



At Greg Howell's suggestion, I have just started using dictation software. It is a weird and strange experience. It is like sitting in a darkened room talking to yourself. Of course it suggested to me a different time and a different place.

When I taught environmental law at the University of San Diego, I assigned each student a 10 page paper on some aspect of environmental law. Because I routinely received papers with words missing, employing poor grammar, engaging in run-on sentencing and other distractions, I used to ask students to proofread their papers aloud to themselves in the bathroom. The bathroom was chosen as a fairly private location so that any interlopers wouldn't believe the student was completely crazy. But the most valuable part was to make sure that they actually heard what they thought the reader was hearing—in other words that they had communicated their thoughts in English. It's amazing how often we miss mistakes when we re-read what we've written. It's largely because our brains anticipate what we thought we said rather than what we actually said. And the same is true when we speak—we often think we have said something that we didn't actually say.

This is one of the reasons that the phrase "speed of trust" bothers me in connection with our industry. Although we may be able to interpret thoughts of close and trusted friends and anticipate what they're going to say, is that a "value add" to us? It is often like missing the details of what we meant to say when we proofread our own work in silence. In design and construction the details are extraordinarily important. How much time do we spend clarifying small details on drawings? How much money is spent in RFI's (edit industry average of \$600 per)? What does a "red" door mean? How much confusion is engendered in the normal transfer of information from programming to designing to bidding to sub-contracting to building? How many users say "wasn't there supposed to be a sink there?" How often are you searching for a plug in a hotel?

Careful and thorough communication is the very essence of what we do. The solution to an owner's problem requires a deep, iterative chain of understanding, yoking the best brains in the business together to vision a solution. The one right solution is often a set of options bundled together into the most satisfactory package. It is a process of inquiry and translation, in continuing loops. Segregating that process into silos is at best wasteful and at worst, well worse. And what do we gain from our segregation? Do we actually mitigate risk or increase risk? Do we come to a collaborative and innovative solution before we run out of time, money and energy? Architects are loathe to "design by committee" but isn't that what segregating the solution process does?

There are many reasons we advocate integrated project delivery at LCI. The most important reason, however, may be that we oppose segregated project delivery. Segregation of project delivery means that an architect is prevented from explaining his/her concept of how her/his



design might actually be built (liability for discussing “means and methods”). Segregation means that a contractor or tradesperson shouldn’t suggest a better detail or an overall better solution (liability for “design”). While we recognize that each party to the program/design/build/commission/operate continuum brings a specific expertise to the table, that doesn’t require that they operate in isolation. Orchestras are full of isolated specialists (oboiists rarely play the violin, at least in concert). Yet, orchestras require integration across the platform (“orchestration”) to perform a piece of music well.

Almost 40 years ago, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Keyes v. Denver School District*, 413 U.S. 189 (1973), that school segregation can in fact result in racial discrimination, regardless of whether the intent of the School District was to discriminate. Thus it outlawed *de facto* segregation.

Similarly, we need to closely examine our project delivery practices for the kind of segregation that promotes waste and discriminates against real value and real solutions. As much as we think we collaborate and innovate, aren’t we in fact segregating programming, design, construction, commissioning and operating? What can we do to integrate those processes, orchestrate our delivery methods and solve the problems we think we’re solving? Think about that out loud someplace where people won’t think you’re crazy. Let me suggest that you do your out loud thinking at your local LCI Community of Practice. Trust me, you’ll find a welcome place for your voice there.