



August 16, 2022

MEMORANDUM

To: Campus Planning Committee

From: Liz Thorstenson, Campus Planning
Campus Planning and Facilities Management (CPFM)

Subject: **Record** of the August 2, 2022 Campus Planning Committee Meeting

Attending: Dean Livelybrooks (chair), Ann Brown, Claessa Davis, Cass Moseley,
Savannah Olsen, Janet Rose, Cathy Soutar, Christine Thompson

CPC Staff: Liz Thorstenson (Campus Planning)

Guests: Austin Bailey (Rowell Brokaw), Colin Brennan (CPFM),
Emily Eng (Campus Planning), Dustin Locke (Rowell Brokaw),
Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning), Martina Oxoby (CPFM),
Eleanor Sandys (Oregon Arts Commission), Cassie Taylor (Campus Planning)

CPC Agenda

1. Zebrafish International Resource Center (ZIRC) 1% for Art Proposal – Siting

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposed site for the Zebrafish International Resource Center (ZIRC) Expansion Project 1% for Art. The committee's role was to determine whether the proposed site is consistent with *Campus Plan* Principles and Patterns (e.g., location, scale, maintenance).

The CPC Chair, Dean Livelybrooks, reviewed the committee's role when reviewing the art proposal, and explained the role is to not review the art itself. The role is to review the art and its location, scale, maintenance in accordance with the *Campus Plan*.

CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials, CPC meeting history regarding the agenda item, and relevant *Campus Plan* Principles and Patterns.

Aaron Olsen (Campus Planning) reviewed the art proposal concept and the proposed exterior locations around the building. Site context, including Campus Plan axes, greens, and primary pathways, were also reviewed. An overview of the site plan, art features, and locations was included.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members. The main committee concerns regarding the proposal are related to scale, security, durability, location, emphasis on pedestrian circulation and the primary entrance, and quantity of artwork that is complimentary/compatible and not in competition with the building and existing landscape features.

Comments regarding artwork scale:

- Members concerned the post mounted pieces shown are not appropriately scaled for an institutional setting (too “residential” in scale); the scale of the wall and mural art is more appropriate for the University setting.
- Members concerned that the proposal includes too many individual art elements for the size and type of the building; each façade does not need a treatment.
- Address potential security concerns. Consider fewer pieces, celebrate the fish but not be so literal as to draw attention to what is inside. When viewing a large mural on the side of a building (e.g. downtown), it is not automatically assumed that what is featured on the mural is what is inside the building.

Comments regarding building security:

- Align the art with the security concerns before moving forward. Concerns for security previously considered by the project team? Encourage the Art Committee to reconsider security.
- Showing the entry way (and a gateway) with fish on it (seems to say “fish here”) raises security concerns; however, murals incorporated into the overall design are less concerning as they seem to say “we celebrate fish.”
- The building is locked 24/7 and not open to the public; it’s a challenging place for an exterior art project.
- Members expressed security concern regarding associating the subject of the art with the zebrafish inside the facility. Historically, indicating what is inside this building has been avoided to address security concerns.

Comments regarding maintenance and durability:

- Member concern that the post mounted pieces shown will not be durable or long lasting.
- Carefully consider maintenance and durability as this artwork is reviewed and refined.

Comments regarding the building entrance and pathway circulation:

- The entrances around the courtyard are not a public entrance. Locate the art where the public engages with the building (front entrance).
- Consider the compatibility of the art with the pathway and circulation network of campus, E.g. primary entrances, secondary entrances, primary pathways, and non-public entrances. The post mounted gateway element at the courtyard is highlighting a non-public entrance along a service route, which is not appropriate.
- Locate art to emphasize the main entrance. Emphasizing the entrance could also help authorized visitors with wayfinding.
- A mural at the entrance may not be appropriate as there is limited space and multiple architectural elements to compete with.

Additional comments regarding artwork location:

- If goal is to make art accessible to the campus community, consider more publicly accessible locations. The current proposal is not the most advantageous place.
- Member support for the mural idea. How many murals are planned?
- This is a small-scale building with multiple building materials; minimize the amount of “clutter” and competition with various elements of the building structure as well the landscape features such as the campus standard light fixtures.
- If the proposed post mounted artwork at the south courtyard were removed from the proposal, would more resources be available to create more mural work?
- No requirements that the art be located within the project site. Consider locations where there is a need for improvement. E.g. opportunity for story telling elements in the courtyard or the pedestrian underpass beneath the railroad tracks on the Riverwalk Axis.

Other comments:

- Members support for seeing the proposal return to the committee.
- Is there an urgency to this project, E.g. in terms of the project timeline?

In response to questions and comments from committee members, Olsen and Colin Brennan (CPFM) provided the following clarifications:

- The wall reliefs shared during the meeting changed slightly from what was sent in the meeting mailing.
- Security related to the ZIRC facility, in particular highlighting zebrafish in the art, was a topic of discussion with the art committee and not identified as a concern.
- The Art Committee supports engagement with what is happening inside the building. The proposed art was preferred because of the opportunity to highlight zebrafish.
- If there is a security issue related to incorporating zebrafish in the art, that needs to be addressed. The artist tailored the art to highlight these fish elements.
- Security concerns could change the proposal.
- The idea of storytelling around the building was fundamental to the proposal. Minimizing that immediately changes the intent of the art.
- There is no immediate urgency to move forward.

Action: No formal action was taken. Action for the **Zebrafish International Resource Center (ZIRC) 1% for Art Proposal – Siting** was delayed until a future meeting.

2. Huestis Hall 1% for Art Proposal – Siting

Background: The purpose of this agenda item was to review the proposed site for the Huestis Hall 1% for Art. The committee's role was to determine whether the proposed site is consistent with *Campus Plan* Principles and Patterns (e.g., location, scale, maintenance).

CPC staff reviewed the purpose of the agenda item as described in the meeting mailing and background materials, CPC meeting history regarding the agenda item, and relevant Campus Plan Principles and Patterns.

Martina Oxoby (CPFM) reviewed the art proposal concept, the internal programming of the building, proposed art location, and materials.

Discussion:

The following is a summary of questions and comments from committee members:

- Member support for the art concept; explore ways that the art could better reinforce and emphasize the main building entrances. For example, is there a way to take some of this art and move it to the recessed walls located near the entrances?
- Member support for the siting location of this piece; however, how will this work with the existing windows?
- Member concerns for maintenance of brick façade and windows.
- Member concerns the artwork could be used as a climbing wall; consider height of the lowest bars located on the support grid, and if the grid can structurally support climbing.
- The Huestis south stairwell façade is blank; this proposal is a positive change.
- Work with Facility Services and Safety and Risk Services to ensure the art and underlying grid are not climbable, that the windows and building are maintainable, and that the grid itself is not dominant and is appropriately mounted to the building.
- Consider overall scale and pulling the piece back from the windows and connecting to the main entrances (rather than enveloping all three sides of the façade).
- Members support for simplifying the artwork and focusing more on reinforcing the entrances. Consider how to accomplish with a lighter hand.
- Carefully consider how the art interfaces with the roofline and where the art ends on the corners of the façade so that it has a finished look to it.
- Will the existing indoor art be returning to the entry lobby after construction?
- Member support for a statement piece on the blank brick south stairwell façade.
- Members concerns for spiderwebs and bird excrements on the art. Carefully consider any unintended consequences of this art without discouraging the opportunity to make a statement in a place that is otherwise an eyesore.

In response to questions and comments from committee members, Martina Oxoby (CPFM) provided the following clarifications:

- The indoor art will be returning inside the north entrance of the building.

Action: With 8 in favor, the committee unanimously agreed that the **Huestis Hall 1% for Art Proposal – Siting** is consistent with the *Campus Plan* and recommended to the president that it be approved with the following conditions:

1. Carefully consider the maintenance, durability, and safety of the art piece and of the building, and work with CPFM and Safety and Risk Services to address the following elements and areas:
 - a. maintenance of the brick façade and windows,
 - b. how the art piece works with the building roofline and corners,
 - c. durability of the art piece and how it is mounted to the building façade,
 - d. carefully evaluating the safety of the art piece and supporting grid and minimizing the potential for climbing of the art and/or support grid, and
 - e. minimizing the potential for spider and bird habitat in the art piece.

2. Carefully consider the overall scale and how the art piece emphasizes the main building entrances, including:
 - a. consider how to reduce the overall scale and simplifying the design, and
 - b. consider how to emphasize the main building entrances.

3. CPC Updates and Tour

CPC staff gave a brief update regarding CPC member retirements, and shared an overview map of CPC areas of impact on campus since 2000.

CPC member, Christine Thompson (Campus Planning), and CPC chair, Dean Livelybrooks (Physics), shared a summary of each other's CPC project history and involvement.

Emily Eng (Campus Planning) shared the impacts that Christine Thompson has had on the committee for the duration of her time with the committee.

The scheduled meeting time ended and the campus tour did not take place.

Action: No formal action was requested.