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### I. Synopsis
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### V. Measures

**Summary**
Not having an art building that equaled the teaching talent found at Weber State University’s Department of Visual Arts was the primary drive for a new facility. A new building with improved physical resources would allow the University’s art program to become more competitive in the Intermountain West and potentially attract a more diverse body of students. The facility would allow instructors to teach with a different pedagogy, more compatible with the group problem solving and critiquing methods found within the artistic community.

In addition, the need for a cultural resource for the City of Ogden was spawned from a wealthy, local family’s desire to donate their art collection to the city. Regrettably, the city lacked an appropriate facility in which to house such a gift, and eventually they placed the collection at the Utah Museum of Fine Arts on the University of Utah campus in Salt Lake City, approximately 35 miles away. This was a poignant milestone in the long struggle towards a new art facility on the Weber State campus.

Situated on the main quadrangle of buildings at Weber State, the Visual Arts School stands as an expression of the activities found within. It reflects the desire to serve both the community and the students through the successful marriage of gallery space with the educational goals of the visual arts school. The building integrates the various programmatic parts with architectural expression that allows for an understanding of the complex nature of the whole. This is accomplished through the massing of the building as well as the exterior materials and interior finishes throughout the project.
Prescott Muir Architects (PMA), a Salt Lake City-based design firm was chosen for both the programming and design of the new school. They not only had experience in designing art centers, museums, and cultural facilities, but also an interest and involvement in the local art community that demonstrated their excitement and interest in this particular project. By finding ways to balance the wants and desires of the students, faculty, community and donors, the Visual Arts School serves as a mechanism facilitating the successful integration of different agendas through architecture.

The value of this case is to study the parallels between the educational goals of Weber State University’s Art program and the design approach of Prescott Muir Architects. The various departments within the school have been provided with appropriate levels of interaction so that knowledge can be shared through dialogue among the students, faculty, and the visiting public. The design of the school was carried out in a similar manner. The differing entities involved in the project maintained a dialogue, as well, that allowed Prescott Muir to gain input from and accommodatethe needs of the constituencies while developing the overall vision for the Ethel Wattis Kimball Visual Arts School and Center.

The design team was composed of principal Prescott Muir, Jack Robertson as the project architect with Lisa Arnett as the design associate. Other consultants participating in the venture were Dave Christensen, landscape architect; Van Boerum & Frank, mechanical engineers; Spectrum Engineering, electrical engineers, Great Basin Engineering, civil engineers; and Comtrol as general contractor. In the span of one year, this team of professionals created a structure that is an invaluable asset to the future of Ogden and Weber State University.
The concept for the Visual Arts Center stemmed from the desire to create a building to provide a new educational facility incorporated with a community art museum space on the Weber State University campus. With its beginnings more than a decade ago, the principal focus of the Department of Visual Arts Advisory Committee (DOVA), chaired by Bob Herman, was to create a case for a new building and advocate for it with the University administration. Through the years, the committee built its case, developing a building program, a preferred site location, a comparative institution analysis, funding options, and so on. Many on this committee were instrumental, especially in this advocacy and fund-raising phase, including Jim MacBeth and Richard Van Wagoner, past-chairmen of the DOVA, and committee members Gwen Williams, Frances Hawk, Gaylor Schmitt, Telitha Lindquist and Carolyn Nebeker.

This committee (DOVA) then took a less active role as the actual programming and design phase of the Visual Arts Center began, though still remaining a presence in the process. For example, during the programming phase, the DOVA committee participated in a workshop conducted by PMA’s team, providing expectations for the facility—especially the gallery—on behalf of the community. In addition, with the project’s funding coming solely from private donors, which is more commonly seen in higher education’s buildings today, the desire of the donors to house an art gallery in
this facility was noteworthy for the designers. Throughout the programming and design process, the collective voices of the clients became the driving force for the entire project.

For the Ethel Wattis Kimball Visual Arts Center, the constituents consisted of several parties: The state entity, the Division of Facilities Construction and Management (DFCM), represented by Blake Court; the public/community of donors led by Vice President Ann Millner, Ph.D. as the University liaison and Bob Herman, AIA, as Chair of the Community Advisory Committee; and Weber State University, along with the faculty and students, represented by Jim Jacobs and later, Jim Harris, who was later brought on board to manage the construction phase. In this category, the project from the schematic phase through design development was informed by a committee comprised of the following individuals: Ann Millner, then Vice-President for Community Relations; David Eisler of Provost; Alan Simpkins, Vice-President of Administrative Services; Craig Hall, Associate Vice-President of Administrative Services; Mike Perez, Director of Facilities Management; Jim Cox, Architectural Services; and June Phillips, Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities.

While some participants were not as vocal as others, this committee proved influential on the design of the building. David Eisler, in particular, had a strong interest in the project and lent his influence, while giving Jim Jacobs a significant voice in all matters. Four representatives from Administrative Services also strongly participated in the design phase, voicing their opinions on many facets of the design. These representatives channeled the desires of those whom they represent to the design team, which turned idea into reality.
DFCM-
The state of Utah was involved because the proposed facility was to be located at a state-owned institution, Weber State University, and was intended for use by state employees and university students in addition to a museum-going public. DFCM’s main role in this project was to insure that the project was completed on time, with no delays or trouble from state auditors, and with as little litigation as possible. This involvement differed from other DFCM-related projects because private funds, as opposed to public funds, were utilized. Mr. Court’s role in this project was contract administrator and budget keeper; he solicited proposals, wrote contracts, and made payments for the various tasks performed. Because this project was privately funded more interaction transpired between the end user and the architect than with the state.

Ultimately the state’s voice was heard through the DFCM by contract language and Mr. Court’s participation in meetings. The state also had a role in the project through Weber State planning and administration.
WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY -

During the initial programming and design phases of the project, the University was represented through the Art Department and others previously mentioned. Six weeks into the construction of the project, Mr. Jim Harris, the Campus Master Planner, was brought in to serve as the Project Manager. His role was to manage the construction budget and to voice his opinions in the interest of the University. This was accomplished by working directly with and holding weekly meetings with the Project Manager, the Architect, the Contractor, and the DFCM. Again, the collaborative process of decision-making allowed problems to be solved fairly and easily because of the relationship that existed at that group level.

The evolution and maintenance of the entire campus and how this building fit into that scheme was of utmost importance. Mr. Harris’s department was also responsible for site planning. The location of the structure to required parking areas and campus utilities became the main topics of concern. In addition, another important concern was the maintenance of safety for students and faculty, ADA accessibility and service vehicle routes into campus during construction.
FACULTY AND STUDENTS-

The future building users also had input in the design of the art center. Mr. Jacobs, the faculty chair, represented the art department’s perspective. Initially, Mr. Jacobs acted as a liaison between the faculty and the school’s administration. Together they needed to decide how much money to allocate to the project, and choose an architect and construction company that would be the best in achieving their goals for the project. Through steering committees, Mr. Jacobs held considerable influence in all stages of development. DFCM and campus administration took a less active role as the project progressed, while faculty, students, and donors all participated more assertively in the decision-making process.

Through the initial programming process, the constituents began to develop the group problem solving theme. Interaction between students from a variety of art disciplines helped stimulate discussion, and the potential for involvement across the several artforms taught at the school was identified. This democratic and resourceful way of generating dialogue was the underlying concept that drove most of the decision-making. This theme applies to the art faculty as well. They wanted to emphasize interdisciplinary discussion brought out into a more public forum, which in turn could engage students in discussion. These goals informed the architect’s design, and led to the creation of the large hallways and corridors found throughout the building that act as circulation paths as well as extensions of classrooms.
DONORS-

Because the Visual Arts Center was funded privately, the donors had significant influence in the project’s development. The donor committee wanted to elevate the notoriety of the school and bring art awareness to the surrounding community. Mr. Herman, the donor committee chair, represented their desires, while negotiating with the other parties involved. His being a licensed architect was advantageous to all, for he contributed knowledgeable insight to the tasks at hand. Mr. Herman’s role was critical and his political influence was essential for creating a successful product. If too much or too little influence were to be imposed by the donors the building would have suffered. The donors wanted a public art gallery as the main feature of the facility. The gallery needed to be spacious and be in a prominent location. Mr. Herman helped to negotiate these desires while working with the architect and others to maintain an art center that would be both functional as an educational building and cohesive in its concept and design.
FIRM IDENTITY-

Prescott Muir Architects was founded in 1976 by Prescott Muir, and in its 28 years of practice has developed a national reputation for their design of uniquely crafted buildings and urban interventions. It is a small office located in the heart of Salt Lake City that employs a number of professionals dedicated to a work grounded in a location, people, culture, and time.

After receiving a Bachelor of Architecture degree from the University of Southern California in 1972, Mr. Muir continued his education at the University of Utah, graduating in 1982 with a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree with an emphasis in painting and drawing. He went on to study at Columbia University and received his Master of Science in Architectural Design in 1986. In addition to heading up the firm, Mr. Muir also participates as a studio critic and has taught a design theory/history course at the College of Architecture + Planning at the University of Utah. He has lectured and exhibited his work at the University of Southern California, at Carnegie Mellon University, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, the Las Vegas Center for Contemporary Art, and the Salt Lake Art Center.

Mr. Muir’s endeavors include extensive amounts of time devoted to community and professional services. He has served as the President of the Utah chapter of the AIA; has participated as a member of the Salt Lake City Planning Commission; has served as Chair of the Board of Directors of the Salt Lake Downtown Alliance; Salt Lake Olympic Cultural Affairs Committee; Salt Lake Art Center Board of Trustees; Governor’s Envision Utah Scenarios Committee; Salt Lake Art Center Board of Trustees; Governor’s Envision Utah Scenarios Committee; Salt Lake Art Center Board of Trustees; Governor’s Envision Utah Scenarios Committee; Salt Lake Art Center Board of Trustees; Governor’s Envision Utah Scenarios Committee.

SERVICES-

Prescott Muir Architects is dedicated to providing solutions to architectural challenges by corroborating a narrative founded on client, community and architect communication. This informs each project’s response, whose physical expression grows from the assemblage of incremental, or detailed “proofs” or solutions mediated by the inherent tension between use and representation.

The firm has established itself as an award-winning firm with a diverse body of work, ranging from performing arts centers and art museums to private residences and affordable housing projects. In addition, they participate in the programming process of project proposals.

\(^1\) Taken from the firm’s website, www.prescottmuir.com
FIRM STRUCTURE-

The architectural firm Prescott Muir Architects (PMA) is a small operation, headed by Prescott Muir. Two partners complete the firm structure. Jack Robertson, AIA, is the partner who has led the project management for most of the firm’s major projects. Lisa Arnett, the second partner, has led and collaborated in the design efforts of many of the firm’s projects. The architectural staff includes from five to fifteen individuals with varied responsibilities. Due to the close-knit nature of the firm, the three partners are able to work closely on the projects that the firm takes on, which leads to a more quality design. Each member of the firm is responsible for bringing to the team effort all possible resources to meet the project needs. As projects come in, the partners collaborate on a work timeline, and assign appropriate responsibilities, which vary from project to project. As assignments are dispersed, the team coordinates in a timely manner to insure that the client’s needs have been heard and will be sufficiently met.
As the initiative for a new art school and museum evolved, the network of decision-making commenced. The task at hand was not a diminutive one—the scheme was to create a visual arts school that would better serve the faculty, students, and community in the present as well as the future. The involvement of various constituents proved fruitful as their input synthesized and structured the overall success of the project on many levels.

Programming was the first step to create this new Weber State University entity, with Prescott Muir Architects chosen to lead the team. DFCM, a campus steering committee from the Weber State campus facilities department, and an advisory committee from the Art Department assembled to establish the building’s program requirements. After touring several other similar visual arts centers to understand more fully the prevailing developments within visual arts education, they set to work to establish their needs and desires for the new facility. The local needs for an art museum coupled with faculty decisions as to where the visual arts program was headed were weighed in the developmental process. Shifts in future visual arts education, such as the more frequent presence of digital methods while phasing out of more traditional analog methods, was discussed, and flexible working spaces became a significant factor to facilitate the group problem-solving methods used to educate students. Other factors affecting the development of the building’s design requirements were the community partnerships to be involved, and environmental concerns affecting the building and its users.

With the programmatic requirements established, a State-managed selection process determined the architect of record for the project. Prescott Muir Architects was ultimately chosen, and the relationships previously established in the programming phase allowed for a smooth transition into the design phase of the project. Weber State administration appointees acted as the liaison coordinator for the venture, heading the team as overseer of the project. The key constituents: Mr. Court, Mr. Muir and his design team of Mr. Robertson and Ms. Arnett, Mr. Herman, Mr. Harris, and Mr. Jacobs met in a committee setting periodically so all would remain informed and provide input on the course of the design.

Whenever more than three entities are involved in the design and construction of a building, inevitably there exists the potential for disagreements in design, programming, and even construction. When numerous constituents bring their ideas, agendas, and priorities to the table, these disagreements can escalate unmanageably. Differences of opinion regarding issues of style and placement of the structure, among others, proved to be a challenge for all
involved. The administration at Weber State was said to be the most critical of every decision to be made. With effort, according to Mr. Muir, he and his team used this discussion to the advantage of the design. The constant assessment and criticism were perceived as opportunities to advance ideas even further until a rewarding outcome ensued. Mr. Muir’s team, instead of trying to immediately dictate what they felt the facility should be, approached this project with a mindset that open lines of communication are the essential component of not only a good design, but also good relations and a viable building that can stand the test of time.

It was discovered that each participant encouraged the design process, with the Weber State administration fully supportive of the vision of the art program. Mr. Harris, as the appointed project manager and official university representative, was responsible for voicing his opinions and thoughts with the best interests of the university in mind. In the end, DFCM had the definitive say; however, the entire working relationship was a success by way of clear, steady communication among all involved.

During the construction phase of the project, weekly project progress meetings were held, with the Project Manager, Architect, Contractor and DFCM in attendance. Differences of opinion were resolved with ease due to a professional atmosphere and respect for all involved. In the end, most major decisions were determined by costs, which were controlled by the project budget.

The successful fusion of ideas and desires was difficult, but with excellent communication among the gifted parties and a working group problem solving method in place, the end result is gratifying to all.
PROGRAMMING -

When the opportunity arose for Prescott Muir Architects to participate in the programming phase of the Ethel Wattis Kimball Visual Arts Center, they accepted the challenge. After meeting with the several clients, they created a programming study that included the needs assessment of six distinct programs within the Visual Art School that were at the time in various locations on the Weber State campus.

The program also suggested a different site location for the building that ultimately proved to be very successful in enhancing the overall image of the University and the adjacent Browning Performing Arts Center. This was accomplished by suggesting that in moving the proposed facility down the hill about seventy yards to an alternative site location, it would complete an implied campus square, creating a better flow of traffic and an enhanced representation of a planned campus. This would allow for an improved collaboration of the new art center with the student services and performing arts buildings in a manner that frames an outdoor space and creating a plaza, thus reinforcing the commitment to the students.

In a now defunct practice here in Utah, PMA had the opportunity to participate in the programming as well as the design of the project, of which they were chosen by the State-managed selection committee for their design proposal for the 64,000sf building.
SCHEMATIC DESIGN -

Taking what they learned from their programming studies, PMA incorporated their idea to provide for as many facets of the arts as the University provided into one facility. The studio art school provides painting and drawing studios, visual communication digital labs, print-making, photography, ceramics, textiles, casting, sculpture and small metals studios, and a foundry. A prominent feature of the design is the gallery, which includes collections handling and storage spaces. A student commons, food service area, and a gift shop links the two functions in the main hall space.

The main entrance ushers you into the main hall that reaches up to include the two-story classroom wing branching off to the east. On the immediate right are the administrative offices. On the left is the gallery space, followed by a gift shop and an open student lounge area. A lecture hall is placed at the end of this hall. The classroom wing, with access by stair or elevator in the main hall, stretches to the east, with rows of classrooms flanking the north side of the wide hallway. Woodshop spaces, painting studios, and pottery classrooms are located on the south side of the hall, giving access to the outdoors and creating caged storage spaces as well as loading/unloading areas. Upstairs, the north side of the spacious hallway houses rows of lofty studio spaces, and faculty offices and a common area occupy the south side. The program, then, creates a T-shaped building, and with careful placement of the differing functions housed within, successfully marries the two functions of the building.
IDEAS -

Ideas can evoke inspiration, optimism, innovation, creativity and criticism. It is then appropriate that a Visual Arts School should embody many of these ideas. Ideas can evolve to create better learning and teaching facilities, they can develop to provide a new healthier environment physically and mentally for students and faculty. Ideas about the future and how this building and academic program can evolve should be addressed. The design team and various committees adopted the notion of developing a high level of innovation and creativity.

To elevate the status of the school’s art program a cohesive teaching philosophy combined with a successful level of student interaction was desired within the campus environment. From this desire a group problem solving method was conceptualized. This idea was initiated by the faculty, and was researched and addressed by the various committees involved in the process. The idea of group problem solving was eventually manifested in the architectural design of the building and in the teaching practices of the faculty. The building provides group interaction and criticism by allowing students from different emphases and backgrounds to be constantly surrounded and enveloped in one another’s work. The creative talents between different disciplines and individuals act as stimulation, support, innovation, and criticism. For example, students involved in photography can get inspiration from digital media, or from more traditional trades like basket weaving or ceramics. The underlying concept is that all skills and media are transversely influenced and affected by each other. The overall intent is that of energy, creativity and criticism.
IDEAS -

The major way that the art center utilized this group problem-solving method is through the long halls and corridors that act as pin-up stations. By widening the hallways the architects created useable classroom space in the halls. The art can be left up after class for review and display by all passersby and other classes. Another great idea was the ability that this building has to expand and adapt. By using few solid load-bearing walls and creating an easily be adaptable grid system the building can adjust with little effort. The ability to change with the needs of the future was extremely important to maintaining a long-term high quality institution.

The physical health of students and faculty was also of major concern to PMA. Great research and detail was undertaken in the mechanical systems and layout to properly and efficiently exhaust harmful fumes and recirculate healthy air. The scattering of wet labs for photography keeps the chemical levels low by not concentrating large amounts of chemicals in one area. The extensive use of large hoods placed at critical locations in rooms helps to ventilate the facility properly. The deliberate exposure of such equipment helped to reassure the attention paid to the health of the occupants.

All of the ideas and innovations were developed and integrated to elevate the school’s visibility nationally and to elevate art awareness and understanding in the community. The group problem-solving method employed in the center is a reflection of the group problem-solving method that created the building. The input from students, faculty, donors, committees, architects, and university and state agencies worked together feeding off each other’s knowledge, experience and opinions.
BUDGET -

The original project budget was $11,787,000, to which a new parking lot and utility piping were added, and a few owner-provided items were deducted, bringing the final project budget for bid to $11,803,000. The final cost of the building was $11,832,000 or roughly $164.00 per square foot. Change orders totaled $184,117, attributed to errors and omissions.
CONSTRUCTION -

In designing the arts center, PMA provided a wide range of architectural services from programming to post-occupancy involvement with the project. At the time that this firm was commissioned to design the new art school, current government policy that prohibits the programming firm as the design architect, was not in effect. Therefore, PMA maintained a greater level of involvement with the project than is typical now among design firms. This degree of involvement proved to be of great value to Weber State University’s new facility.

As the desire for a new art center became a reality, DFCM put together a qualified team of designers and consultants to develop the project. This team worked together under the direction of PMA to develop a dialogue and a relationship that resulted in an overriding concern for the project rather than any individual’s agenda.

The master plan for the campus of Weber State initially required the new facility to be placed in a different location than was finally realized. However, the programming and site analysis that the architect performed had a direct impact on the final site for the Visual Arts Center. In addition, utility studies confirmed the need to design a utility tunnel connecting the new building with the existing mechanical resources on campus.

In the design and construction phases of the project, the architectural firm provided another set of services. PMA, in designing the building, adhered to the requirements of the building code and to ADA requirements as well, allowing the necessary access to all building occupants. The design firm created a beautiful building both outside as well as inside, handling all of the interiors, signage, and fur-
CONSTRUCTION -

Furniture purchasing in addition to providing excellent lighting that is adjustable and accommodates the changing needs of the art school. Because of the location of the University, on the bench of the Wasatch Mountains, the building was designed to meet or exceed the seismic requirements of its location so that the life-span of the building will be maximized. In order to comply with the overall aesthetic of the University, the architect was required to undertake materials research. The result was to create a building that fits the campus, yet is a prominent feature of the central portion of it.

The architectural firm oversaw the administration of the construction contract as well. Issues arose during the construction phase that had to be dealt with. For example, the original steel contractor had to be replaced with a different contractor due to budget in discrepencies. Another example is with the company that was contracted to produce the window shading devices for the studios. The original company went bankrupt, and had to be replaced during the construction phase. Although the project was not completed on time (the decision to provide an excellent facility rather than an on-time, but poorly constructed building was a conscious one), the building was completed under budget regardless of the construction delay. Control, the general contractor, delivered beautifully what some might consider a difficult product due to the attention necessary to fulfill what is not considered a standard building type.

Because of the specialized equipment and programmatic spaces required in the arts center, continual monitoring of the energy consumption of the building is being undertaken. The building itself is not particularly energy efficient. However, the systems are integrated into the building in such a manner that, if at any time the needs of the school change, differing zones can be bypassed, allowing the building to potentially reduce its energy intake and become more efficient.
SUMMARY -

The design and construction of the Ethel Wattis Kimball Visual Arts Center was a successful project not only from the standpoint of its completion within budget as a significant addition to the campus of Weber State University, but also according to the experiences of those involved in the fruition of the venture. A crucial factor to that success evolved from the relationships that existed among all of the entities involved, which focused concern on delivering a high quality facility rather than catering to any specific agenda.

The Visual Arts Center, which included 72,283 square feet of classroom space, production facilities, as well as exhibition and lecture space, was originally scheduled for completion in August 2001. However, due to some setbacks caused by weather and other factors, the actual completion date was May 2002. This delay did not result in penalization of the contractor. The project team opted to focus on the realization of a well-built building that achieved all of the intended goals instead of pushing the contractor to meet a deadline, possibly sacrificing those goals. This was accomplished with no cost implications.

PMA is extremely pleased with the outcome of the Ethel Wattis Kimball Visual Arts Center. They have had the opportunity to participate in the development of a unique project that has raised the standard for education in the arts at Weber State University and the state of Utah. The new building facilitates dramatically increased interaction among the design disciplines while meeting their individual needs. The architect was able to provide a building that meets the goals of all of the organizations involved: the university, donors, DFCM, and user groups, while orchestrating the overriding vision of the Visual Arts Center. Accomplishing this, in addition to falling within budget and the absence of litigation over the project, proves to be a success.
SUMMARY -

The several client groups involved look at the successes of the building in different ways. Mr. Court (DFCM representative) has a unique viewpoint. Because the project was entirely funded by donors, he placed emphasis on meeting the needs of the students and faculty rather than strictly adhering to any other agenda. DFCM views the building as successful in that it is a much better facility for educating students and that it met its budget requirements. Mr. Jacobs (faculty representative) says, “I think the overall design is more innovative than many others on the campus.” The change in siting of the project has helped it become a more prominent feature on campus.

In addition, the wide corridors provide much more interaction between students and faculty alike. The gallery spaces as well as the high tech equipment in the classrooms and lecture halls increase the capabilities of those environments. The gift shop and café that were included are not as successful as had been hoped. Because of the commuter nature of Weber State University, these elements do not see the amount of revenue that was intended, and in fact, the café has since been removed. Mr. Harris (University representative) praises the good interior traffic flow and the accomplishment of meeting curriculum requirements. The exterior of the building, he says, “deviates significantly from the campus ‘standard,’” although he does not comment on whether or not that is a good thing. In addition, the students seem to be pleased with their new facilities and are now in the second full year occupying them.

As design is undertaken, ethical questions unavoidably surface. In this particular project, because DFCM is contractually the client but the building is situated on the campus of Weber State, there is concern about how to provide the best building for the campus while maintaining the interests of the client. Fortunately, as was previously mentioned, communication and good relationships among all of the entities involved smoothed over what could potentially be a point of major contention. Although this is somewhat of a balancing act, the support of the steering committee and the entire project team supported an attitude of doing what was best for the project, with the realization that the building would outlast any of the people or personal interests involved. Mr. Muir kept himself open to the dialogue, but maintained a unified and clear vision for the project.