

post-it label number

Folder Name

Date

1 Misc. Correspondence I-Z 4/1/1975

19

4/25/1975

18

5/13/1975

17

6/10/1975

16

6/11/1975

14

6/20/1975

13

8/8/1975

12

9/2/1975

11

9/15/1975

10

9/16/1975

9

9/29/1975

21

11/25/1975

² Additions or Credits to
Contract

12/5/1975

8

3/31/1976

7

5/3/1976

6

8/11/1976

3 Architect: E. Hedric Clay
and Assoc.

9/30/1976

20 Progress Pictures

10/22/1976

22

10/22/1976

23

10/22/1976

4

11/16/1976

5 (not digitized)

1/3/1977

15

n/d

Summary

Comments

Mississippi Valley Structural Steel (MVSS) proposes use of a prefab building for the DC cite instead of using cite-specific forms. E. Hedric Clay (EHC) protests. English Brothers, as contractors, are caught in the middle between the architect/designer of the project and the supplier of the materials.

Herein is a case where the owners of the means of production deem what is best for the consumer. Whether race is a factor is not apparent. Nor is there clear evidence that MVSS is trying to "get over." Still, a specific request for materials was made and MVSS is offering what they think is best for the situation. In the least this is paternalism.

Letter from EHC to English Bros. re: the latter's winning of the contract bid.

This letter effectively establishes the relationship between architect and contractor on the project that has, in the least, an unusual history with regards to the way it relates to race and space.

Letter from EHC to English Bros. re: the rebidding by CPD of the demolition contract. There are also some lingering aspects of the construction project that EHC wants to get cleared up.

So who actually ended up doing the demolition? On a voided contract (in this same file) English Bros. are listed as being responsible for the work. But this designation may come from the fact that the work has not been assigned to a sub-contractor.

Letter from EHC to English Bros. re: the use of a prefab structure for the DC

EHC is almost adamant here that a prefab building will not come close to satisfying the specs for the project. I wonder if English Bros. suggested this first, or if the CPD put them up to it. Given the amount of time EHC put into the design of the center, one can almost assume that specs would require a site specific design. EHC iterates that no spec data was even presented to have the prefab structure even be part of the discussion at this juncture of the project.

letter of request for "indefinite extension of the completion date for" the DC project

This request by English Bros. comes around the time that McCabe Brothers, the company contracted to do the demolition of the old center, is protested and shot up.

Letter from EHC to English Bros. conveying the decision of the CPD to change the location of the cite.

I can use this document to find the exact minutes from the board meeting. This letter is all about time. The overall time for completion of the project gets put off because of the need to revise plans to an agreed to state. This can be read as a response on the part of the architect, the space designer, to the rhetorical decisions of the Parks board. Words, powerful words, can manipulate spatial realities.

Letter from EHC to English Bros. re: revised drawings for a relocation of the DC on the site.

Letter from EHC to English Bros. re: starting construction on the new site.

This conversation takes place in the context of all parties moving forward on building the new facility without demolishing the old one. No indication as to how EHC feels about this change.

English Bros. offer to relocate the new Dc building on the proposed plans

English Bros. appears to want to get the project going. Also, this and the previous correspondence confirm that plans to relocate the new structure to avoid demolishing the old building were in fact in place.

Letter from EHC to English Bros., informing the latter of the CPD Board's approval of the request for demolition and the relocation of the DC "back to the original site as shown on contract drawings dated Feb. 21, 1975."

So here's the go ahead to demolish the original DC. I'll have to read this letter against the Park Board minutes and also any discourse issued by the DC committee.

Letter from EHC to Robert Toalson of CPD, which lists violations of the contract based on CPDs proceeding with the demolition without the architect's consent.

EHC is holding CPD accountable for any negative results from work done on the site. A "Mr. Erwin" is referred to here, as an inspector of the demolition work. This correspondence situates CPD as proceeding with the demolition of the old center without the consent of EHC and probably the DC committee as well. This exchange is well after the injunction is filed. It also reads like EHC is not only watching his professional back, but also has the interests in the community in mind here.

Photo of DC "Looking West"

This photo shows the foundation. Note also the houses in the background. Is that a boys' and girls' club sign on the building on the left? I'll have to go on site and place this pic in a contemporary context.

A series of correspondences with Western Waterproofing Co. that amend the type/kind of recreational spaces on the DC site. Particularly, the letters 'DC' are to be removed from centercourt.

Who wants the DC logo removed? Why? Was it an issue of cost? Identification?

An exchange between CPD and EB, where CPD asks for a partial refund in light of the fact that funds allocated for winterizing were not needed because of a mild season. EB replies, "Should it be the desire of the owner to change the form and type of contract employed on this project we would be in a position to consider a renegotiation not only of this section, but all other divisions of the work in the contract documents. Should this be agreeable we shall be glad to discuss this matter further."

Clearly EB is aware of the maxim, "Give 'em an inch and they'll take an ell." Very clear rhetorical positioning here in this statement. Does EB think its been cutting CPD a deal? If so, this letter confirms it. Moreover, CPDs rhetoric is almost "buddy buddy" here, as if this is an exchange among friends. Thus far, EHCs position has been the one that appears the most fraught. But what is the relationship between EB and CPD?

A letter from English Bros.(EB) to EHC (and others?) expressing concern about the progress of the construction.

This letter articulates Carter Electric's inability to receive materials to complete the current project because of past due funds to its supplier. So, EB lets everyone else in on the problem, but then themselves are left out of the resolution.

A letter from English Bros. to EHC (and others?) expressing concern about the progress of the construction.

Seems there is a payment issue with Carter Electric/BNS development Corporation. Since they have not received payment, they have ceased work. In turn, all other work on DC has been halted. More than anything, English Bros. interprets their lack of invitation to a resolution meeting as a bit of disrespect. They understand their participation to be central to the project at this point. The proposed completion date for the project (Oct. 1, 1976) "is seriously jeprodized (sic) at this point." While they are informed secondhand of meeting's proceedings by EHC, EHC is also the recipient of this letter.

Sandhu and Assoc., consulting engineers on the project, issue a list of "salient points" from a meeting with CPD, EHC, English Brothers and other contractors directly involved with the project.

While others present at the meeting are identified by their affiliation, EHC is listed as "came in late." Is this an indication of how he's been perceived by those involved with the project? An "ungrateful recipient"?

Photo of DC "Looking Northwest"

Photo of DC "Looking Southeast"

Photo of DC "Looking Northeast"

A letter from Robert Toalson, General Manager of CPD, to EHC re: what needs to be done for CPD to assume ownership of the DC. ECH also relays these concerns to English Bros.

The rhetorical dust seems to be settling here, in that there is care conveyed in the level of detail considered. EHC also refers to "the owner" in his letter. Who is this? is CPD considered the owner of the space? Are there other instances where ownership of DC is discussed?

Application and Certificate for Final payment

This set contains legal documents and dollar values for all the account for construction at DC. No digital file made (it's thick) but I might want photocopies of this.

Flyer for Mississippi Valley Structural Steel (MVSS) Building Systems and Development

This informational flyer is for prefab structures. In the context of ECHs proposed plans, at worst consideration of prefab is an indication that many of the spatial requirements state by the DC community are not being considered. At best, this is a cost-saving process that might let money go to other aspects of the project.