to Mathes and Nash, and you mentioned that somebody on the Board actually didn't like the way you first drew it.

HK: Right.

TB: If they had not agreed to your drawing, would you have adapted your drawing or adapted your work to what they wanted, or would you have said, "No, I don't want to do that."

HK: Well, it depends how far they wanted to go. The argument was an argument or a discussion of scale, and I did my best to explain why I thought our building, even though it was taller, was more appropriate for the sight, and the scale is even better than if you'd covered the whole sight with building. And, in the end, the rest of the Board saw it, and Bartholick backed me up.

TB: OK, and then you also mentioned that you were a part of the landscape design for Mathes and Nash.

HK: Yes.

TB: So is that something that your architectural firm does, or you sort of farmed it out and approved it, or how does that...?

HK: Well, usually we have a landscape architect as a consultant, and its part of our work, but just like the structural engineer, mechanical engineer, landscape architect, they're consultants to us, and their work is incorporated in our drawings.

TB: OK, is there anything else that I haven't asked you that you'd like to comment on?

HK: I'm afraid I've said too much already (laughter).

TB: No, no, not at all. Well, I really appreciate your taking the time to do this.

HK: You're welcome.

TB: Thank you.