

Abstract:

This paper examines a new exhibition policy for works of art on paper as developed by the conservation department at the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts in 1991. It focuses specifically on the recommended exposure times to which works can be reasonably subjected in light of the Museum's concurrent but sometimes conflicting mandates of preservation and display. The policy involves 3 sensitivity categories and proposes an annual limit (which can be converted into a bi-annual or tri-annual limit as required). Category lists have been prepared which classify most materials in the works on paper class to assist the conservator with accurate classification of works of art into appropriate categories. The rationale behind the elaboration of the policy as well as ideas for effective administration are discussed.

# **A Suggested Exhibition /Exposure Policy for Works of Art on Paper**

*by Karen M. Colby,*

## **1.0 Introduction**

The establishment of an *acceptable* exposure period for the exhibition of works of art on paper represents a great source of frustration for many museum professionals, including conservators. An unprecedented surge in the frequency of use of our collections for both loans and exhibitions has prodded conservators to look closely at the exhibition policies currently in place and, in many instances, we are finding the recommendations to be out of date, ill-defined, or generally inadequate. Other museum professionals, whose mandate it is to also circulate and use the collection, are quick to challenge what they often perceive (sometimes correctly) as unnecessarily rigid and poorly rationalised restrictions.

The Montreal Museum of Fine Arts (MMFA) represented a good case in point. The previous exhibition policy for works on paper had shown itself to be a source of tension between various departments within the museum. It stipulated a six week maximum exposure period which provoked conflict with virtually every external loan or exhibition request. Since the rationale behind the selection of this limit was unknown - even to the conservation department - exceptions were routinely made to accommodate the inevitable "politically-essential" requests. Unfortunately, consistency became a problem. In the interest of both the preservation of the collection and in the maintaining of credibility of the conservation profession, it became essential for the conservation department to develop a new approach which it was prepared to defend and explain. Motivating factors behind redrafting the exhibition policy, then, included:

- i) a view that a more soundly based compromise could be achieved between the museum's twin mandates of conservation and *exhibition*;
- ii) a need to develop a more factual and defensible policy which could satisfy the conservation department's practical preservation concerns, and that would be based on the most current knowledge and research; and
- iii) a dramatic increase in the number of requests to use the

collection which had put pressure on the old policy.

The exhibition policy at the MMFA was by no means unique in its shortcomings. Some preliminary investigation of the policies of other major Canadian art institutions revealed that there was no uniformity or consistency whatsoever in the approach taken. It is typical for museums to specify a standard exhibition duration for works on paper, but this period ranges from 4 weeks per year to 6 months per year depending on the institution. Informal inquiries to conservators at these museums further indicated that most policies have not been reviewed in years and, in most cases, the rationale behind the permissible period is unknown.

In elaborating a new, somewhat more complex policy at the MMFA, every effort was made to acknowledge the different levels of sensitivity to light within the works on paper collection while keeping the new system manageable from an administrative point of view. Works of art on paper cover the entire range of possible degrees of sensitivity to light and resist, perhaps more than any other class of artworks, being grouped together for policy purposes. Our previous "one-size-fits-all " or one category approach provided us with both a dangerous false sense of security in the case of extremely sensitive artworks, and with unnecessary frustration in the case of more durable artworks. The choice appeared to be to consider all artworks together as though they were very sensitive, with a maximum exposure of 4 weeks per year if we wanted to even moderately delay the fade of sensitive works, or to devise a system which allowed us a little flexibility with respect to our more durable pieces. The result was a new three-category approach, in use by the Conservation department of the MMFA in formulating its internal recommendations for exhibition and loans since the writing of this policy in early 1991.

The following pages present a description of the new exhibition policy and an explanation of the rationale behind it.

## **2.0 The Exhibition Policy:**

### 2.1 Summary

All artworks on paper have been assigned to one of three categories which pertain to their sensitivity to light.(See Table 1) The categories are based on the British Blue Wool or International Standards Organisation (ISO) standards as follows.

Category 1: Works of sensitivity levels ISO 1, 2, or 3;

Category 2: Works of sensitivity levels ISO 4, 5, or 6; Category 3: Works of sensitivity levels ISO 7, 8, or above.

The policy is based on an understanding of the approximate quantity of luxhours which may cause a "just noticeable" degree of fade in the most sensitive works of each category.<sup>1</sup> This luxhour quantity is shown in the first column of Table 1. Based on this approximate quantity of luxhours believed to cause fade/ a yearly exhibition duration has been recommended for each category. This is shown in the second column. If the artwork is displayed as allowed in these recommendations, we might expect to see fade on some of the artworks in that category in the number of years indicated in the third column. Note that these are very approximate figures only. Fade rates are very difficult to predict with any precision.

Artworks are assigned to their categories following classification by the conservation staff. This is done either with specific knowledge of the ISO levels of the materials involved or through consultation with the policy handbook which has been prepared for this purpose. (See Category Lists I/ 2, and 3 and the section on *Classification* for further details)

The following points also apply:

- i) These exposure recommendations are based on regular yearly use. Recommended exhibition durations can/ in practice, be modified as necessary by adjusting the storage factor. (e.g. A recommendation of 4 weeks exposure per year is assumed to have the same effect as 8 weeks per 2 years/ 12 weeks per 3 years/ etc.<sup>2</sup>) It is recommended that exhibitions never exceed 20 weeks, regardless of accumulated storage time.
- ii) It is assumed that ultraviolet radiation (UV) has been filtered out or is excluded from the light source. UV greatly alters the fade rates of materials and, since it should not be present in more than fractional quantities in museum environments/ it was not included in any calculations.
- iii) The figures in the policy have been based on a 42 hour exposure week with an intensity of 100 lux for Category 2 and 3 works, and 75 lux for category 1 works.

## 2.2 The Blue Wool System

The Blue Wool system refers to the British blue wool standard BS 1006; 1978 also known as the International Standards Organisation R105 series (ISO). The system consists of 8 dyed wool bands which fade at characteristic rates, ISO 1 being the most fugitive and ISO 8 the most permanent. Materials are described as exhibiting similar behaviour to one of the ISO levels. Since it was found that the literature already provided enough information on ISO rankings of materials pertinent to the works on paper class to allow the writing of a general policy, no original testing or research on material behaviour was conducted for the purpose of this project. Mr. Stefan Michalski, Senior Conservation Scientist with the Canadian Conservation Institute (CCI) was very helpful in assisting with the more difficult to classify material, and has indicated that CCI is planning to publish a list of materials with characteristic ISO levels at some point in the future.

There were many advantages to basing our policy on the ISO blue wool system. It was, for example, very useful in immediately illustrating that the artworks in the works on paper class fall not only into the lowermost (the more sensitive) levels as is often presumed, but in fact covered the entire spectrum from ISO sensitivity level 1 to ISO sensitivity level 8. Use of the ISO system seemed, furthermore, to be the only factual way to attempt to discuss the behaviour of materials and colour in their response to light. Another important advantage is that it can be used to communicate concepts of fading to non-specialists, and tends to be more convincing than vague warnings. Effective communication of the rationale behind protective policies is essential if cooperation or support in their implementation is to be forthcoming.

It is understood that the Blue Wool System does not, strictly speaking, always apply to some of the diverse materials within the works on paper class where fading is not necessarily relevant. For our particular purposes, however, and in the interest of coherence and simplicity, colour "change" of pigments or materials has been considered as similar to first "fade". It should also be understood that while the categories are based on the Blue wool system to provide an initial logic we can, for our own reasons enlarge these categories to include other materials.

### 2.3 Rationale behind the Policy

Table 2 assembles some of the relevant background information. It shows the approximate quantity of light in megaluxhours required to achieve a "just noticeable" degree of fade for each ISO level. Since materials in the works on paper class cover the entire range of ISO level 1 to 8, it was necessary to acknowledge this enormous range of sensitivity. It was decided to work with three broad categories in an effort to allow some flexibility in the possible exposure allowances while trying to keep the policy simple to administer. The categories *A<sub>f</sub>*, *B*, and *C*, first proposed by Robert Feller<sup>3/</sup> seemed to work well for the purpose and were re-named Categories 3 (durable), 2 (intermediate), and 1 (sensitive).

It was necessary to target one of the ISO levels in each of the three categories on which to make our calculations in elaborating the policy. The original idea was to select the lowest ISO value in each category, thereby protecting the most sensitive works for all of that category. This worked well, and was done, for the more durable groups (Categories 2 and 3) in which ISO levels 4 and 7 were targeted respectively.

In the most sensitive group (Category 1) this was more difficult. This group begins with the most light-sensitive materials (with virtually no light tolerance) and runs to ISO 3. Choosing the lowermost materials as a standard for the rest of the group would have meant no permissible exposure at all and would not have been a fair representation. It is, in practise, difficult for the conservator to distinguish materials of ISO level 1 and lower. They have often changed or disappeared long ago or, even if identified early, will likely change in anywhere from 0 to 100 years even if displayed in the most drastically restricted sort of display context. The conservator will have difficulty being any more precise than that.

It seems necessary to consider all works that are suspected of containing materials of ISO 1 or lower sensitivity levels as exceptions to the policy as a whole and to make recommendations on a case by case basis. In practise this occurred very infrequently and the number of exceptions was but a tiny fraction of what it was prior to the use of this policy. It was decided to target the ISO 2 level as a general rule for the group. This, it should be remembered, is approximately 3 times more sensitive than the ISO 3 materials and thus conservatively covers most of the Category 1 group.

Having identified the approximate light quantities required to cause first fade in the lowermost works within each category, it remained for us, as a museum, to decide how quickly we were

prepared to deliver these light quantities. That is to say, over how many years were we comfortable in causing a hypothetical first fade?

The compromise we arrived at in each category, was already illustrated in Table 1. One column gives the annual luxhour allowance (also expressed in weeks) and another gives the number of years over which we will potentially see first fade in some of the artworks in that category.

Although it was Conservation staff who proposed the 100 year, 250 year, and 3500 year time frames for the Category 1, 2, and 3 works respectively, the curatorial and administration departments were consulted at this stage. With an understanding of the factors involved, they had occasion to consider other possibilities. For example, they were given the opportunity to consider longer annual exposure limits in the lower category as long as they were prepared to accept responsibility for the more rapid anticipated fade rates. Being presented with such tangible concepts and discussing, as a group, the moral implications, was an important phase in developing the policy. As custodians of the collection, they felt unable to condone possible fade in less than a century (in theory) and 100 years was established as the benchmark for Category 1. Although 100 years may seem alarmingly short as a period in which to accept change, it seemed to represent a realistic compromise between the competing mandates of exhibition and preservation. It is, incidentally, the most protective policy existing among the major Canadian art institutions today, including our previous "6-week policy" at the MMFA. (This underscores just how a false sense of security is currently being provided by many policies in the case of sensitive artworks.)

As described in the policy *Summary*, all calculations assume illumination levels of 75 lux in the case of Category 1 works, and 100 lux for Categories 2 and 3. These are a little higher than what we are accustomed to, but provide an allowance for travelling shows where we are sceptical about 50 lux actually being respected. They are also intended to allow us some flexibility in the light levels maintained in our in-house exhibitions. It is worth noting that the traditionally recommended level of 50 lux is increasingly coming under review as being too dim for older viewers.<sup>4</sup>

Recommendations for annual exhibition durations are given in both weeks and luxhours. This, it is hoped, will encourage a little more flexibility on our part in accommodating special lighting requirements, for example, in the case of requests by contemporary artists.<sup>5</sup> We should be able to make adjustments, when necessary,

and are able to do so when we start thinking in terms of lux hours per year rather than weeks or months.

An upper limit of 20 weeks is recommended as the total exhibition duration per year for all categories - regardless of accumulated storage time. This was done for various reasons. First/ it avoids accumulated "reserves" of storage time always being completely "used up." Second, it preserves the concept in the minds of both the public and the administration that semi-permanent or permanent display is, generally speaking, very hard on the collection. It must also be recalled that there are other factors which will affect the appearance of an object over time. These include travel, handling, wear and tear, humidity, and pollution. In the absence of quantifiable information on these factors, we felt some sort of upper limit on exhibition lengths had to be imposed. 20 weeks was judged to be a reasonable compromise. This is the reason for the 20 week annual recommendation for Category 3 works where a light restriction hardly seems necessary if works are not on regular permanent display.

Finally, it must be said that this policy does not pretend to make any sort of specific predictions about fade rates on particular objects. We do not know to what degree of partial fade many of these artworks have already progressed. We are usually estimating the ISO value of given materials; and we are grouping an enormous range of different materials (3 ISO levels in each case) into each category. We must understand the limitations that arise out of this, and resist making overly specific predictions.

#### 2.4 Classification of Artworks into Categories 1, 2 or 3

Accurate classification of artworks into the relevant categories is obviously of critical importance. This is a vast subject with many gray areas and questions still under study. The conservator who is well informed on the subject of materials behaviour will be able to more rapidly and confidently classify artworks into the appropriate categories, but it is also important that conservators with relatively little experience in this area feel they can work with the policy right away. As a result, we suggest two approaches to classifying artworks.

The most accurate involves detailed technical examination of the pigments and support materials. This is recommended where time and resources permit and where the importance of the artwork demands it. The pigment section of each category list is intended to be helpful in this instance. This section is, at present, still quite

underdeveloped and small. The conservator may have to go further than the policy handbook in identifying the ISO levels of the pigments in question.

In the busy museum context where time, facilities, and expertise do not allow for pigment or materials analysis on a routine basis, it will be much more practical to rely on the media and techniques section of each category list. This second approach has the advantage of being very rapid and slowly introducing the inexperienced conservator to the subject as well as allowing the policy to be implemented immediately. Given the very general nature of the predictions made by the policy there is every reason to have confidence that the collection can be well served with this approach.

It was surprisingly straightforward to identify a list of materials and techniques very typical to the works on paper class and to subsequently assign these to a category. A conservative bias was incorporated into our category lists and they should be very useful. It is worth mentioning a few qualifying factors. Lightfastness ratings in the literature are usually given for a typical middle shade. Tints and thin washes may be 1 to 2 ISO levels more sensitive while heavy colours may be more durable.<sup>6</sup> The media in which pigments are mixed could arguably represent a variable but this does not appear to dramatically affect light sensitivity.<sup>7</sup> Although pigments mixed in oil seem consistently to be 1 ISO level more durable than those mixed in acrylic, CCI tests on selected pigments revealed there was no significant difference in fading between pigments in oil and watercolour.<sup>8</sup> For the purposes of our lists, we have not, for the most part, considered pigment vehicle as a determining factor.

In practice, it was found that artworks were most efficiently classified on an "as needed" or "as acquired" basis. The category ranking is then indicated both on the inside of the window mat and in the condition report file. This avoids duplication of the process and allows the curator to make use of the information.

The category lists can be consulted to provide a sense of techniques typical to each category. It is interesting to note a few examples. Category 1 contains the longest list. This is the most sensitive category and also serves as a catch-all for unknown or unidentified materials. It is often surprising to some to see that coloured printing inks can be as sensitive as some watercolours and pastels. Although it is known that some watercolours (such as Winsor and Newton's top of the line series) can be very lightfast, when the brand names or quality of coloured

materials are unknown it must be assumed that at least one of the colours present will be very light sensitive.

Category 2 is most remarkable for its inclusion of wood pulp papers. Almost all weakening and colour change of wood pulp papers occurs when exposed to the ultraviolet region of the spectrum.<sup>9 10</sup> As a result, when UV is excluded from the light source as presumed by this policy, most wood pulp papers behave like intermediate materials.<sup>11</sup> This is of great value to museums possessing large collections of 20th century Canadian material such as the many Group of Seven works consisting of durable drawing materials on inferior grade papers.

Category 3 is important for containing all historical black and white prints on good quality rag papers. Carbon-based inks such as these have excellent lightfastness as do rag papers when UV is excluded. This obviously represents a large body of work in our museum collections and it comes as a great relief to be able to circulate them more frequently without compromising our preservation concerns.

Finally, it should be understood that the category lists are not engraved in stone and should be changed and updated as information becomes available. This is especially important in the case of the pigment sections of each category list. More comprehensive literature searches should be undertaken as time permits. The photographic materials sections are also underdeveloped although what is known about the new colour materials and black and white silver gelatin prints is very encouraging. Very little data on the light sensitivity of many historic prints and the older colour photographs exists and this should be incorporated if and when it becomes available. And lastly, whenever possible, I think the compiling of information on brand name materials would be very useful. The optimum format for such updating is a small handbook with room for added pages in the category list section.

### 3.0 Administration

The technical aspects of the policy should, of course, be managed by the Conservation department. This includes classification, as previously discussed, and all subsequent recommendations. It has always been part of the Conservation department's role to examine and make recommendations regarding requests for loan or exhibition so this, in itself, does not represent a big change. The department's work is facilitated by a clearly presented handbook containing category lists and a continually expanding list of pigments with information on their sensitivity to light. Once large sections of the collection have been classified, and this information entered into the museum computer system, a properly trained staff member in the collections management department could, foreseeably, screen many of the more obviously unsuitable loan requests. We are not yet at this stage, but it would certainly be a logical development.

Also basic to the policy's implementation is the maintenance of an exposure history which lists all past exhibitions for each artwork. A record of this kind is already kept by the collections management department in most museums and as such represents no change in the administrative workload.

One administrative detail which generated some concern was that of developing an in-house exhibition system which would easily permit showing mixtures of works from all three exposure categories with a minimum of paperwork. For the present, we have been trying the following approach. We try to keep our in-house shows (that draw from our permanent prints and drawings collection) to 8 weeks duration which allows access to almost all artworks without any conflict at least every 2 years. Since works from Categories 2 and 3 can be annually exposed for this period without harm, these are not routinely, and individually verified. Exposure histories for the Category 1 works, on the other hand, are verified by the conservator. To date this system has worked well.

In the case of all loan requests, without exception, the exposure history of artworks in question is subject to individual verification. The collections management department sends a record of the exposure history of each work along with the loan request forms and the conservator then verifies that the recommended accumulations are not being exceeded. In both exhibition and loan procedures, we generally try to insist that the storage time necessary to justify the requested exhibition duration *already be accumulated*. This avoids the enormous difficulties that can be

encountered in trying to enforce lengthy storage periods *after* an exhibition. Again, implementation of all of the above/ to date, has been successful. Computerization of all internal operations and inventories will eventually render the procedures much more efficient.

It is acknowledged that all institutions will have different demands and priorities and that the above administrative details (e.g. routine duration of internal exhibitions from the permanent collection) may have to be modified. The details of our system by no means represent the only possibilities. In working with an understanding of the same fade rates and categories described here, museums may come up with varying working solutions.

#### **4.0 Conclusions**

Although the implementation of a multi-category system of classification for works of art on paper is clearly more work and less straightforward than our previous policy, it seems the time has come to acknowledge that our collections do not respond uniformly to light. It may be much more convenient to ignore this reality in continuing to group all artworks on paper into one category with one recommended exposure duration, but this will compromise the longterm preservation of some parts of our collection and limit our flexibility unnecessarily with others.

The elaboration of this exhibition policy involved a consultation session with the relevant curators and some members of the senior administration in which exhibition duration options, along with the corresponding fade rates over time, were discussed. In this way, these other museum professionals became more familiar with the tangible results associated with adjusting exhibition durations and saw that, in examining the technical data along with the conservation department, a policy could be devised to better serve both the conservation and exhibition mandates of the museum. From the point of view of the Conservation department it was significant in communicating to other museum professionals, in particular the administration, that we all share the responsibility for controlling changes in the appearance of the collection. This seems to have re-awakened an important commitment on their part to the concept of exposure control. Our experience to date has been positive and the conservation department will continue to make its recommendations for exhibition and loan on the basis of the newly established policy. At the end of a prolonged trial period, we

will propose a more formal adoption of the exhibition policy by the Museum administration.

## Category One

### Definition

All artworks with colours, media, or support of lightfastness rating (ISO blue wool standards) ISO 3 or lower.

### General Guidelines

The following materials and techniques are classified as Category One:

- pastels; any sensitive colours, cheap or unknown palettes
- watercolours; any sensitive colours, cheap or unknown palettes
- gouaches; any sensitive colours, cheap or unknown palettes
- coloured printing inks (including oil based); any sensitive colours or unknown palettes eg. : lithographs, screenprints, commercial printing, etc.
- multi-coloured tempera images of unidentified pigments (e.g. Illuminated manuscripts, oriental gouache or tempera on paper or silk)
- most tinted papers, e.g. blue gray, green gray
- colour photographs of unknown quality including older colour photographs
- polaroids
- most historic natural dyes on textiles (except indigo & madder on wool )
- felt tip pen drawings (e.g. Inuit drawings)
- bistres, sepias (sensitivity of iron gall not known)
- complex black inks
- unknown yellows and reds in Japanese block prints
- unknown yellows and reds in European manuscripts
- feathers, low grade commercial materials used in collages

### Specific Pigments

All pigments of ISO sensitivity 1, 2, and 3 are classified as Category One, including:

- gamboge
- complex blacks
- madder and indigo on cotton
- indigo in watercolour
- thin tints and washes of intermediate pigments, e.g. Carmine
- most lake pigments, (quercitron, carmine in watercolour washes on white paper)

- safflower red
- turmeric
- dayflower blue.

## Category Two

### Definition

All artworks with colours, media, or support of lightfastness rating (ISO blue wool standards) ISO 4, 5, or 6.

### General Guidelines

The following materials and techniques are classified as Category Two:

- wood pulp and other low grade paper or card supports
- silver dye bleach processed prints
- colour slides known to be Kodachrome, Ektachrome, Fujichrome, etc.
- Cibachromes
- new colour photographs (this decade)

### Specific Pigments

All pigments of ISO sensitivity 4, 5, and 6 are classified as Category Two, including:

- some traditional dyes on textiles (Padfield and Landi, 1966)
- vermilion (darkens rather than fades)
- Indian yellow
- the principal brilliant reds: carmine, madder lake, alizarin lake.

## Category Three

### Definition

All artworks with colours, media, or support, of lightfastness rating (ISO blue wool standards) ISO 7, 8, or above.

### General Guideline

The following materials and techniques are classified as Category Three:

- good quality rag papers
- carbon-based inks
- graphite, charcoal
- silver and metal points (coatings for metalpoint papers are probably acceptable if white, but not if coloured)
- earth pigments, ochres, umbers, etc.
- natural chalks, sanguine, brown, black, white (conté crayons)
- black and white silver/gelatin photographs
- gold toned, selenium toned, and other permanently processed photographs
- plastics, polyethylene, synthetic resins

### Specific Pigments

All pigments of ISO sensitivity 7, 8, and above are classified as Category Three, including:

- top quality modern colours including watercolours, gouache, pastels, etc.,
- modern cadmium red
- ultramarine, most blues
- aureolin (cobalt yellow)
- indigo and madder on wool.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Light Damage Slide Rule", *CCI Notes 2/6*, Canadian Conservation Institute, Ottawa, 1989.

Brommelle, N.S., "The Russell and Abney Report on the Action of Light on Watercolours" *Studies in Conservation* , vol 9 (1964), 140-153.

Daniels, V. "The Discolouration of Paper on Ageing". *The Paper Conservator* , vol 12 (1988), pp.93-100.

Feller, R.L., *A Handbook of Pigments and their Characteristics*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, (1985).

Feller, R.L., "Control of deteriorating effects of light on museum objects" *Museum* 17(2), (1964), pp.71-98.

Feller, R.L., Curran, M., Bailie, C., *Identification of traditional organic colorants employed in Japanese prints and their rates of fading* Alien Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin College, distributed by Indiana University Press, 1984.

Feller, R.L., "Further studies on the International blue wool standards for exposure to light", in Preprints of the 5th Triennial Meeting, ICOM-Committee for Conservation, Zagreb, Yugoslavia, 1978, Grimstad, K., Ed. pp. 78/18/2.

Feller, R.L., Johnston-Feller, R., "Continued investigations involving the ISO blue wool standards of exposure" in Preprints of the 6th Triennial Meeting, ICOM-Committee for Conservation, Ottawa, 1981, pp. 81/18/1.

Feller, R.L., "Studies on the darkening of vermilion by light" *Report and Studies in the History of Art, National Gallery of Art*, Washington, 1967, pp. 99-111.

Feller, R.L., "Studies on photochemical deterioration" in Preprints of the 4th Triennial Meeting, ICOM-Committee for Conservation, Venice, 1975, pp. 75/19/4.

Feller, R.L., "The deteriorating effect of light on museum objects" *Museum News Technical Supplement* 3, 1964.

Hendricks, Klaus, B., Thurgood, B., Iraci, J., Lesser, B., Hill, G., *Fundamentals of Photograph Conservation: A Study Guide*. Lugus Publications, The National Archives of Canada, and The Canada

Communication Group - Publishing Supply and Services Canada, Toronto/ 1991.

Lafontaine, R.L. "Environmental Norms for Canadian Museums, Art Galleries and Archives", *CCI Technical Bulletin* 5, Canadian Conservation Institute, 1981.

Leary, G.J. "The Yellowing of Wood by Light" *TAPPI*, vol.50, no.1, January 1967, pp. 17-19.

Michalski, S., "Damage to Museum Objects by Visible Radiation (light) and Ultraviolet Radiation (UV)". In preprints of *Lighting in Museums, Galleries and Historic Houses*, London, The [British] Museums Association, 1987, pp. 3-15.

Michalski, S., "Time's Effects on Painting" *Shared Responsibility: Proceedings of a Seminar for Curators and Conservators*, National Gallery of Canada, Ramsay-Jolicoeur, B.A., and Wainwright, I.N.M., Editors, Ottawa, 1990, pp. 39-53.

Michalski, S., "Towards Specific Lighting Guidelines", in Preprints of the 7th Triennial Meeting, ICOM-Committee for Conservation, Dresden, Germany, 1990, pp. 583-589.

Padfield, T., and Landi, S., "The Lightfastness of the Natural Dyes" *Studies in Conservation*, vol. 11 (1966), pp. 181-195.

Pratt, Christopher, "Conservation and Curatorial Issues: An Artist's Thoughts", in *Shared Responsibility: Proceedings of a Seminar for Curators and Conservators*, National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, (1990), pp. 153-158.G

Shelley, M. "Rembrandt's Inks", *AIC Book and Paper Group Annual*, vol. 2, 1982, pp. 93-94.

*Standard Methods for the Determination of the Colour Fastness of Textiles and Leather*", Society of Dyers and Colourists, 4th Ed., England, 1978.

"Storing Works on Paper", *CCI Notes* 11/2, Canadian Conservation Institute, Ottawa, 1986.

Thomson, G. *The Museum Environment.*, 2nd edn., (London, Butterworths, 1986).

Van den Akker, J. A., Harry F. Lewis, Gary W. Jones and M.A.

Buchanan "The Nature of the Color Changes in Groundwood" *TAPPI*  
vol. 32., no.4, April 1949, pp. 187-192.

*Acknowledgments: I would like to thank Mr. Stefan Michalski, Senior Conservation Scientist at the Canadian Conservation Institute, for his assistance. He generously provided technical information where little was available in the published literature and contributed valued suggestions and opinions to the project.*

(July 9, 1993)

#### ENDNOTES

1. "Just noticeable fade" refers to a Grey scale 3-4 level of change in the blue wool standard. These values can be obtained from different sources and vary due to difficulties in obtaining precise values. The very approximate luxhour quantity said to cause fade has, in this case, been taken from the CCI slide rule. (CCI Note 2/6)
  
2. Although environmental conditions such as temperature, humidity, and oxygen concentration can affect fade and rates of change somewhat, reciprocity is assumed to be demonstrated for most dyes, colours, and materials damaged by white light. [Michalski, "Damage to Museum Objects by Visible Radiation" *Lighting in Museums, Galleries, and Historic Houses*. Bristol Seminar, Museums Association (London, 1987) p.6.] CCI is currently conducting longterm testing of colours over a broad range of lux levels to further clarify the issue.
  
3. R.L. Feller, "Studies on Photochemical Deterioration" ICOM Committee for Conservation, (Venice, 1975) 75/19/4-6.
  
4. S. Michalski, "Toward Specific Lighting Guidelines", ICOM Committee for Conservation, (Dresden, 1990) p.583.
  
5. C. Pratt, "Conservation and Curatorial Issues: An Artist's Thoughts" *Shared Responsibility: Proceedings of a Seminar for Curators and Conservators*, National Gallery of Canada, Ramsay - Jolicoeur, B.A., and Wainwright, J.N.M., Editors, Ottawa, 1990, p.153-8.
  
- 6.S. Michalski, "Time's Effects on Paintings" *Shared Responsibility: 1990*, p.42.
  
7. Ibid.
  
8. Ibid.
  
9. G.J. Leary "The Yellowing of Groundwood by Light" *TAPPI*, vol 50, no.1, Jan. 1967, p.19.

10. J.A. Van den Akker, H.F. Lewis, G.W. Jones and M.A. Buchanan, "The Nature of the Color Changes in Groundwood" *TAPPI*, April 1949, vol.32, no.4, p.187.

11. Personal communication with S. Michalski, Senior Conservation Scientist, Canadian Conservation Institute, January 1991.



**TABLE 2 - EXPOSURE CATEGORIES**

<b>ISO LEVEL</b> (blue wool)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Perm.
<b>Megaluxhours to cause fade (-UV)</b>	0.4	1.2	3.6	10	32	100	300	900	-
<b>Feller's Categories</b>	C Fugitive		B Intermediate			A Excellent			
<b>MMFA Categories</b>	1 Sensitive		2 Intermediate			3 Durable			